

INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again -- beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

72-30,022

NORTH, Gary Burgess, 1937-

A STUDY OF EXPECTATIONS HELD BY SIGNIFICANT
REFERENCE GROUPS FOR THE POSITION OF HEAD
RESIDENT ADVISOR AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1972
Education, administration

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company , Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

A STUDY OF EXPECTATIONS HELD BY SIGNIFICANT
REFERENCE GROUPS FOR THE POSITION OF
HEAD RESIDENT ADVISOR AT MICHIGAN
STATE UNIVERSITY

By

Gary Burgess North

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1972

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have

indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF EXPECTATIONS HELD BY SIGNIFICANT REFERENCE GROUPS FOR THE POSITION OF HEAD RESIDENT ADVISOR AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By

Gary Burgess North

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to identify the role expectations which counselors, residence hall managers, Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, faculty, and students living in residence halls hold for the position of Head Resident Advisor at Michigan State University. It was hypothesized that no significant differences existed among the groups being studied on expectations held for the position of Head Resident Advisor. The expectations, measured by the instrument used for this study, were examined to determine overall differences among the groups. Areas of agreement and areas of conflict were noted among expectations held by Head Resident Advisors for their role and other's expectations of the Head Resident Advisor's role.

Procedure

A random sample of six groups (counselors assigned to residence halls, residence hall managers, Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, University College faculty teaching in residence halls, and undergraduate students living in residence halls) were identified as "significant reference groups" and selected as subjects for the study.

An instrument concerning selected aspects of the Head Resident Advisor's role was developed. The instrument contained ninety-seven items within six sub-scales. The sub-scales were: (1) expectations for program functions; (2) expectations for group advising functions; (3) expectations for individual advising functions; (4) expectations for student behavior functions; (5) expectations for liaison functions with residence hall management; and (6) expectations for administrative functions.

The instrument was submitted to 672 subjects during Spring term, 1971. A total of 489, or 71.2 per cent usable questionnaires, were returned.

A multivariate analysis of variance technique was used to determine overall differences among the six groups on the six sub-scales. A one-way analysis of variance technique was used to examine the questionnaire as a single scale. Following the one-way analysis of variance, the mean scores of the six groups were analyzed by the Scheffé post hoc comparison technique to precisely

locate differences among groups. The individual items of the questionnaire were analyzed by the chi square technique. In addition, the percentage responses of each group were ranked to determine degrees of consensus or disagreement for each role segment measured by the instrument developed for the study.

Findings

The multivariate analysis of variance indicated significant differences among the six groups for each of the sub-scales. The one-way analysis of variance indicated significant differences among the six groups on the total instrument. The Scheffé post hoc comparisons indicated that significant differences existed between: (1) Head Resident Advisors and students, (2) counselors and Student Affairs Personnel, (3) Student Affairs Personnel and faculty, and (4) Student Affairs Personnel and students. It may be noted that Student Affairs Personnel held the highest expectations for all the selected role segments measured in this study.

The generalist nature of the position of Head Resident Advisor was supported by the data gathered for the study. Generally, all groups indicated relatively high expectations for program responsibilities, group advising, and working with discipline and student behavior. Very little support was expressed, however, for expectations that required the Head Resident Advisor to function

in a counseling capacity. All groups tended to view the Head Resident Advisor as a referral agent, a resource agent, or information agent and not as one who delivered primary specialized services. All groups tended to reject expectations that the Head Resident Advisor play a primary role in the management of a residence hall. The Advisor's functions were seen as that of maintaining regular communication with hall management and providing assistance with interpretation and clarification of policies and regulations.

Significant differences were found to exist between the groups on fifty-two of the ninety-seven items included in the questionnaire. Sixty-eight of the items were given positive support by the groups being studied.

Since a significant statistical difference has been indicated between Head Resident Advisors and students, and Student Affairs Personnel and students, it is recommended that a committee composed of the identified significant reference groups be established to more clearly define the responsibilities of the Head Resident Advisor. After the position has been more clearly defined, an effort should be initiated by the Office of Student Affairs to communicate expectations held for the position to the campus community.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to the members of his guidance committee for their many considerations during his degree program. Dr. Eldon Nonnamaker, Chairman of the committee, is due a special note of thanks for his patience and "willingness to help" whenever called upon.

Deep appreciation is also expressed to the members of the Residence Hall staff who assisted with the development of the questionnaire and participated in the study. It is hoped that this study will contribute in some small way to the profession for which they have given so willingly--so much!

The staff members of the office of research consultation offered invaluable assistance during the tenure of the study--from the initial idea, through the development of the questionnaire, the pilot study, and the analysis of data. Mr. Ray Gabriel was extremely helpful during the process of data analysis.

To my wife, Marty, and sons, Michael and Matthew, all my love for their patience, support, and encouragement

during my procrastinations. Without their faith and constant prodding, this work would be yet incomplete.

And finally, to Mary McClafferty, an educator, who had enough faith to take a 17-year-old dropout into her home and guide him back into high school and on through college. Without her support and trust during those difficult times, this day would have never been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction.	1
The Problem	4
Statement of the Problem.	9
Hypothesis	13
Importance of the Study	15
Definition of Terms	17
Scope and Limitations of the Study	19
Overview of the Study.	20
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	22
Historical Development of Role Theory	22
Role Theory in Education	34
Student Personnel Literature Related to the Position of Head Resident Advisor	49
Summary	58
III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	60
Hypotheses	60
The Sample	61
Selection of the Sample	62
Counselors	62
Residence Hall Managers	62
Head Resident Advisor.	62
Student Affairs Administrators.	63
University College Faculty	63
Students	64
Instrumentation.	65
Scaling	65
Pilot Study	66
Reliability	67
Validity	68

Chapter	Page
Administration of the Questionnaire	68
Statistical Analysis	69
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	71
Introduction	71
Review of the Sub-Groups and the Pro- cedure of the Study	72
Hypotheses to be Tested	73
Tests of Hypotheses	74
Summary of Hypotheses Findings.	82
Analysis of the Sub-Scales	83
Analysis of Sub-Scale I	84
Analysis of Sub-Scale II.	92
Analysis of Sub-Scale III	101
Analysis of Sub-Scale IV.	107
Analysis of Sub-Scale V	116
Analysis of Sub-Scale VI.	122
Summary	137
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	138
Methodology	138
Conclusions	140
General Recommendations	156
Implications of the Study	159
Concluding Statement	160
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	162
APPENDICES	
Appendix	
A. Letter to Participants	167
B. Instrument Used in the Study	168
C. Job Description, Head Resident Advisor Position, Men and Women	172

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3-1. The Make-Up of the Sample and the Percentage of the Sample Returning the Questionnaire	64
3-2. Reliability Coefficients Computed for the Six Sub-Scales	67
4-1. Multivariate Analysis Test for No Difference Between Groups on the Six Sub-Scales of the Questionnaire	74
4-2. Table of Cell Means	75
4-3. One-Way Analysis of Variance Test for No Difference Between Groups on the Total Instrument	77
4-4. <u>Post Hoc</u> Comparisons	78
4-5. Results of Scheffé <u>Post Hoc</u> Comparisons.	80
4-6. Expectations for Program Responsibilities Held for the Head Resident Advisor	85
4-7. Expectations for Group Advising	93
4-8. Expectations for Individual Advising.	102
4-9. Expectations for Student Behavior.	108
4-10. Expectations for Liaison with Residence Hall Management	117
4-11. Expectations for General Administration.	123

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

This study is an attempt to clarify and describe the emerging professional role of the Head Resident Advisor at Michigan State University. It reports the outcome of an empirical study of role expectations held by significant reference groups for the position. The essential purpose of the study is to determine whether there are differences in expectations held for the position by significant reference groups. Role concepts developed in the fields of social psychology, sociology, and anthropology are used as the theoretical base for the study.

Michigan State University is recognized as a national leader in the field of residential housing. The University operates thirty-six residence halls and annually houses over 17,000 students on campus. It takes great pride in "providing more than just a place to eat and sleep for students."¹ A wide variety of

¹Michigan State University Catalogue, 1970, East Lansing, Michigan, p. 237.

housing facilities and educational programs has been developed to make residence halls a more important part of the student's total educational program. "Living-Learning Centers," a new phrase applied to a very old concept in housing, were constructed in the early 60's as the University attempted to break away from more traditional models of housing and better integrate experiences outside the classroom with classroom experiences. Classrooms, faculty offices, lecture rooms, recreation space, and other facilities were added to the living areas in order to cope with the problem of a growing institution and to make maximum use of space and time.²

As President John A. Hannah stated:

It is proposed to improve the environment of learning by making greater academic use of residence halls, and of the time students spend in them, thus eliminating as best we can physical inconveniences as an impediment to learning and capitalize upon our greatest advantage as a resident university.³

The new focus on the academic environment of residence halls brought with it the assignment of faculty to the living units, the development of decentralized

²Howard R. Neville, "How to Live with Bigness," Phi Delta Kappa, April, 1966, pp. 430-32; Edward Blackman, "Residence Halls as an Integral Part of the Learning Environment," Current Issues in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: Washington National Education Association, 1966).

³John A. Hannah (address to faculty and administration, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, March 27, 1961).

counseling center facilities, and the assignment of business officers to manage the food service and physical facilities of the halls. A student affairs staff directed by a Head Resident Advisor was assigned to each of the buildings by the Dean of Students. Residence halls had been staffed similarly in the past, but with the advent of the "Living-Learning" centers, the position of Head Resident Advisor took on a new level of educational responsibility in the administrative structure of the student affairs organization. In 1961, the first full-time professionally trained female Head Resident Advisor was employed by M.S.U. Prior to this date, housemothers had been employed for women's halls.

The aim of the new housing program was, in short, to develop an environment which provided a greater variety of faculty-student contacts, more counseling and orientation assistance, and more cultural, social, and academic programs for students. As the concept developed and grew, some forms of the "living-learning" idea have been extended to virtually all other residence halls on campus.

The Head Resident Advisor and his staff have assumed the role of catalyst or facilitator in the process of enriching the residence hall environment. Working through student government, ad hoc, student groups, faculty, the counseling staff, and other university

personnel, the Head Resident Advisor has assumed the initiative for organizing and coordinating hall orientation programs, encouraging faculty-student interaction, making use of University referral resources, and providing students with a primary staff contact at the house and hall level.

The Problem

The position of Head Resident Advisor has begun to emerge and grow toward a full-time professional level in the student affairs organization at Michigan State University. As the position has developed, however, incumbents have often encountered problems of ambiguity, identity, and status as they have attempted to more specifically delineate an appropriate role for themselves in the process of education. Head Resident Advisors have often encountered conflict in role expectations as they function as administrators, advisors, counselors, and disciplinarians. And, inadequate, inconsistent, or unclear interpretations of the position from higher level administrators often make for ambiguous and inconsistent definitions of expectations. Such a lack of clarity permits a high degree of latitude on the part of Head Resident Advisors in setting job priorities and contributes even further to misunderstanding and confusion about the position. In addition, little has been done by way of research to adequately justify and define the position as

a part of the educational process, and thus its functions have not been immediately recognized and accepted by other segments of the University. Thus, part of the problem has been a result of inadequate information about the new dimensions of the position. The Head Resident Advisor has often found himself in limbo, somewhere between the faculty and the non-academic employees with a pay scale consistently below that of faculty. Recognition for his accomplishments has often gone unnoticed and unrewarded. The position has been staffed primarily by doctoral students who have had prior experience in higher education, and thus it is often viewed as part of an internship training program rather than a full-time professional position which has importance to the educational purposes of the University. In addition, staff turnover has been relatively rapid and incumbents often perceive themselves as students first rather than professional educators. This factor alone has contributed significantly to the problem of acquiring status and recognition for the position in the University community.

One's interpretation of his role is shaped by the expectations of others as he perceives them, by his own attitudes and beliefs toward his role, and by the formal role definitions which communicate institutional expectations for his role. As Gross points out:

Three basic ideas which appear in most of the conceptualizations (of role analysis) if not in the definition of role themselves are that individuals: (1) in social locations (2) behave (3) with reference to expectations.⁴

The Head Resident Advisor is viewed somewhat differently by each group with whom he comes in contact. Some view him as an educator, others as an administrator, others as a counselor, while others often see him as a hotel clerk or recreation director. Such lack of common understanding on the part of significant reference groups has contributed to reduced productivity, frustration, and confusion for role incumbents. Thus the identification of areas of divergent expectations and role conflicts regarding the position of Head Resident Advisor is necessary if potential, real, and perceived conflict is to be resolved.

Traditionally, the position of Head Resident Advisor has been one of control. Throughout American educational history, dormitory staffs have functioned as agents of student control. This tradition was rooted in colonial colleges and has continued on through modern-day education in the form of parental rules and penalties. Dormitory staffs functioned to communicate and enforce such rules and policies. If at the same time they could assist students with social and academic concerns, it was

⁴ Neal C. Gross, Ward S. Mason, and A. W. McEachern, Exploration in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley, 1958), p. 17. (Hereinafter referred to as Role Analysis.)

appropriate but not as a primary responsibility of the job.⁵ However, as the emphasis on learning environment has grown, the control element of the Head Advisor's position has declined. During the mid-60's, a number of significant shifts occurred in the area of student social regulations which changed the emphasis of the position. The University moved away from its strong in loco parentis orientation toward a more liberal posture in the areas of visitation, selective hours for women, and usage of alcohol on campus. As more attention was given to students' rights as citizens, due process became a part of the disciplinary procedures. With this change, the Head Advisor had to rely more on persuasion and logic rather than arbitrary decision-making power to resolve problems and mediate disputes. A press also developed in the student community for more privacy, greater decision-making authority in the areas of social and academic governance, and more personal independence and autonomy. Thus, as the position of Head Resident Advisor was beginning to take on new organizational and educational dimensions, a number of internal forces added another definition by taking away some of its traditional authority.

⁵ John R. Powell, Samuel A. Plyler, Barbara A. Dickson, and Stephen D. McClellan, The Personnel Assistant in College Residence Halls (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969), pp. 6-10.

Efforts by other University agencies have also failed to deal adequately with the question of the appropriate role of the Head Resident Advisor. In 1967 the Committee on Undergraduate Education endorsed the value of the "living-learning" program for students. Their recommendations suggested (1) the extension of the living-learning program into intercollegiate units of instruction and residence and (2) the appointment of an all-University committee on residence halls.⁶ The committee does not, however, make mention of the position of Head Resident Advisor at any point in its preliminary remarks on housing nor in the recommendations for expanding the "living-learning" program. A Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, after investigating a challenge to the University residency requirement by the Off-Campus Council, an agency of student government which represents students living off campus, did, however, influence the Provost to appoint a committee to study the residence hall system.⁷ The committee, established in 1968, considered physical facilities, regulations, staffing, and the living-learning program as a part of its study. Here again, however, the

⁶Arthur Adams, et al., Improving Undergraduate Education (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1967), p. 52.

⁷Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, "Report on Off-Campus Council's Proposal Regarding Housing Regulations" (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1968).

committee report, while strongly supportive of the concept that residence hall experiences are a significant part of a student's out-of-class education, failed to give anything more than cursory attention to the fact that the Head Resident Advisor is a part of the housing structure. Thus, the Provost's Committee on Residence Halls, although charged specifically to look at residence hall staffing as one part of its responsibility, failed completely to clarify and interpret the role of the Head Resident Advisor so that it might be better understood by the University community.⁸

Statement of the Problem

The basic purposes of this study are to describe and analyze expectations held by significant reference groups for the role of Head Resident Advisor at Michigan State University. The study is based on the assumptions that each of these groups holds specific expectations which have primary importance for the position, and the extent to which such expectations are convergent or divergent strongly influences the way the position is defined by role incumbents. In addition it is assumed that role conflicts will result from ambiguous or unclear statements of role expectations.

⁸ Ann Garrison, et al., The Residence Hall Study, The Provost's Ad Hoc Committee on the Residence Halls (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1969), pp. 24-30.

To illustrate the extent to which differences in expectations prevail, one might point out some opinions which have been verbalized by members of the different groups about the position. Students generally expect the advisor to function in a supportive role--as an advisor and helper rather than as an administrator, supervisor, or disciplinarian for the University. The management staff often views the Head Resident Advisor as responsible for helping maintain order, protecting property, saving money for the operation, and enforcing regulations for the University. Counselors see the Head Resident Advisor as a facilitator and referral agent working through them. Faculty often perceive the Head Resident Advisor as social director, service personnel, or "babysitter" who keeps students entertained and provides for creature comforts. Faculty do not often view the position as one which has complementary educational value to the functions they perform in the classroom. Student affairs administrators tend to view the position as administrative and usually expect role incumbents to work in a way that reflects University objectives. Among Head Resident Advisors there prevails a host of definitions for the position. Some see it as advisory; others as a service position; while others still tend to see it as eclectic--administrative with supervisory, counseling/advising,

and control responsibilities included in its functions.⁹ Such divergence in points of view suggests that at best there exists a considerable degree of ambiguity regarding the position of Head Resident Advisor; and at worst, a high degree of conflict exists regarding the position.

While it is recognized that the definition of role includes many aspects, the primary focus of this paper will be on role expectations and the impact they have on the position of Head Resident Advisor. An examination will be made of the expectations incumbents hold for selected aspects of the role. These will be compared with those held by student affairs administrators who formally define the role to determine congruences of expectations and also with other significant reference groups which impact the position. Bentley points out that expectations are what is prescribed for a position. They are the rules of the game and are what is expected of an incumbent in a certain position of a social system. Incumbents are judged and evaluated as being competent according to the extent to which they are observed as carrying out or conforming to expectations for a position by others. If a person is significant to the incumbent, i.e. (supervisor, primary interactor), then the

⁹These opinions have been drawn from the writer's contacts with the various reference groups during his experiences as a residence hall administrator.

expectations of that person for the role must be attended to.¹¹ Bentley further states that role expectations are anticipated actions pertaining to positions in a social structure and that they fall into two general categories: (1) the actions expected of a role incumbent of a position--his obligations or duties, and (2) the actions an incumbent expects to be able to perform--his rights.¹²

Drawing on these comments, one could assume that an incumbent could not adequately perform a role for which he lacks an awareness of necessary role expectations. The communication and interpretation of appropriate role expectations for a position are a reciprocal responsibility of the formal role definers and the role incumbent, not the role incumbent himself. An incumbent must be provided with clear and consistent role expectations if he is to perform in a satisfactory manner.¹³

¹¹Joseph Bentley, The Counselor's Role: Commentary and Readings (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968), p. 74.

¹²Ibid., p. 75.

¹³Clinton Snyder, "Variations in Expectations for the Teacher Role, as Related to General and Specific Roles, Expectation Categories, and Social Distance" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965), pp. 122-24.

Brookover and others have pointed out the need to give careful attention to the impact of role expectations.¹⁴ They conclude that when role expectations are unclear or inadequate, uncertain cautious role performance is likely to follow. Sarbin extends on this idea by stating, " . . . conflicts are likely to follow from ambiguous role expectations."¹⁵

Thus, a primary assumption of this study is that role conflict may arise when the actions of a role incumbent (Head Resident Advisor) differ appreciably from the role expectations of significant others. And, in order to minimize the potential of conflict and provide greater clarity and predictability for the position, a more thorough understanding of role expectations is necessary. Such understanding can best be accomplished by a thorough study of role expectation held by significant reference groups for the position.

Hypothesis

The major hypothesis of the study is:

There are major differences in expectations held by significant reference groups for the position of Head Resident Advisor at Michigan State University.

¹⁴Wilbur Brookover, "Research on Teacher and Administrator Roles," The Journal of Educational Sociology, XXXIX (September, 1955), 317-53.

¹⁵Theodore Sarbin, "Role Theory," in Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. I, ed. by Gardner Lindzey (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954), p. 227.

The data will be analyzed to determine expectations held by significant reference groups for the performance of the Head Resident Advisor in selected areas of responsibility defined by the current job description for the position (see Appendix C). They are: (1) program functions, (2) group advising functions, (3) individual advising functions, (4) discipline, (5) management relations, and (6) general administration.

Included in the major hypothesis but also subject to study are the following secondary hypotheses.

- A. There are significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by residence hall counselors as measured by the instrument developed for this study.
- B. There are significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by residence hall managers as measured by the instrument developed for this study.
- C. There are significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by Student Affairs Personnel as measured by the instrument developed for this study.
- D. There are significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by faculty working in residence halls as measured by the instrument developed for this study.
- E. There are significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by students living in residence halls as measured by the instrument developed for this study.

These five secondary hypotheses are being studied because of the emphasis in literature on role theory about the importance of understanding how a role incumbent views

his position in comparison to other groups. A number of writers (Gross, Bentley, Brookover) affirm the importance of studying differences in expectations held by a role incumbent and those held by formal role definers of the position. For the purposes of this paper, Student Affairs Administrators will be defined as formal role definers.

The hypotheses will be stated in the null form for the purpose of statistical analysis in Chapter III of this study.

Importance of the Study

The position of Head Resident Advisor in a large university has never been studied in depth. A study of this nature should have implications for all members of the student personnel profession and for members of the academic community who hold different points of view about the position or who do not understand its role and functions.

The issue of the role of the Head Resident Advisor has become more central as the position has become more professionalized. A part of the process of professionalization is defining and limiting the activities of a position. This study attempts to provide a greater degree of clarity and predictability for the position and point out its functions and limitations. Role theory is used to study the position of Head Resident Advisor in an attempt to better define the position and to apply role concepts to the analysis of a position in the student

personnel profession. Professions are constantly looking for better methods for describing, analyzing, and evaluating positions within their field of interest. A basic assumption of this study is that role theory will prove to be a useful tool for this purpose.

Since this study is of a pilot nature and localized to Michigan State University, the findings may suggest that it is appropriate to apply the study more broadly to a cross section of Head Resident Advisors' positions in other schools where the position is emerging to a more significant level of importance.

The study should provide a bench mark which Head Resident Advisors can use as a point of reference for the interpretation of their own role.

The study could also have implications for the way job descriptions are written for the position and the way in-service education programs are developed. A clearer definition of the position should be provided for those people responsible for the development of selection and training programs for new Head Resident Advisors.

The results of the study should have implications for faculty and other groups on campus who have a limited knowledge of the position. Such information should provide a basis for further communication and clarification about the functions and responsibilities of the housing staff in the educational process of the University.

The study is also an important first step toward building a more systematic body of knowledge about the position of Head Resident Advisor. It will point out some selected areas of conflicts in expectation for the position and will more specifically pinpoint the location and nature of the conflict. Such information should be instrumental in helping administrators define, understand, and clarify points of conflict in the position. The study will hopefully generate data that would contribute to greater insight into the role of the Head Resident Advisor. It should help increase organizational effectiveness, improve morale, and generate greater personal satisfaction for role incumbents. Data generated from the study could also be used to develop a more comprehensive job description for the position.

Finally the study will test the value of role theory as a model for evaluating positions in the student personnel profession.

Definition of Terms

Role.--A set of standards, expectations, descriptions, norms, or concepts held for the behavior of a person or position. Here role is defined as a

normative concept emphasizing the expectations of behavior held by others for a role incumbent.¹⁶

Position.--The location of an individual or a class of individuals in a system of social relations.¹⁷

Role Expectations.--An evaluative standard applied to an incumbent of a position, i.e., what a person is expected to do in a given situation.¹⁸

Role Incumbent.--The focal person in a position. For the purposes of this study the Head Resident Advisor will be referred to as the "role incumbent."¹⁹

Role Conflicts.--Inconsistent prescriptions or standards held for a person or position by one or more others.²⁰

Role Concensus.--Sameness of commonly held norms, expectations, or conceptions of a position.²¹

¹⁶Bruce J. Biddle and Edwin J. Thomas, Role Theory: Concepts and Research (New York: John Wiley, 1966), p. 12. (Hereinafter referred to as Role Theory.)

¹⁷Gross, Mason, and McEachern, Role Analysis, p. 58.

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Biddle and Thomas, Role Theory, p. 12.

²¹Ibid.

Formal Role Definers.--Student affairs administrators.

Head Resident Advisor.--The chief administrative officer of a residence hall; a male or female responsible to the Dean of Students Office for the development and maintenance of a personnel program in a specific residence hall and for the supervision of a staff of graduate and undergraduate students.

Significant Reference Group.--A group having an impact, either formally or informally, on the definition of expectations of a position within a system of social relations. For the purposes of this study, significant reference groups are defined as: I. Counselors assigned to residence halls, II. Residence halls managers, III. Head Resident Advisors, IV. Student affairs administrators, V. Faculty teaching in residence halls, and VI. Students.

Expectations.--A standard held for the behavior of a person.²²

Scope and Limitations of the Study

Because of the lack of theoretical or empirical research on the position of Head Resident Advisor, this study is confined to an examination of expectations held

²²Ibid., p. 10.

for the position at Michigan State University. The pilot nature of the study limits the extent to which results can be generalized. A purpose of the study, however, is to test the instrument being used and the role theory model of analysis as possible tools for a more expanded study of this nature.

In addition the study is limited by factors inherent in the use of any questionnaire. These include the difficulty of securing complete cooperation of the sample, the biases of the respondents, the difficulty of getting consistent interpretations of the questions being asked, and the fact that some elements of the sample may be unable to adequately reflect perceptions of the position of Head Resident Advisor.

The findings of the study are limited to the position of Head Resident Advisor at Michigan State University.

Overview of the Study

This study of role expectations of the Head Resident Advisor is presented in five chapters.

Chapter I deals with an introduction and delin-eation of the problem; the problem statement, the importance of the study, a definition of terms to be used, and an overview of the study.

Chapter II consists of a review of related liter-ature in the areas of role theory and its application to

research in education. Section one treats the development of role theory in social science; section two covers its use in describing and analyzing positions in education, and section three treats literature related to the position of Head Resident Advisor.

Chapter III describes the research methodology used to develop and analyze the study, procedures for designing the study, the development of the questionnaire, and data collection and analysis are discussed.

Chapter IV deals with the presentation and analysis of the data.

Chapter V presents a summary of the study, draws conclusions about the research findings, makes suggestions about possible implementations, and recommends possible areas for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter is devoted to a review of literature related to the origin and development of emerging theoretical concepts of role analysis, to research in education using role concepts, and to a review of literature dealing with the position of Head Resident Advisor.

Historical Development of Role Theory

Role theory is a relatively new field of inquiry in the behavioral sciences. It has developed primarily through the interdisciplinary areas of anthropology, sociology, psychology, and education. Role concepts have been used to analyze and describe a variety of real-life behaviors such as an individual's appraisal of himself, the adequacy of a person's performance in a position, expectations groups hold for a role or position, and many more.

Since the issue of role appears to be central to an adequate understanding of the position of Head Resident

Advisor, it would appear that role theory would be an appropriate technique to use in analyzing and describing the position.

Brookover and Gottlieb support this assumption in their estimation of the value of role theory as a tool for analysis. They state:

Recent studies demonstrate that status-role theory provides a framework for fruitful analysis of various positions in the school system. . . . Understanding of the expectations held for teachers, administrators and other positions in the school is an essential foundation for the education of school personnel and the effective functioning of the school system. . . .¹

Gross, Mason, and McEachern concur with Brookover and Gottlieb by asserting "that students of the social sciences frequently make use of the concept of role as a central term for the analysis of the structure and functioning of social systems and for the explanation of individual behavior."² Parsons, Newcomb, and other researchers in the behavioral sciences make use of role concepts as anchorpoints in their framework for analyzing positions in social systems. With role concepts becoming so widely used in a variety of fields, it is appropriate to consider its origins and development and some of the

¹Wilbur Brookover and David Gottlieb, A Sociology of Education (New York: American Book Company, 1964), p. 353. (Hereinafter referred to as Sociology of Education.)

²Neal C. Gross, S. Mason, and A. W. McEachern, Exploration in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley, 1958), p. 3. (Hereinafter referred to as Role Analysis.)

definitional problems encountered in advancing the concept to a common level of understanding and acceptance.

A review of the theoretical aspects of role concepts soon becomes extremely detailed and complex. An attempt will be made to describe the basic constructs of role analysis and provide a framework for understanding and clarifying the term "role" and its related components. The works of Gross, Mason, McEachern, and Biddle have been used extensively for background material on the development and classification of emerging role concepts.

The prevailing definitions of role are generally summarized in three categories: (1) Normative, (2) Individual, and (3) Behavioral. Definitions of role which fall into the normative category refer to standards or norms expected of occupants of positions rather than to the actual behavior of individuals. Ivey and Robins follow the normative category when they define role "as an expectation of behavior, stemming from a general social agreement or from those whose judgements are psychologically significant to a role incumbent."³ The work of Ivey and Robin will be discussed in more detail in the section on role theory in education.

³Allen E. Ivey and Stanley S. Robin, "Role Theory, Role Conflict and Counseling, A Conceptual Framework," Journal of Counseling Psychology, XIII (Spring, 1966), 30. (Hereinafter referred to as "Role Theory, A Conceptual Framework.")

In the individual category, role is defined as behavior that is seen as appropriate by an individual in a social setting. Here, role is defined as what the individual considers to be appropriate behavior. Sargent⁴ and Parsons and Shills⁵ are writers who treat role from the perspective of an individual's definition of his situation. The behavioral category includes definitions of role which focus on the behavior of role incumbents in social positions. Davis, Gross, Roeber,⁶ and others have used this definition of role to develop their work. Their emphasis has been, not on what an incumbent should do, nor to his orientation to a situation, but what an incumbent actually does as the occupant of a position. Or, as Davis states, "Role is the manner in which a

⁴Stansfeld Sargent, "Concepts of Role and Ego in Contemporary Psychology," in Social Psychology at the Crossroads, ed. by John H. Rohrer and Muzafer Sherif (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), p. 360. (Hereinafter referred to as "Concepts of Role and Ego.")

⁵Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shills, Toward A General Theory of Action (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), pp. 53-54.

⁶Kingsley Davis, Human Society (New York: The McMillian Company, 1948), p. 90. (Hereinafter referred to as Human Society.); Gross, Ward, and McEachern, Role Analysis, p. 14;

person actually carries out the requirements of his position. It is the dynamic aspect of status. . . ."⁷

Gross, Mason, and McEachern use the three categories--normative patterns, individual's definitions, and behavior of incumbents--as one method of partitioning definition of role into segments which provide greater clarity and understanding of the concept as it has been formulated over time.⁸

James, Baldwin, and Cooley laid the foundation for the concept of "role" as they worked toward an improved understanding of "self" in personality development.⁹ Mead and Linton followed up on the ideas of "self" advanced by Cooley, and Mead was one of the first American theorists to employ the term "role" in writing on role problems.¹⁰ Mead used the term "role," not so much as a pragmatic concept, but as a theoretical means of getting at a better understanding of socialization processes as

⁷Davis, Human Society, p. 90.

⁸Gross, Mason, and McEachern, Role Analysis, pp. 11-17.

⁹Bruce J. Biddle and Edwin J. Thomas, Role Theory: Concepts and Research (New York: John Wiley, 1966), pp. 4-7. (Hereinafter referred to as Role Theory.)

¹⁰George H. Mead, Mind, Self and Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934), p. 72.

he analyzed in detail the mental and social processes involved in taking the role of the other.¹¹

Such concepts as "status," or "position," and "role" come primarily from the work of anthropologist Ralph Linton although they remained highly abstract until the late 30's and early 40's.¹² Linton defined the concept of "status" as "a position in a particular pattern" and "role" as the performance of the status requirements by the individual. For Linton, a status was simply a collection of rights and duties while a role represented the dynamic aspects of status. When the rights and duties of a status are put into effect, an individual could be said to be performing a role.¹³ In The Cultural Background of Personality, Linton further defines role as a normative cultural pattern by stating that it consists of . . . "attitudes, values and behavior ascribed by the society to any and all persons occupying this status."¹⁴

¹¹Biddle and Thomas, Role Theory, p. 6.

¹²Ralph Linton, The Study of Man (New York: Appleton Century Crofts, Inc., 1936), p. 113. (Hereinafter referred to as Study of Man.)

¹³Ibid., p. 114.

¹⁴Ralph Linton, The Cultural Background of Personality (New York: Appleton Century Co., 1945), p. 77.

Newcomb follows much the same definition for role as does Linton in his conceptual framework. He says . . . "the ways of behaving which are expected of any individual who occupies a certain position constitutes the role associated with that position."¹⁵

Sargent gives emphasis to the individual in his definition of role. He states that "a person's role is a pattern or type of social behavior which seems situationally appropriate to him in terms of the demands and expectations of those in his group." He further states that "roles have ingredients of cultural, of personal and of situational determination. But never is a role wholly cultural, wholly personal or wholly situational."¹⁶ Thus for Sargent a role is defined as an incumbent's orientation to a situation.

In a broader definition of role, Parsons refers to it as "that organized sector of an actor's orientation which constitutes and defines his participation in an interaction process."¹⁷

One of the most significant contributions to the clarification of the multitudinous definitions for the

¹⁵Theodore M. Newcomb, Social Psychology (New York: The Dryden Press, 1951), p. 280.

¹⁶Sargent, "Concepts of Role and Ego," p. 360.

¹⁷Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951), p. 23.

concept "role" was a study by Neiman and Hughes in 1950. This article reviewed literature of role theory from 1900 to 1950 and did much to clear away the confusion and semantic problems which had developed over time. In the various conceptualizations of role, anthropologists have given emphasis to normative patterns which influence behavior without reference to individuals being included. Sociologists have strongly emphasized the interaction situation as the starting point while social psychologists have given emphasis to the individual and his orientation to a situation. In many situations the differences in definition have been found to be previously of a semantic nature.

In distinguishing various definitions and usages of the concept "role" in terms of (1) the dynamics of personality development, (2) functional definitions in terms of society as a whole, and (3) definitions in terms of specific groups, Neiman and Hughes found three elements of similarity:

1. In all the definitions and usages of the concept, there is involved either an individual definition of a specific situation or an individual acceptance of a group's definition of a specific situation.

2. Role behavior, no matter how it is defined, or even when it is defined, involves the assumption of a process of symbolic interaction, or communication as a prerequisite, which leads then to further generalization; namely that man is the only role-playing animal and that is one of the characteristics which distinguishes man from other animals.
3. Human behavior cannot be explained nor described by the use of traits or other atomized concepts, but must be viewed from the framework of organized and integrated patterns of behavior.¹⁸

Neiman and Hughes comment that the most definitive use of the concept and the one about which there is the most concensus was the trend toward associating the concept of role with that of status and that in spite of the confusion and lack of concensus, the concept "role" is at present an integral part of sociological literature. They further point out that in psychological literature, although the word "role" may not be used itself, the implication is found in such concepts as "self," "self-perception," and "self-awareness."¹⁹

¹⁸L. J. Neiman and J. W. Hughes, "Problems of the Concept of Role--A Re-Survey of the Literature," Social Forces, XXX (1951), 141-49.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 149.

Neiman and Hughes conclude in their re-survey of literature that the concept of role

. . . is still rather vague, nebulous and non-definitive. Frequently in literature, the concept is used without any attempt on the part of the writer to define or delimit the concept, the assumption being that both the writer and the reader will achieve an immediate compatible consensus. . . .²⁰

This comment made in 1950 is still applicable. In the literature of education today, there is a tremendous amount of material being written about various "roles" in educational systems but relatively little work is placed in a theoretical framework of role theory as developed in the social sciences. The term "role" is generally used inclusively as a generic term rather than as a concept developed through research.

Two studies having paramount significance for advancing role concepts toward acceptance as a legitimate theoretical body of knowledge are those by Gross, Mason, and McEachern and by Biddle and Thomas.

The study by Gross, Mason, and McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis, attempts to combine theoretical and empirical research efforts in a review of role and role conflict in public school administration. An extensive effort was made to examine and deal with a number of theoretical and operational problems of role analysis which have restricted the development of a systematic

²⁰ Ibid.

body of role theory. These writers attempted to synthesize prior research efforts and to develop a conceptual model for role analysis which reflects a minimum of semantic and definitional problems. Gross and his associates developed a language for role analysis that reflects in eclectic nature--it is made up of combined thinking and contributions of earlier researches of role concepts and is restricted to concepts which lend themselves to operational definitions. Gross concludes that three basic ideas which appeared in most conceptualizations of role were that individuals (1) in social locations (2) behave (3) with reference to expectations.²¹ Their research shows that an understanding of expectations held for a position is an essential element of any model developed for predicting social behavior.²² This idea is supported by formulations of Linton, Parsons, Davis, and others describing the extent to which behavior is influenced by expectations.

Gross, Mason, and McEachern extend on their formulation by discussing the importance of identifying social locations. They comment that expectations are assigned to individuals on the basis of their locations of positions in social systems and that such locations must

²¹Gross, Mason, and McEachern, Role Analysis, p. 17.

²²Ibid., p. 122.

be specified in order to determine what expectations are held for a specific position.²³

The analytical model generated by Gross, et al., has been widely used at Michigan State University for empirically based studies of positions in secondary and higher education.

The work of Biddle and Thomas has been greatly influenced by that of Gross and associates. Their efforts during the past ten years have been of such magnitude that they far surpass the scope of this study in so far as review of research is concerned. Biddle attempted to study the "total role" of the public school teacher through a series of studies originating at the University of Missouri. His effort to accomplish this task is somewhat grandiose and extremely complex.²⁴ Role Theory: Concepts and Research, by Biddle and Thomas, is a culmination of much of the previous research done by Biddle on public school positions. In this most recent text on the subject of role theory, the development and present status of role analysis, the conceptual structure for classifying role, and the basic concepts of role properties for the variables for role phenomena are discussed. Their review of the development of role concepts

²³Ibid., p. 18.

²⁴Biddle and Thomas, Role Theory, p. 1.

and the current status of the language of role is one of the most comprehensive statements available on the subject today. It is pointed out by Biddle and Thomas that in role theory the behavior of an individual is examined in terms of how it is shaped by the demands and roles of others, by their sanctions for his conforming and non-conforming behavior, and by the individual's own understanding and conception of what his behavior should be.²⁵

Role Theory in Education

Role theory has been used extensively by educational researchers as a technique for analyzing positions in school systems. In 1932, Waller used the concept of role in a descriptive study of the teaching profession. He gave particular emphasis to the concept of role in describing social life in schools. Waller stated that:

The role appears as the organization of the individual with reference to an entire situation; it is the response of the individual to the entire situation as it has taken shape in his mind. Some insight (correct or incorrect) into the attitudes of others is implied. The insight may be incomplete, but to play a role is to regulate one's behavior by the imagined judgement of others.²⁶

Of course, Waller made use of the concept "role" in a rather general sense. However, his study was among

²⁵Ibid., pp. 17-18.

²⁶Willard Waller, The Sociology of Teaching (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1932), p. 322.

the first recorded in education using role concepts. Waller used the concept "role" as applied to the theater and reported his work in descriptive terms rather than use statistical analysis and role theory as it is viewed today.

Brookover has written extensively on the uses of role concepts for studying a variety of positions in education. He contends that role theory is an important theoretical model for analyzing educational systems and their constituent positions. He also asserts the importance of understanding expectations held for positions. He recommends research on three levels of expectations which groups may hold for a role incumbent. They are:

- (1) General or normative expectations which apply to an actor in a general status;
- (2) Status in situation expectations which apply to an actor occupying a status in a particular situation, and
- (3) A group's expectations of a particular situation. Public image and expectation of teachers.²⁷

Brookover and Gottlieb also suggest examining status-role expectations of three types:

²⁷Wilbur Brookover,

- (1) Differences in expectations held by a number of the wide range of relevant groups which exist for most positions. They refer to intra-group differences as "divergence" and to similarities in expectations as "convergence";
- (2) Differences in the expectations held by several members of the same group. Degrees of similarity within a group is called "consensus" by Brookover and Gottlieb;
- (3) Differences in general expectations held for a position or status and expectations held for a specific person occupying the given role.²⁸

Brookover offers a conceptual framework for better understanding the relationships of role concepts as they apply to the analysis of positions in education:

An actor enters a situation with his previous experience in a related situation, personality needs and the meaning (for him) of the present situation.

Self-involvement by the actor is his image of the ends anticipated from participation in the status as he projects his self-image into the role.

Definition is the actor's perception of what he thinks others expect of him in the role.

Actor's behavior in interaction with others which continually redefines roles and actor's definition.

Role--others' expectations of a given actor in a given situation.

²⁸ Brookover and Gottlieb, Sociology of Education, pp. 321-22.

Status in Situation--others' expectation of any actor in a particular situation.

General Status--others' expectations of any actor in a broadly defined position, such as a teacher.²⁹

Brookover points out that behavior is not fixed or static but is a function of communication. Brookover regards it as significant that behavior in interaction involves continual redefinition of role and actor's definition. As communication occurs, new expectations and the actor's understanding of them replaces previous expectations and understandings. Thus the process is dynamic and changing in definition over time.³⁰

Brookover is also supportive of research focusing on role expectations. He states:

It would seem important to identify significant sub-groups of students with varied expectations of teachers. . . . We would hypothesize that teachers who are aware of the possible variations in the expectations which students have of them would be more likely to communicate effectively with their students.³¹

If this assumption made by Brookover is valid, it has many implications for research on role expectations in other areas of education. A purpose of this study is to test the assumption that expectations held by "others" has an impact on the definition or on the position of H.R.A.

²⁹Wilbur Brookover, "Research on Teacher and Administrator Roles," The Journal of Educational Sociology, XXXIX (September, 1955), 2-3.

³⁰Ibid., p. 7.

³¹Ibid., pp. 8-9.

Brookover and Gottlieb further support the idea of research on role expectations by suggesting that status role expectations be studied in three areas.

The first area suggested for study is differences in expectations held by a number of the wide range of relevant groups which exist for most positions. The differences in expectations held by significant reference groups are identified as "divergence" and the similarities as "convergence."

The second area suggested for research is the difference in expectations held for a position by several members of the same groups. Brookover calls this consensus. And a third area suggested is the general status expectations held for all incumbents in a position and those held for a specific person occupying the given role.³²

Charters also used role concepts to study the school as a social system. One of the basic assumptions of his study was "that an individual's behavior is strongly influenced by the expectations which members of various important groups have of him and his relationships with them."³³ In the context of organizational

³² Brookover and Gottlieb, Sociology of Education, pp. 331-32.

³³ W. W. Charters, "The School as a Social System," Review of Educational Research, XXII (February, 1952), 41.

theory, role has added significance because certain of these expectations become institutionalized and an individual is penalized by the organization if his behavior deviates from that which is expected from him.

Charters, like many other researchers, suggests studying the internal organization and its relationships within a social system.³⁴

The study by Getzels and Guba focused on role conflict in the teaching position. The major issues under consideration in their work were: the nature of expectations attached to the teacher's role; the extent of conflict among these expectations; and the differential effect of such conflict on the teacher as a function of certain personal and social characteristics. Three areas of the teacher's role chosen for study were: (1) socio-economic role, (2) citizen's role, and (3) the professional role.

From this study, the authors concluded that:

1. The teacher is defined by both core expectations common to the teaching situation in general and by significantly varying expectations that are a function of local school and community conditions.
2. Many of the expectations attached to the teacher's role are inconsistent with expectations attached to other roles the teacher typically occupies; or the teaching role is subject to conflicts in many critical areas.
3. The nature of the conflict is systematically related to certain differences among schools and among communities.

³⁴Ibid., pp. 41-43.

4. The existence of role conflicts may be taken as evidence that the teacher role is imperfectly integrated with other roles. The result of such role conflict is likely to be frustration for the teacher and ineffectiveness for the institution.
5. Reactions differ among teachers according to the extent of their liability to role conflict in the teaching situation. Such reactions are related to certain personal characteristics of teachers.³⁵

The outcome of this study reflects many of the assumptions made by the writer of this paper about the role of the Head Resident Advisor (a) within the student affairs organization and (b) as he relates to other significant reference groups in the university.

Doyle studied convergence and divergence of expectations held by parents, board members, and elementary teachers for the role of the elementary school teacher. Using a 48-item check list, he sampled ninety-six elementary teachers, ninety-six parents, and nineteen board members. He found that teachers often erroneously define for others role expectations which do not exist and that teachers often identify potential role conflict where none exists. Doyle also found that teachers held many beliefs which the other groups under study did not share.³⁶

³⁵J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba, "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in a Teaching Situation," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIX (1955), 30-40.

³⁶Andrew Lewis Doyle, "A Study of the Expectations Which Elementary Teachers, Administrators, School Board Members, and Parents Have of the Elementary Teacher's Roles" (unpublished Ed.D. Thesis, Michigan State University, 1956).

Seeman did a major empirical study of role conflict in school administration positions. He defined role conflict as "the exposure of the individual to incompatible behavioral expectations in a given position."³⁷ Seeman concludes that institutional leadership positions are positions of high vulnerability with mutually contradictory demands. Seeman suggests that the public places a leader in a position of built-in conflict and then demands of him greater clarity and decisiveness regarding that role than it commands.³⁸

A study by Smith on the effects of clear and unclear role expectations showed that ambiguous role expectations reduced group productivity and that when role expectations were clarified, productivity increased. Smith observed that unclear role definitions also produced defensive behavior on the part of group members.³⁹

Snyder did an elaborate study of variations in expectations for the teacher role which relate to general and specific roles, expectation categories, and social distance. The primary thrust of his study was toward

³⁷Melvin Seeman, "Role Conflict and Ambivalence in Leadership," American Sociological Review, XVIII (1953), 373-80.

³⁸Ibid., pp. 379-80.

³⁹Ewart E. Smith, "Effects of Clear and Unclear Role Expectations of Group Productivity and Defensive-ness," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, LV (1944), 213-29.

a further refinement of role concepts. He concluded that expectations held for both general and specific roles appear to be highly stable. Respondents generally held the same expectations for teachers they knew as they did for teachers in general.⁴⁰

Bass studied the role of the public school principal in Tennessee by surveying seventy-six principals and twenty-five authorities in the field of High School Administration. Using a check list of duties performed, he found that principals spend most of their time in administration and supervision of the school. Problems identified for high school principals were encouraging acceptable student performance, leading the teaching staff, recruiting new teachers, and funding the budget.⁴¹

Role expectations for selected college and university presidents were studied by Nelson. He concluded that:

1. Prospective presidents should be familiar with expectation which board members hold for the role of president.
2. It is desirable for board members to be aware of expectations upon which they and their incumbent president hold differing points of view.

⁴⁰Clinton Snyder, "Variations in Expectations for the Teacher Role, As Related to General and Specific Roles, Expectation Categories, and Social Distance" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965).

⁴¹Floyd Bass, "Duties of Tennessee High School Principals," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLV (October, 1961), 79-88.

3. It is desirable for an incumbent president to familiarize himself with the expectations of divergence in order to better understand the board numbers position.
4. That presidents and board members should recognize that there are hidden areas of conflict in expectations for the role of college president.⁴²

Alton Cowan studied the role of the building director in the Flint Community school system to determine role expectations held by relevant groups. Using a 74-item questionnaire to determine expectations held for the professional roles of teacher, administrator, professional staff member, and coordinator of school and community relations, Cowan found that "significant others"--defined as building directors, principal adult education coordinators and a random sample of teachers--hold different and sometimes conflicting expectations regarding the selected aspects of the position. Building directors, adult education coordinators, and principals tended to agree on expectations while teachers tended to hold decidedly different expectations for the position. Cowan concluded that the conflict between building directors' perceptions of the role and those held by teachers could create serious problems for the community school program unless they were resolved.⁴³

⁴²Lawrence O. Nelson, "Role Expectations for Selected College and University Presidents" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1960), pp. 132-40.

⁴³Alton W. Cowan, "The Flint Building Director: Role Expectations Held by Relevant Groups" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1960).

Blue did a similar study of the community school director during 1970. His focus, however, was more directly related areas of conflict in the position than Cowan's study. Using the survey method, he studied differences in conflict and differences in expectations for the position of community school director as defined by the actual and perceived expectations of community school directors, parents, principals, and teachers when comparing (1) inner-city and non-inner-city schools; (2) teaching and released community school directors; (3) perceived and actual expectations; (4) role segments, and (5) groups of role definers.

Blue did not find significant differences when comparing inner-city and non-inner-city conflicts of expectations; nor did he find differences when comparing released and teaching directors. He did find significant differences existing; however, between the expectations of the directors and the perceived expectation of other. In all cases the director's expectation for the role exceeded the expectations of significant others on all four role segments.

Blue found, as Cowan had determined ten years ago, that differences in expectations for the position still existed between teachers and directors. He

suggested that improved communications appeared to be needed to close the gap of understanding.⁴⁴

Smith studied expectations told by teachers, administrators, board members, and citizens of three Michigan communities for the teacher role in the school and the community. He found that as the local area grew larger, attitudes toward teachers became more liberal. The most restrictive expectations for the teacher role were found in areas defined as village-rural.⁴⁵

A number of researchers have used role analysis to study the principal's position and superintendent's position in public school systems. Sweitzer attempted to define the nature and magnitude of agreement between role expectation and role perception held by various groups for the superintendent's role. He found that there were great differences among the groups studied on role expectations (desirable behavior) and role perceptions (actual behavior) held for the position. Sweitzer recommended that the gap between what "should

⁴⁴Fermin K. Blue, "The Flint Community School Director: Analysis of Role Conflict and Expectations" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970).

⁴⁵Rex B. Smith, "A Comparative Study of the Expectations Which Teachers, School Board Members and Citizens of Three School Districts Have of the Teacher's Role in School and Community" (unpublished Ed.D. thesis, Michigan State University, 1960).

be" and "what is" be closed by making a greater effort to clarify role expectations and role perceptions.⁴⁶

In the field of Student Personnel, role theory has been used to conduct a number of empirical studies at Michigan State University. Eldon Nonnamaker used the model advanced by Gross to study the role of the enrollment officer at Michigan State. Seven groups were identified and surveyed. A 60-item questionnaire based on the scale developed by Gross was used. This study suggested that there was no one set of expectations held for the enrollment officer. It did, however, serve to point out areas of agreement for many categories of the position. Nonnamaker did find that there appeared to be significant differences in expectations held for the role of enrollment officers by counselors. He suggested that a faculty committee define the duties of the position and conduct an in-service education program consistent with the job description.⁴⁷

Upcraft used a similar approach to study role expectation for chief student personnel administrators in large universities. His study was empirically based

⁴⁶Robert E. Sweitzer, "The Superintendent's Role in Improving Instruction," Administrator's Notebook, VI (April, 1958), 1-4.

⁴⁷Eldon R. Nonnamaker, "The Role of the Enrollment Officer at Michigan State University" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1959), pp. 83-93.

as was Nonnamaker's; and although an exhaustive effort was made to review pertinent literature, few of the theoretical concepts were used in the actual analysis of the results. Upcraft found in his study that there is a high degree of consensus among Chief Student Personnel Administrators as to their role and functions. Only four of eighty-one items under study were found to yield significant differences.⁴⁸

The most comprehensive application of role theory to Student Personnel has been made by Bentley in his attempt to clarify the counselor's role. He too draws heavily on the theoretical work of Biddle and the empirical research of Gross for his thesis. Bentley points out the extent to which the term "role" is used in counseling and then attempts to apply role theory to the position of counselor. He advances five role concepts which provide a more comprehensive framework for understanding the role of the counselor and which could be applied to the analysis of similar positions. They are:

1. Role Expectation--what others expect an incumbent to do.
2. Role Concept--what an incumbent conceives his role to be.

⁴⁸Lee Upcraft, "Role Expectations for Chief Student Personnel Administrators in Large Universities" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967), p. 99.

3. Role Acceptance--what an incumbent will accept of others' expectations of him within the framework of one's own role perception.
4. Role Performance--what one actually does on the job.
5. Role Conflict--a variance in role expectations and role conceptions.⁴⁹

Bentley discusses these points with reference to the part they play in a social interaction system. Then each point is considered in more detail by other researchers in the counseling field. One has a much greater appreciation for the counseling field after reading Bentley's commentary on counseling and role theory.

Ivey and Robin agree with Bentley that the role of the counselor needs clarification. They suggest that role theory may provide a conceptual tool which may better describe the role of the counselor. In their research they define "role" as a normative concept dealing with expectations held for a position and "role behavior" as what a person actually does.

They further point out that basic kinds of role conflicts develop when there is difficulty in assuming, maintaining, or functioning in a role situation. They identify four basic types of role conflict:

⁴⁹Joseph Bentley, The Counselor's Role: Commentary and Readings (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968), pp. 74-84.

- (1) Role conflict stemming from role definers;
- (2) Role conflicts internal to the role, such as the administrator/counselor controversy;
- (3) Role conflict stemming from the role in interaction with the social system;
- (4) Role conflict stemming from the interaction of the individual and his role.

Ivey and Robin conclude that these areas must be considered if such dimensions of role conflict are to be clarified.⁵⁰

Student Personnel Literature Related
to the Position of Head
Resident Advisor

A review of literature in the student personnel area shows a paucity of research on specific personnel positions. The work that has been done deals primarily with chief student personnel officers--the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Dean of Students. Thus one does not find information in the professional literature to adequately describe the position.

The most comprehensive information to date on the Head Resident Advisor is presented by Harold Riker in a monograph, College Housing as Learning Centers. Riker stresses the need and importance of professionally

⁵⁰Ivey and Robin, "Role Theory, A Conceptual Framework," pp. 29-37.

trained full-time staff to assume an active role of motivator, initiator, and consultant in the housing profession. Riker states that a Head Resident Advisor should stress the continuity of education throughout the campus community and work constantly to broaden his perspective and strengthen his role as an educator.⁵¹ He further points out some of the problems which can develop when the housing staff is not given adequate status nor recognition to function as educators in the University setting. Riker suggests that unless such recognition is given, barriers develop which prevent housing staffs from being functional and often prevents them from receiving adequate consideration when salaries and promotions are decided.⁵² Riker does not look in detail at the conflicts inherent in such a position, and his work is also too general for use in areas needing more specific evaluation and clarification.

One does find in professional literature of student personnel, however, continued reference to the importance of learning environment, the physical facilities, and programs in residence halls. The press of peer culture, the need for security, stimulation, and identity,

⁵¹Harold Riker, College Housing as Learning Centers (Washington: The American College Personnel Association, 1965), p. 26.

⁵²Ibid., pp. 27-28.

the value of student-faculty contact, advising, and counseling, and student involvement in community governance are all common threads woven into each study of student housing. Yet nothing is said about the person expected to facilitate such activity--the Head Resident Advisor.

A work that has some significance for this study is a thesis by Donald W. Kilbourn.⁵³ Kilbourn examined two hypotheses in a study of the role and status of women Head Resident Advisors working in colleges and universities that were members of the Association of College and University Housing Officers Association. They were: (1) the professional status of Head Resident Advisors is inferior to that of members of the academic faculty, and (2) college and university housing officers do not agree on the roles which Head Residents should play.

Kilbourn was able to substantiate the hypothesis that women Head Residents are perceived as inferior to members of the academic faculty. In addition, he was able to prove, in part, his second hypothesis. He found that housing administrators did not agree on the appropriate disciplinary role that women Head Residents should

⁵³ Donald W. Kilbourn, "A Study of the Status and Roles of Head Residents in Colleges and University Residence Halls for Women" (unpublished Ed.D. thesis, Michigan State University, 1959), p. 2.

play. However, they did agree on expectations held for administrative performance.

Kilbourn's findings also suggested that the primary emphasis found in housing programs was the provision of food and shelter--the educational mission of housing was secondary. He also found that in general Head Resident Advisors were not adequately trained to undertake the complex duties of counseling and organizing educational programs.⁵⁴

Kilbourn recommended that Head Resident Advisors should be professionally trained for the position, that they should be afforded pay and professional status equivalent to that of the academic faculty, and that universities should better articulate the educational mission of residence halls in the total structure and that Head Advisors should organize and implement programs to accomplish that mission.⁵⁵

Kilbourn reaffirms this position in an article, "The Status and Role of Head Residents."⁵⁶ He argues that residence halls can and should make a significant contribution to the student's total educational experience. He supports his argument by making reference to

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 3.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 4.

⁵⁶Donald W. Kilbourn, "The Status and Role of Head Residents," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXIX, No. 3 (November, 1960), 203-07.

the recommendations made by the American Council on Education study group on housing, the recommendations of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, and the suggestion of E. G. Williamson.⁵⁷ All the recommendations follow the same basic line of thought: "The Head Resident can be a key person in the effective implementation of a successful housing program." Housing officers must be made equal to faculty and given equal pay and prestige if the educational potential of group living is to be achieved. Also, residence halls must be viewed as educational facilities; and housing programs and personnel, in general, need to be upgraded.⁵⁸

These questions, raised in the decade of the 50's, just before the enormous expansion of college and university enrollment, are still with us. Housing programs have undergone considerable change. Programs and personnel have been upgraded; however, the questions of pay, status, and the appropriate role of the Head Resident Advisor in the context of higher education are yet unresolved.

Kilbourn's works are of some assistance for raising questions about the status of housing. However, his research focuses on women Head Residents at a time when the position was staffed primarily by untrained

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 203.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 202.

housemothers and when educational programs in residence halls were relatively unstructured and unrelated to the educational mission of an institution. The recommendations he made, however, are still goals to be achieved.

In the decade of the 60's, a few sporadic references are made to the position of Head Resident Advisor. Most of the literature refers to programs and administrative structures with some cursory reference made to housing staff. In 1965, however, Barbara Keller did a follow-up study, using the models advanced by Kilbourn and Campbell and Davis, in an effort to determine if there were trends toward greater recognition by institutions of the professional responsibilities assigned to the director of a woman's residence hall.⁵⁹ Keller asked questions about (a) titles, (b) incidence of faculty status, (c) educational background, and (d) salary and other fringe benefits as indicators of professional recognition.

She found that women working in residence halls in 1962 were most often called "Head Advisors" or "Directors." "Housemother" was used less frequently and the term "counselor," or some variation, was often mentioned. Keller concluded that such findings suggested

⁵⁹ Barbara Keller, "Status, Role, Training and Salary of Residence Hall Directors," NAWDC Journal (Summer, 1965), 179.

that the control concept of the position might be diminishing. She also found that residence hall populations had increased in size and that Head Advisors had larger staffs working under them, thus suggesting greater administrative responsibility. The majority of respondents indicated that they had counseling responsibilities and that they most frequently reported to individuals responsible for educational functions in the university. The percentage of those people holding academic degrees had increased significantly. Thirty-five per cent of the group sampled had Master's degrees, thus suggesting that institutions were recognizing the need for people in residence halls to have more specialized training. However, only 15 per cent of the group sampled indicated that they held faculty rank. Comparison of salary data from earlier studies suggested that some improvement had been made; however, salaries of Head Advisors were in no way comparable to those of academic faculty.⁶⁰

Thus, Keller concluded that some progress had been made in the areas of professional training, pay, and appropriate titles. However, she also found a great gap between Head Advisors and faculty on all variables studied. She suggested that mobility was limited in the position, that few institutions had given formal

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 181.

recognition to incumbents, and that few institutions had recognized the importance of residence halls to the educational community.

Beder and Rickard contend that the Head Resident Advisor personifies the myth of the personnel generalist who does all things for all students--trying to function as landlord, counselor, and disciplinarian.⁶¹ They argue that students perceive such role ambiguities as threatening and often prefer to live with problems rather than seek out help from a Head Advisor. They further contend that the practice of combining several functions under one staff member must be questioned if institutions are interested in providing conditions that permit Head Residents to be responsive to student needs.⁶²

Greenleaf concurs with Beder and Rickard's position by stating that "too often residence hall staff members have been forced into a 'control' role to the extent that they have lost essential rapport with students and their effectiveness as advisors."⁶³ She too calls for a clarification of role ambiguity and argues that

⁶¹Harrold W. Beder and Scott T. Rickard, "Residence Hall Regulations and Staff Rules: A Substitute Model for In Loco Parentis," NASPA Journal, IX, No. 1 (July, 1971), 57-61.

⁶²Ibid., p.

⁶³Elizabeth A. Greenleaf, "Residence Halls 1970's," NASPA Journal, VII, No. 2 (October, 1967), 66-67.

expectations held for staff must be made more specific. She argues that an educational need exists for the redefinition of residence staff roles by institutions so that "professional staff will be expected to provide counseling for individual growth, to facilitate the development of educational programs, to administer a program integrating facilities and personnel into a unified educational sub-system of the institution, and to evaluate results as a basis for educational and administrative decisions."⁶⁴

Pool⁶⁵ attempted to identify behaviors of Head Resident Advisors perceived by students to be "enhancing" or "retarding" to their feelings of emotional maturity. She used the critical-incident technique to secure situational responses from 195 freshmen and sophomores. Incidents reported as "enhancing" by residents included a friendly smile, a compliment, an expression of interest and regard, an expression of trust, and the delegation of responsibility. Behaviors considered "retarding" included reprimands, suspicions, inconsistencies, and unrequested advice.

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 69.

⁶⁵Cynthia Pool, "Head Resident Behavior," National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XXX, No. 4 (Summer, 1967), 178.

Pool concludes that Head Advisors contribute to student development when they value students as persons, respect their opinions, and treat them with warmth and friendliness.⁶⁶

Summary

In this chapter, the origin and development of role theory have been presented. It has been pointed out that role theory is a relatively new concept in behavioral science. It has been developed primarily through areas of anthropology, sociology, psychology, and education. The major works from researchers in the various disciplines have been presented to show the growth of role study toward acceptance as a theory in behavioral science and to show its value as a tool for clarifying and analyzing positions in a social system. Specific emphasis has been given to describing studies done in education which have used role concepts for analysis.

Available literature from Student Personnel dealing with the position of Head Resident Advisor is also discussed. One is impressed by the extent to which articles on residence hall housing point out the ambiguous and multitudinous expectations held for residence advisory staff. Many writers recognize such conflicts and call for clarification of role and better articulation of

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 179.

expectations by institutions but little is suggested in the way of solutions for the problem.

The following chapter presents the methodology used to design the study, gather the data, and analyze the results.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to analyze and describe expectations held by significant reference groups for the role of Head Resident Advisor at Michigan State University. Responses by counselors, faculty, residence hall managers, students, and student affairs administrators were tested to determine differences in expectations held by the various groups for the position of Head Resident Advisor. The study was based on the assumption that these different groups would hold different and often conflicting expectations for the position.

This chapter will describe the hypotheses to be tested, the target population of the study, the development of the instrument, data collection, and the method of analyzing the data.

Hypotheses

The basic hypothesis of this study was stated in Chapter I. To be operationalized and tested statistically, it is stated as a null hypothesis:

There are no significant differences in expectations that residence hall counselors, residence hall managers, Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, faculty, and students hold for the position of Head Resident Advisor at Michigan State University as measured by the instrument developed for this study.

Five secondary hypotheses included in the major hypothesis are also being studied. They are stated in the null form to be analyzed statistically.

- A. There are no significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by residence hall counselors as measured by the instrument developed for this study.
- B. There are no significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by residence hall managers as measured by the instrument developed for this study.
- C. There are no significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by Student Affairs Personnel as measured by the instrument developed for this study.
- D. There are no significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by faculty working in residence halls as measured by the instrument developed for this study.
- E. There are no significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by students living in residence halls as measured by the instrument developed for this study.

The Sample

The null hypotheses were tested on a sample of professional counselors assigned to residence halls, residence hall managers, Head Resident Advisors,

student affairs administrators, university college faculty, and undergraduate students. These groups were identified as having significance for the definition of the position of Head Resident Advisor after extensive discussions with a number of Head Resident Advisors regarding various influences which advisors considered to have an impact on the way they perceived the position.

Selection of the Sample

Counselors

All full-time counselors and counseling interns assigned to residence halls were asked to respond to the questionnaire. Twenty of the thirty counselors surveyed, or 67 per cent, responded to the survey.

Residence Hall Managers

All residence hall managers were asked to respond to the instrument. Twenty-one of the twenty-five managers, or 84 per cent, responded to the questionnaire.

Head Resident Advisor

All professional full-time Head Resident Advisors assigned to the undergraduate residence halls were asked to respond to the questionnaire. Twenty-six of the thirty-two Head Resident Advisors included in the sample, or 86.6 per cent, responded to the questionnaire.

Student Affairs Administrators

Student Affairs administrators from the Dean of Students Office were asked to participate in the study. Thirty of the thirty-five administrators, or 85.6 per cent, responded to the questionnaire.

The total sample was composed of 672 elements. Of this sample, 489, or 71.2 per cent, chose to respond to the questionnaire. Through the assistance of the Office of Research Consultation it was determined that the response to the questionnaire was sufficient for the purposes of statistical analysis.

University College Faculty

A list of University College faculty assigned to residence halls was obtained from the Departments of Natural Science, Social Science, Humanities, and American Thought and Language. The list was arranged alphabetically and numbered in order. Using a table of random numbers, fifty faculty members were selected for the study. No effort was made to identify faculty according to teaching discipline. The instrument used for the study was mailed to the sample in March of 1971. Response to the questionnaire by faculty was not good. A second mailing and a telephone follow-up were completed in May of 1971 and finally thirty, or 60 per cent, of the sample returned the questionnaire.

Students

Five hundred students were selected from the residence hall population on a stratified random basis as elements of the sample. A housing list for each of the six complex areas was obtained from the Office of Residence Halls Assignments; and using a table of random numbers, 100 students were selected for the sample. For the purposes of consistency in size, the Red Cedar area and West Circle area were combined into one unit prior to selection, and 100 elements of the sample were drawn from each of the five areas. The sample was also stratified by sex prior to the selection of the elements to give an equal distribution of men and women.

Of 500 students receiving a questionnaire, 362, or 72.4 per cent, responded to the survey.

TABLE 3-1.--The make-up of the sample and the percentage of the sample returning the questionnaire.

Sample	Number	Return	Percentage
Counselors Assigned to Residence Halls	30	20	67.0
Residence Hall Managers	25	21	84.0
Head Resident Advisors	32	26	86.6
Student Affairs Administrators	35	30	85.6
University College Faculty	50	30	60.0
Undergraduate Students	500	362	72.4
Total Sample	672	489	71.2

Instrumentation

The instrument to be used for this study was developed by consulting a selected number of Head Resident Advisors, students, counselors, and student personnel administrators to determine what kinds of expectations they may hold for the position of Head Resident Advisor. From these interviews, a list of 300 statements was developed. These items were submitted to six persons from the residence hall staff for review. After reviewing suggestions from these people, the number of items was reduced from 300 to 97 and organized into six sub-scale categories. The sub-scales were:

- (1) Expectations for program functions
- (2) Expectations for group advising
- (3) Expectations for individual advising functions
- (4) Expectations for discipline
- (5) Expectations for management relations
- (6) Expectations for administration

The instrument was then submitted to three residence hall central staff and to a member of the Research Consultation staff from the College of Education for review and criticism.

Scaling

It was decided that a summated rating scale, or a Likert-Type Scale, would be appropriate for an

attitude instrument of this nature.¹ Five degrees of response ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree were selected as alternatives for the scale. The respondent was asked to select one of the choices for each item in the instrument.

Values ranging from 0 to 4 were assigned to each of the responses. A weight of 4 was assigned to the strongly agree items, 3 to agree, 2 to no response, 1 to disagree, and 0 to strongly disagree.

An attempt was made to construct the instrument so that anyone of the five alternatives could be used in responding to any one of the questions.

Pilot Study

The instrument was administered to seventy-five randomly selected subjects during Fall term of 1971. Of the seventy-five, sixty-two, or 83 per cent, responded to the questionnaire.

A frequency and percentage of response table was computed from the pilot data for the purpose of further modifying and improving the instrument.

¹Fred Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), pp. 484-85.

Reliability

A reliability study using the Hoyt technique was conducted on the instrument.² This technique is a two-way analysis of variance computed among individuals and items.

TABLE 3-2.--Reliability coefficients computed for the six sub-scales.

Scales	Reliability Coefficient
Scale I	.82
Scale II	.90
Scale III	.86
Scale IV	.74
Scale V	.75
Scale VI	.88

Ordinarily, .80 is cited as an acceptable cutoff on reliability coefficients; however, after consultation with staff members from the Office of Research consultation and the Social Science Research Center, it was decided that the reliability coefficients obtained for Scales IV and V were sufficient enough to permit use of the instrument.

A final instrument was developed from this background material and was used in the final study to measure selected job expectations held for Head Resident Advisors.

²C. J. Hoyt, "Test Reliability Estimated by Analysis of Variance," Psychometrika, VI (1941), 153-60.

Validity

Validity of the instrument was determined by having three professional student personnel workers do a content analysis of the instrument. After a systematic review of the instrument, they concluded that it did cover a representative sample of the subject under consideration. Face Validity can also be claimed for the instrument. Subjects in the pilot study agreed that the questionnaire did measure Head Advisor job expectation. This opinion was further supported by Head Resident Advisors and Residence Hall Administrative Personnel who reviewed the instrument. Residence Hall staff members, Dean of Students staff members, and students were consulted as the instrument was developed and the final list of questions reflects their comments and constructive criticisms.

Administration of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire and a cover letter describing the purposes of the study were distributed to the members of the sample during the second week of spring term of 1971. A follow-up letter and duplicate questionnaire were mailed to non-respondents five weeks after the first distribution. Nine weeks after the first mailing, a total of 489, or 71.2 per cent, had responded to the questionnaire.

Statistical Analysis

The responses of each subject were transposed from mark sense score sheets to data processing cards. Data analysis was performed using either the C.D.C. 3600 or the C.D.C. 6500 computer.

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance Program was used to analyze interactions between the groups sampled by the six sub-scales of the questionnaire.³ Following the multivariate analysis, a one-way analysis of variance was computed on the total instrument, treating it as a single scale.⁴

Post hoc comparisons, using the Scheffé technique, were computed following the one-way analysis of variance to more precisely determine areas of difference between the groups.⁵

The CISSR Overlay Program was used to compute descriptive data from each of the items contained in the questionnaire.⁶

³J. D. Finn, Multivariate: Fortran Program for Univariate and Multivariate Analysis of Variance and Co-Variance (Buffalo: State University of New York at Buffalo, 1967).

⁴Ibid.

⁵William L. Hays, Statistics for Psychologists (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 484.

⁶CISSR Overlay Program, Michigan State University, Computer Center.

Contingency tables showing the frequency and percentage of responses by each group were computed. A mean score and standard deviation for each group's response to the individual items on the questionnaire were also computed. A chi square score measuring significance at the .05 level was computed to show differences between the responses of the six groups to each of the items. Using the percentage responses, each of the items was ranked on the Crossland Scale to show degrees of congruence or disagreement.⁷ Following the statistical analysis, a descriptive analysis of the sub-scales was presented.

Chapter IV presents an analysis of the data.

⁷Ronald Crossland, "Role Expectations for Chief Administrators of Community Service Programs in Selected Community Colleges in the United States" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971), p. 62. (Hereinafter referred to as "Role Expectations.")

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter is devoted to a presentation and analysis of the data gathered for the study. The data were analyzed by a Multivariate analysis of variance technique to determine if differences existed between the sub-groups on the six sub-scales of the questionnaire. After the Multivariate analysis was completed, a one-way analysis of variance was used to analyze the questionnaire as a single scale. Scheffé post hoc comparisons were computed on all pair wise comparisons to determine specific differences between groups. Next a Chi Square test of independence was computed to determine where specific differences existed between items. Following the Chi Square analysis, the percentage response of each group for each item was ranked according to the Crossland scale¹ to determine degrees of consensus for each of the selected role segments included in the questionnaire.

¹Crossland, "Role Expectations," p. 62.

These data are presented descriptively to show areas of agreement and disagreement held by the sub-groups for the selected responsibilities of the position of Head Resident Advisor.

The major findings of the analysis are presented in statistical, descriptive, table, and graph form. An interpretation of the data analysis will be presented in Chapter V.

Review of the Sub-Groups and the Procedures of the Study

As previously indicated, six groups are included in the study. They are: (1) Professional counselors assigned to residence halls; (2) Residence Hall Managers; (3) Head Resident Advisors; (4) Student Affairs Personnel; (5) University college faculty assigned to residence halls; and (6) Students (undergraduate students living in residence halls).

A questionnaire containing ninety-seven items within six sub-scales was administered to the six groups to determine their expectations for the role of the Head Resident Advisor at Michigan State University.

For the purpose of analysis, scaled values were assigned to the items of the questionnaire. The responses and the scale values are:

Strongly Agree	4
Agree	3
No Opinion	2
Disagree	1
Strongly Disagree	0

Hypotheses to be Tested

The major null hypothesis of the study states:

There are no significant differences in expectations that residence hall counselors, residence hall managers, Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, faculty, and students hold for the position of Head Resident Advisor at Michigan State University as measured by the instrument developed for this study.

In addition to analyzing the data to determine differences between all the groups, five minor hypotheses included in the major hypothesis will be examined more specifically to identify areas of potential role conflict for the position. They are:

- A. There are no significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by residence hall counselors as measured by the instrument developed for this study.
- B. There are no significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by residence hall managers as measured by the instrument developed for this study.
- C. There are no significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by Student Affairs Personnel as measured by the instrument developed for this study.
- D. There are no significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by faculty working in residence halls as measured by the instrument developed for this study.
- E. There are no significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by students living in residence halls as measured by the instrument developed for this study.

Tests of Hypotheses

Table 4.1 summarizes the results of the Multivariate analysis for significant differences between the six groups on the six sub-scales. A test for significance at the .05 level indicates that there are significant differences between the groups on each of the sub-scales. Thus, the major null hypothesis can be rejected.

TABLE 4.1.--Multivariate analysis test for no difference between groups on the six sub-scales of the questionnaire.

<u>Multivariate Table</u>				
Variable	Between Mean Squares	d.f.	Univariate F	P Less Than 0.0001
1. Program Advising	332.99	5 and 483	7.54 ^a	0.0001
2. Student Behavior	321.85		11.06 ^a	0.0001
3. Management Liaison	242.68		13.01 ^a	0.0001
4. General Administration	121.01		4.47 ^a	0.0006
5. Individual Advising	204.53		9.01 ^a	0.0001
6. Group Advising	141.05		5.00 ^a	0.0002

^aSignificant at the .05 level.

Table 4.2 presents a graphic representation of the cell means for the six groups. The mean scores suggest a high degree of agreement on expectations for the Head Resident Advisor to assume responsibility for the areas of program advising, group advising student behaviors, and general administration. Less agreement is indicated in the areas of individual advising and liaison responsibilities with residence hall management. A visual inspection of cell means does not suggest major differences between the expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor and those held by other significant reference groups for the selected areas of responsibility measured by the sub-scales.

TABLE 4.2.--Table of Cell Means.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Group	Program Advising	Group Advising	Individual Advising	Student Behavior	Management Liaison	General Adminis- tration
1. Counselors	61.95	54.60	32.30	54.45	28.75	62.80
2. Managers	62.86	55.19	32.76	60.24	32.19	63.76
3. H.R.A.	65.08	55.73	36.31	55.34	31.92	66.04
4. S.A.P.	68.63	59.03	37.13	59.16	32.83	68.10
5. Faculty	61.43	55.33	32.70	55.20	28.93	65.10
6. Students	64.49	54.18	32.19	53.72	28.00	64.03

Following the computations of the Multivariate analysis of variance, the data were analyzed by a one-way analysis of variance technique treating all the items contained in the questionnaire as a single scale. Table 4.3 reports the results of the one-way analysis of variance.

TABLE 4-3.--One-way analysis of variance test for no difference between groups on the total instrument.

One-Way Analysis of Variance					
Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	f	P
Between Categories	47,501.11	5	9500.22	13.71 ^a	<0.005
Within Categories	334,585.03	483	692.71		
Total	382,086.14	488			

^aSignificant at the .05 level. The value of the F ratio at the .05 level of significance for 5 and 483 degrees of freedom 2.21.

As indicated in Table 4.3, the overall F value is significant, indicating that there are differences in expectations held by significant reference groups for the role of Head Resident Advisor at Michigan State University. The justification for rejecting the null hypotheses is further supported by these findings.

The Scheffé post hoc comparison¹ technique was used to determine more specifically where there were differences between groups.

Table 4.4 illustrates the cell means for the groups under study and shows all possible pair wise comparisons that will be computed to locate differences. The comparisons of primary interest are those between the Head Resident Advisor and other significant reference groups.

TABLE 4-4.--Post hoc comparisons.

		Group				
		1	2	3	4	5
		Couns.	Mgt.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Students
Mean Group	Mean	236.00	248.38	269.57	238.37	232.74
1. Head R.A.	252.62	16.62	4.24	-16.95	14.25	19.88 ^a
2. Couns.	236.00		-12.38	-33.57 ^a	-2.37	3.26
3. Mgt.	248.38			-21.19	10.01	15.64
4. S.A.P.	269.57				31.20 ^a	36.83 ^a
5. Fac.	238.37					5.63
6. Students	232.74					

^aIndicates significant differences between groups being compared.

Formula to determine the number of all pair wise comparisons:²

$$\hat{\psi} = \frac{(N)(N-1)}{2} = \frac{(6)(6-1)}{2} = \frac{(6)(5)}{2} = \frac{30}{2} = 15$$

¹Hays, p. 484.

²Ibid., p. 473.

The Scheffé post hoc technique is a method of computing confidence intervals to determine if a sample mean deviates significantly from the population mean. A significant difference is obtained when the computed confidence interval does not cross zero.

Table 4.5 is a summary of the computed Scheffé post hoc comparisons.

The results of the Scheffé post hoc comparisons show that significant differences exist at the .05 level between the mean scores of:

- (1) Head Resident Advisors and students;
- (2) Counselors and Student Affairs Personnel;
- (3) Student Affairs Personnel and faculty, and
- (4) Student Affairs Personnel and students.

No significant difference was found between the mean scores of the remaining comparisons.

It may be noted that a primary source of significant differences was found between Head Resident Advisors and students and Student Affairs Personnel and students.

TABLE 4-5.--Results of Scheffé post hoc comparisons.

Groups		Sig- nificant	Not Significant
1.	H.R.A.--Counselors		
	16.62 $\pm$ 27.30		
	-10.68 $\leftrightarrow$ 43.92		x
	$\hat{\Psi}$ Not significant at .05 level		
2.	H.R.A.--Managers		
	4.24 — 26.85		
	-22.61 $\leftrightarrow$ 31.09		x
	$\hat{\Psi}$ Not significant at .05 level		
3.	H.R.A.--S.A.P.		
	-16.95 $\pm$ 24.29		
	-41.29 $\leftrightarrow$ 7.34		x
	$\hat{\Psi}$ Not significant at .05 level		
4.	H.R.A.--Faculty		
	14.25 $\pm$ 24.29		
	-10.04 $\leftrightarrow$ 38.54		x
	$\hat{\Psi}$ Not significant at .05 level		
5.	H.R.A.--Students		
	19.88 $\pm$ 18.44		
	1.44 $\leftrightarrow$ 38.32	x	
	$\hat{\Psi}$ Significant at .05 level		
6.	Counselors--Management		
	-12.38 $\pm$ 28.44		
	-40.82 $\leftrightarrow$ 16.06		x
	$\hat{\Psi}$ Not significant at .05 level		
7.	Counselors--S.A.P.		
	-33.57 $\pm$ 26.23		
	-59.80 $\leftrightarrow$ -7.34		
	$\hat{\Psi}$ Significant at .05 level	x	

TABLE 4-5.--Continued.

Groups		Sig- nificant	Not Significant
8.	Counselors--Faculty		
	-2.37 $\pm$ 26.23		
	-28.60 $\leftrightarrow$ 23.86		
	$\hat{\Psi}$ Not significant at .05 level		x
9.	Counselors--Students		
	3.26 $\pm$ 20.97		
	-17.71 $\leftrightarrow$ 24.23		
	$\hat{\Psi}$ Not significant at .05 level		x
10.	Managers--S.A.P.		
	-21.19 $\pm$ 25.92		
	-41.11 $\leftrightarrow$ 4.73		
	$\hat{\Psi}$ Not significant at .05 level		x
11.	Managers--Faculty		
	10.01 $\pm$ 25.92		
	-15.91 $\leftrightarrow$ 35.93		
	$\hat{\Psi}$ Not significant at .05 level		x
12.	Managers--Students		
	15.64 $\pm$ 20.55		
	-4.91 $\leftrightarrow$ 36.19		
	$\hat{\Psi}$ Not significant at .05 level		x
13.	Student Affairs--Faculty		
	31.20 $\pm$ 23.39		
	7.81 $\leftrightarrow$ 54.59		
	$\hat{\Psi}$ Significant at .05 level	x	
14.	Student Affairs--Students		
	36.38 $\pm$ 17.30		
	19.08 $\leftrightarrow$ 53.68		
	$\hat{\Psi}$ Significant at .05 level	x	

TABLE 4-5.--Continued.

Groups	Sig- nificant	Not Significant
15. Students--Faculty		
5.63 $\pm$ -11.67 — 22.93		
$\hat{\psi}$ Not significant at .05 level		x

Scheffe post hoc formula¹ for .95% confidence interval.

$$x_1 - x_2 \pm (\sqrt{(J-1) F_{j-1, n-j}}) (\sqrt{MS_w (\frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2})}$$

$$\bar{x}_1 - x_2 \pm (\sqrt{(5) (2.39)^a}) (\sqrt{692.72 (\frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2})}$$

where:

x = group mean.

J-1 = number of groups minus one.

^aF_{j-1, n-j} = value required for significance at .05 level with 5 and 483 degrees of freedom.

MS_w = mean square within groups.

($\frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2}$) = the combined reciprocal of each of the groups being compared.

¹Ibid., p. 484.

Summary of Hypotheses Findings

The major null hypothesis of no significant difference between groups must be rejected. This conclusion is supported by the multivariate analysis of variance which shows significant differences between the responses of the six groups to the six sub-scales of the questionnaire, by the one-way analysis of variance which shows significant differences between responses of the six groups to the total questionnaire, and by use of the Scheffé post hoc technique which permitted the researcher to precisely locate the sources of difference between the groups.

The Scheffé comparisons showed that differences by expectations do exist between Head Resident Advisors and students thus permitting the rejection of minor Hypothesis E. No significant differences were demonstrated, however, between expectations held by Head Resident Advisors and the remaining comparison groups. Therefore, the remaining minor hypotheses must be accepted.

In addition to testing the hypotheses, the researcher was interested in a further explanation of the specific items contained in the questionnaire. The following discussion will focus on a descriptive analysis of the individual items contained within the six sub-scales of the questionnaire. Findings will not be used for inferential purposes.

Analysis of the Sub-Scales

As has been indicated earlier, a role incumbent defines his conception of his professional role by internalizing the expectations of others, especially the "significant" others who influence his role performance on a regular basis. A primary purpose of this study was to identify role expectations held by "significant others" for the position of Head Resident Advisor at Michigan State University and examine them critically to point out the areas of convergence and divergence of expectations.

The items of each sub-scale are reported in tabular form to show the mean response and standard deviation of each group to the questions. A chi square score is reported for each of the items to show over-all significance. However, since statistical inferences are not being made from the item analysis, significant differences between groups are not reported. Degrees of Consensus for group responses to the items are determined by a scale similar to one developed by Crossland¹ in his study of role expectations for administrators of community service programs in community colleges.

- (1) Significant consensus--75 per cent or more answering in one category;

¹Crossland, p. 62.

- (2) Strong concensus--65 per cent to 74.9 per cent answering in one category;
- (3) Limited concensus--50.0 per cent to 64.9 per cent;
- (4) Divergence--less than 50.0 per cent answering in one category.

A plus (+) sign following the indication of concensus is used to indicate positive support where more than 50.0 per cent of a group agree to an item. A minus (-) sign following the indication of concensus is used to indicate opposition to an item when 50 per cent or more of a group agree that the item is an inappropriate expectation for the position of Head Resident Advisor.

Analysis of Sub-Scale I

Table 4.6 presents the individual items of sub-scale I, expectations for program responsibilities. As indicated in the table, the chi square analysis indicated significant differences at the .05 per cent level for eight of the seventeen items. No significant differences were reported in nine items.

As Table 4.6 indicates, five of the seventeen items received a significant concensus from the groups, six of the items received a strong concensus, three received a limited concensus, and three received divergent responses from the groups.

TABLE 4-6.--Expectations for program responsibilities held for the Head Resident Advisor.

Legend: "Couns." represents counselors assigned to residence halls; "Mgt." represents residence hall managers; "H.R.A." represents Head Resident Advisors; "S.A.P." represents Student Affairs Personnel; "Fac." represents university college faculty teaching in residence halls; "Stu." represents a stratified random sample of undergraduate students living in residence halls; "Group Total" represents the total response for all groups; column 8 represents the chi square score obtained for the item; and columns 9 and 10 represent the .05 and .01 levels of significance. "S" is used to indicate a significant difference in these columns and "N.S." represents no significant difference. The value of chi square required for significance at the .05 level with 20 degrees of freedom is 31.410; at the .01 level the required value is 37.566. In the first row, "Conc." represents the degree of consensus for the item by each group and it is indicated over the percentage response. "Sig." indicates significant consensus; "St." indicates strong consensus; "Lt." indicates limited consensus; and "Div." indicates divergent opinion. In the second row, "%a" represents the percentage of agreement for the item by the groups, and "%d" represents the percentage of disagreement with the items by the groups. In the fourth row, "m" represents the mean response of each of the groups to the item. In row five, "s" represents the standard deviation for each group response to the item. This legend also applies to Tables 4.7, 4.8, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11.

The Head Resident Advisor Should:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Couns.	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	.05	.01
4. Have primary responsibility for the selection and training of his staff.	Conc.										
	%a	70.00	85.71	100.00	96.60	66.66	68.23	72.40	43.225	S	S
	%d	20.00	14.29	0.00	0.00	30.00	28.45	24.33			
	m	2.85	2.90	3.65	3.47	2.51	12.59	2.72			
	s	1.14	1.18	.49	.57	1.30	1.29	1.24			
6. Participate in regular inservice education programs.	Conc.										
	%a	65.00	90.48	92.31	96.67	66.67	70.91	73.79	41.504	S	S
	%d	15.00	4.67	0.00	0.00	13.33	7.21	6.96			
	m	2.65	3.14	3.31	3.63	2.73	2.89	2.95			
	s	1.09	.73	.62	.56	.94	.90	.90			
16. Consult with staff and students before filling vacant staff positions.	Conc.										
	%a	85.00	66.67	76.92	96.67	92.00	86.43	85.86	42.583	S	S
	%d	10.00	23.81	23.08	3.33	3.33	8.03	9.02			
	m	3.20	2.43	2.85	3.27	3.37	3.30	3.23			
	s	1.11	1.16	1.22	.64	.76	.93	.96			
19. Work closely with other Head Resident Advisors in coordinating programs and activities among halls.	Conc.										
	%a	68.42	71.43	46.15	86.67	46.67	53.59	56.15	27.602	NS	NS
	%d	10.53	14.29	34.62	0.00	26.67	17.96	17.83			
	m	2.68	2.76	2.12	3.10	2.23	2.44	2.47			
	s	.82	.94	1.14	.61	1.19	1.01	1.01			

TABLE 4-6.--Continued.

The Head Resident Advisor Should:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Couns.	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	05	01
24. Encourage students to plan concerts, lectures, seminars, and play readings in residence halls.	Conc.	Div.	St.+	St.+	Sig.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	19.430	NS	NS
	%a	30.00	66.67	65.38	76.67	56.67	58.45	59.01			
	%d	30.00	19.04	15.38	6.67	20.00	16.34	16.60			
	m s	2.05 .89	2.67 1.15	2.69 .97	2.87 .78	2.53 1.01	2.59 1.03	2.59 1.01			
30. Spend as much time as possible in the living areas talking with students.	Conc.	Lt.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Lt.+	St.+	30.185	NS	NS
	%a	60.00	76.19	76.92	83.34	83.34	62.88	66.60			
	%d	15.00	19.05	7.69	3.33	10.00	14.96	13.73			
	m s	2.50 1.00	2.62 1.02	2.77 .71	3.17 .79	3.00 .87	2.63 .96	2.69 .95			
32. Give consideration to the needs of minority groups when select- ing his undergraduate staff.	Conc.	Lt.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	St.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	50.638	S	S
	%a	60.00	85.72	96.15	96.67	73.34	80.11	80.98			
	%d	5.00	0.00	3.85	0.00	10.00	8.84	7.57			
	m s	3.05 1.05	3.24 .70	3.23 .82	3.63 .56	2.90 .92	2.96 .92	3.03 .91			
40. Be trained in group dynamics and sensitivity training techniques.	Conc.	St.+	Div.	Sig.+	Lt.+	Lt. +	St.+	St.+	27.636	NS	NS
	%a	65.00	42.85	80.77	60.00	63.34	71.27	69.12			
	%d	20.00	28.57	11.54	10.00	6.67	10.49	11.45			
	m s	2.60 .99	2.19 1.08	2.88 .86	2.67 .88	2.80 1.00	2.89 1.00	2.83 .99			
43. Be the key personnel for establishing an intellectual environment in the residence hall.	Conc.	Lt.-	Div.	Div.	Lt.+	Div.	Lt.-	Div.	52.447	S	S
	%a	25.00	42.86	30.77	63.33	43.66	19.06	23.93			
	%d	55.00	28.57	38.47	20.00	46.66	51.10	47.44			
	m s	1.53 1.05	2.24 1.14	1.96 1.04	2.57 1.17	1.73 1.17	1.60 .95	1.71 1.03			
47. Assist students with problems of socialization--social and personal adjustment.	Conc.	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Lt.+	St.+	St.+	50.059	S	S
	%a	75.00	80.95	88.46	93.34	63.33	67.12	70.56			
	%d	10.00	4.76	3.85	3.33	20.00	13.54	12.27			
	m s	2.95 .94	2.90 .89	3.27 .78	3.10 .76	2.50 .90	2.63 .86	2.71 .87			

TABLE 4-6.--Continued.

The Head Resident Advisor Should:		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			Couns.	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	05	01
53. Use student advisory committees to provide feedback on student needs and concerns.	Conc.	Sig. +	Sig. +	Sig. +	Sig. +	Sig. +	Sig. +	Sig. +	Sig. +	19.926	NS	NS
	%a	85.00	90.48	88.46	96.67	86.67	86.74	87.53	19.926			
	%d	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.33	3.32	2.86	19.926			
	m	3.15	3.24	3.12	3.30	3.00	3.11	3.12	19.926			
	s	.99	.62	.59	.53	.79	.72	.71	19.926			
56. Be trained in first aid and safety procedures.	Conc.	Sig. +	Sig. +	St. +	Sig. +	Sig. +	Sig. +	Sig. +	Sig. +	17.248	NS	NS
	%a	80.00	80.95	73.08	76.67	76.67	79.50	78.90	17.248			
	%d	0.00	14.28	11.54	13.33	6.67	7.20	7.79	17.248			
	m	3.10	2.86	2.92	2.73	3.00	3.01	2.98	17.248			
	s	.72	1.20	1.09	.94	.87	.90	.92	17.248			
58. See that adequate recreational facilities and programs are made available to students.	Conc.	Lt. +	Lt. +	Sig. +	St. +	Lt. +	Lt. +	Lt. +	Lt. +	19.735	NS	NS
	%a	50.00	52.38	76.92	73.33	63.34	64.34	64.42	19.735			
	%d	20.00	14.28	7.70	16.66	23.33	15.39	16.56	19.735			
	m	2.50	2.33	2.73	2.73	2.47	2.60	2.59	19.735			
	s	1.19	1.02	.83	1.05	1.04	.95	.97	19.735			
68. Take the lead in instituting new programs and activities in the hall.	Conc.	Lt. +	Lt. +	Lt. +	St. +	Div.	Div.	Div.	Div.	20.393	NS	NS
	%a	50.00	57.05	50.00	66.67	43.34	40.33	43.76	20.393			
	%d	25.00	33.33	34.62	20.00	40.00	37.29	35.58	20.393			
	m	2.30	2.38	2.19	2.63	2.07	2.04	2.11	20.393			
	s	1.08	1.24	1.10	1.00	1.08	1.03	1.05	20.393			
74. Organize study skills programs for students needing academic assistance.	Conc.	Div.	Div.	St. +	St. +	Div.	Div.	Div.	Div.	34.389	S	NS
	%a	40.00	47.62	69.23	70.00	43.33	35.08	40.29	34.389			
	%d	25.00	38.09	11.54	10.00	26.67	34.53	31.08	34.389			
	m	2.25	2.14	2.69	2.63	2.17	2.02	2.12	34.389			
	s	.97	1.15	.84	.72	1.05	.98	.99	34.389			
85. Encourage the organization or special interest living groups such as "academic houses," "social action houses," or "current issues houses."	Conc.	Lt. +	St. +	Lt. +	Sig. +	Lt. +	Lt. +	Lt. +	Lt. +	32.549	S	NS
	%a	55.00	71.43	61.53	86.67	53.33	50.00	54.19	32.549			
	%d	0.00	9.52	15.39	3.33	20.00	18.78	16.57	32.549			
	m	2.60	2.81	2.58	3.10	2.37	2.35	2.44	32.549			
	s	.60	.87	1.03	.71	.96	.96	.95	32.549			
91. Organize programs and make information available on such topics as drugs, sexuality, alcohol, self-identity, and personal adjustment.	Conc.	St. +	Sig. +	Sig. +	Sig. +	Sig. +	Sig. +	Sig. +	Sig. +	17.353	NS	NS
	%a	70.00	85.72	88.46	83.33	86.67	75.14	77.30	17.353			
	%d	10.00	00.00	11.54	10.00	10.00	11.88	11.04	17.353			
	m	2.85	3.00	3.12	3.03	3.00	2.82	2.87	17.353			
	s	.93	.55	.91	.89	.95	.95	.93	17.353			

A significant consensus (> 75.0%+) of the groups felt that Head Resident Advisors should:

16. Consult with staff and students before filling vacant staff positions. All six groups supported this item strongly or significantly.
32. Give consideration to the needs of minority students when selecting his undergraduate staff. All groups except counselors and faculty indicated significant consensus for giving particular consideration to minority students. Faculty gave strong consensus to the idea while counselors indicated limited consensus.
53. Use student advisory committees to provide feedback on student needs and concerns. All six groups indicated significant consensus.
56. Be trained in first aid and safety procedures. Five of the six groups gave a significant consensus to this item. Head Resident Advisors indicated a strong consensus (+73.08%) for the item.
91. Organize programs and make information available on such topics as drugs, sexuality, alcohol, self-identity, and personal adjustment. All groups except counselors indicated a significant consensus for the item. Counselors indicated a strong consensus (+70.0).

A strong consensus (65.0% to 74.9%) of the groups felt that Head Resident Advisors should:

4. Have primary responsibility for the selection and training of his staff. Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, and managers indicated a significant consensus for item four, while counselors, students, and faculty indicated a strong consensus.
6. Participate in regular in-service education. Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, and managers indicated a significant consensus for item six, while counselors, faculty, and students a strong consensus for the item.
24. Encourage students to plan concerts, lectures, seminars, and play readings in residence halls. Student Affairs Personnel indicated significant consensus for the item. Head Resident Advisors and managers indicated a strong consensus while faculty and students indicated a limited consensus for the item. Counselors held divergent opinions about the expectation.
30. Spend as much time as possible in the living areas talking with students. Managers, Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, and faculty indicated a significant consensus

for item thirty while counselors and students indicated a limited consensus for the item.

40. Be trained in group dynamics and sensitivity training techniques. The reaction of the groups were mixed to this item. Head Resident Advisors indicated a significant consensus (+80.77), counselors and students indicated a strong consensus while Student Affairs Personnel (+60.0), and faculty (63.34) reflected a limited consensus for the items. Residence hall managers indicated a divergence of opinion on the value of group dynamics and sensitivity training.

47. Assist students with problems of socialization--social and personal adjustment. Four of the subgroups--counselors, managers, Head Resident Advisors, and Student Affairs Personnel--gave a significant consensus to item forty-seven while students indicated a strong consensus and faculty gave a limited consensus to the item.

A limited consensus (50.0% to 64.9%) of the group indicated that the Head Resident Advisor should:

19. Work closely with other Head Resident Advisors in coordinating programs and activities among halls. Student Affairs Personnel indicated a significant consensus for item nineteen.

Counselors and managers indicated a strong consensus while students indicated a limited consensus. Head Resident Advisors reflected a divergence of opinion on the item, neither agreeing nor disagreeing that it is an appropriate job expectation.

58. See that adequate recreational facilities and programs are made available to students. Head Resident Advisors indicated a significant consensus for item thirteen, while Student Affairs Personnel showed strong consensus. The remaining groups indicated a limited consensus for the item.
85. Encourage the organization of special interest living groups such as "academic houses," "social action houses," or "current issues houses." Student Affairs Personnel indicated significant consensus for item eighty-five. Hall managers indicated strong consensus. The remaining groups indicated limited consensus for the item.

Divergent opinions (less than 50.0% indicated in any one category) were held by the groups for the following items indicating that the Head Resident Advisor may or may not:

43. Be the key personnel for establishing an intellectual environment in the residence hall.

Student Affairs Personnel indicated limited consensus in favor of item forty-three. Counselors and students indicated opposition to the item.

68. Take the lead in instituting new programs and activities in the hall. Student Affairs Personnel indicated strong consensus for item sixty-eight. Counselors, managers, and Head Resident Advisors indicated a low limited consensus for the item while faculty and students indicated a divergence of opinion.

74. Organize study skills programs for students needing academic assistance. Head Resident Advisors and Student Affairs Personnel indicated a strong consensus for item seventy-four; however, the remaining groups expressed a divergence of opinion on the item.

Analysis of Sub-Scale II

The chi square analysis indicated significant differences at the .05 level between the groups on five of the sixteen questions in the sub scale. No significant differences were found on eleven of the questions.

As Table 4.7 indicates, four of the sixteen items received significant positive consensus and one received significant negative consensus. Six of the items received

TABLE 4-7.-- Expectations for group advising.

The Head Resident Advisor Should:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Couns.	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	05	01
8. Interpret and explain uni- versity philosophy, policies, expectations, and regulations to individual students and to student groups in the hall.	Conc. %a %d m s	Lt.+ 60.00 10.00 2.65 1.04	Sig.+ 90.48 4.76 3.43 .81	Sig.+ 100.00 0.00 3.50 .51	Sig.+ 96.67 0.00 3.67 .56	Sig.+ 93.34 3.33 3.23 .82	Sig.+ 80.61 10.25 2.94 .94	Sig.+ 82.99 8.40 3.04 .92	54,309	S	S
10. Serve as a model for students through his own actions and patterns of living.	Conc. %a %d m s	Lt.+ 55.00 25.00 2.50 1.36	Sig.+ 95.24 4.76 3.33 .91	Sig.+ 84.62 11.54 3.15 .97	Sig.+ 96.67 3.33 3.50 .68	Lt.+ 53.33 16.66 2.40 1.13	Lt.+ 55.52 20.99 2.50 1.16	Lt.+ 61.27 18.65 2.63 1.16	53,776	S	S
13. Act as editorial consultant to house and hall news- papers.	Conc. %a %d m s	St.- 10.00 70.00 1.10 1.12	Div. 33.33 28.97 2.05 .97	St.- 3.85 73.08 .96 .87	Div. 26.67 46.67 1.67 1.03	St.- 10.00 66.67 1.13 .97	St.- 8.56 68.78 1.10 .94	St.- 10.63 65.85 1.17 .98	42,655	S	S
18. Act in an advisory capacity to Ad. Hoc. groups as they develop in the hall.	Conc. %a %d m s	Lt.+ 55.00 5.00 2.60 .75	St.+ 71.43 9.52 2.76 1.00	Sig.+ 92.31 3.48 2.92 .48	Sig.+ 76.67 6.67 2.90 .80	St.+ 66.67 20.00 2.53 .90	Lt.+ 57.46 13.81 2.50 .90	Lt.+ 61.55 12.68 2.56 .89	34,489	S	NS
22. Socialize with residents outside the hall.	Conc. %a %d m s	Div. 45.00 00.00 2.55 .69	Div. 23.81 28.57 1.95 1.07	Div. 23.08 11.54 2.15 .67	Div. 98.28 24.14 2.31 1.04	Div. 46.67 6.67 2.53 .82	Lt.+ 51.11 6.63 2.56 .85	Div. 47.75 8.61 2.49 .87	38,411	S	S
26. Serve as chief advisor to the hall student government program and should attend hall govern- ment meetings.	Conc. %a %d m s	Lt.+ 55.00 15.00 2.50 1.05	Sig.+ 85.72 14.28 3.05 1.12	Sig.+ 80.77 7.69 3.00 .85	Sig.+ 76.67 10.00 3.13 1.01	St.+ 73.34 20.00 2.53 1.04	St.+ 66.57 18.51 2.58 1.01	St.+ 68.71 17.18 2.65 1.02	45,554	S	S

TABLE 4-7.--Continued.

The Head Resident Advisor Should:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Couns.	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	05	01
33. Coordinate and administer an orientation program for new students to help them adjust to the hall and the university.	Conc.	St.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	St.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	28.074	NS	NS
	%a	65.00	80.96	80.77	80.00	68.97	58.73	63.04			
	%d	20.00	0.00	7.69	6.67	10.34	17.73	15.40			
	m s	2.65 1.04	2.95 .59	2.96 .82	3.10 .99	2.83 .93	2.53 1.01	2.63 1.00			
34. Provide training for student government officers and committee members which will better enable them to carry out their elected functions.	Conc.	Lt.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Sig.+	Div.	Div.	Div.	44.544	S	S
	%a	55.00	61.91	61.54	75.86	43.34	36.19	42.22			
	%d	20.00	19.05	23.08	6.90	23.33	32.32	28.69			
	m s	2.40 .88	2.62 1.16	2.46 1.07	2.97 .98	2.30 .95	2.04 1.05	2.17 1.06			
35. Encourage residents to establish social policies and regulations to govern the hall.	Conc.	St.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	St.+	St.+	Sig.+	37.703	S	S
	%a	70.00	90.48	96.15	96.67	70.00	72.10	75.46			
	%d	15.00	9.52	3.85	0.00	13.33	12.15	11.04			
	m s	2.80 1.01	3.10 .83	3.23 .65	3.50 .57	2.70 .99	2.75 .97	2.83 .95			
39. In addition to providing alternatives to a topic or a concern, make his position known on the subject.	Conc.	St.+	St.+	St.+	St.+	St.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	33.633	S	NS
	%a	70.00	71.43	73.08	70.00	70.00	54.58	58.19			
	%d	20.00	14.28	7.69	3.33	13.34	22.99	19.88			
	m s	2.70 1.17	2.86 1.15	2.69 .68	2.93 .94	2.50 1.01	2.39 1.07	2.48 1.06			
44. Not influence elected student officers through advice or organized training programs.	Conc.	Div.	Sig.-	Sig.-	St.-	Lt.-	Lt.-	Lt.-	25.259	NS	NS
	%a	15.79	14.28	11.54	10.00	23.34	28.73	25.82			
	%d	47.37	76.19	76.92	66.67	60.00	50.00	54.10			
	m s	1.63 .85	1.29 1.15	1.23 .95	1.50 1.25	1.60 1.10	1.79 1.12	1.70 1.12			

TABLE 4-7.--Continued.

The Head Resident Advisor Should:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Couns.	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	05	01
57. Encourage students to participate in the selection and evaluation of residence hall staff.	Conc.	Sig.+	Div.	St.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	42.682	S	S
	%a	80.00	47.62	69.23	83.34	80.00	79.84	76.64			
	%d	5.00	42.86	19.23	3.33	6.67	12.19	12.70			
	m	3.10	2.10	2.77	3.07	3.13	2.94	2.92			
	s	1.02	1.01	1.57	.74	.90	.98	1.01			
67. Act as a representative for the students rather than the administration.	Conc.	Div.	St.-	Div.	Div.	Div.	Lt.+	Lt.+	74.641	S	S
	%a	45.00	14.29	19.23	30.00	53.34	59.39	52.55			
	%d	35.00	66.67	38.57	46.66	13.33	15.74	21.68			
	m	2.20	1.29	1.77	1.73	2.57	2.62	1.73			
	s	1.20	.96	.82	1.11	.94	1.01	1.07			
71. Focus his efforts primarily on the organized student government groups in the residence hall.	Conc.	St.-	St.-	Sig.-	Sig.-	Sig.-	Sig.-	Sig.-	30.003	NS	NS
	%a	15.00	23.81	3.85	13.33	6.67	4.09	7.15			
	%d	70.00	72.67	88.46	76.67	80.66	79.55				
	m	1.35	1.48	1.04	1.27	1.17	1.03	1.09			
	s	1.04	1.12	.60	.83	.75	.77	.80			
76. Let students assume responsibility for their social and recreational activities.	Conc.	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	17.592	NS	NS
	%a	90.00	80.95	92.30	86.07	83.33	86.74	86.70			
	%d	5.00	19.05	3.85	6.67	10.00	5.52	6.34			
	m	3.35	2.81	3.12	3.07	3.10	3.14	3.12			
	s	.81	1.12	.65	.78	.92	.83	.84			
90. Function primarily as a counselor and advisor to students.	Conc.	Lt.+	Lt.+	St.+	St.+	Sig.+	St.+	St.+	24.552	NS	NS
	%a	55.00	52.38	73.07	66.67	80.00	71.73	70.49			
	%d	30.00	38.09	23.08	26.67	6.67	14.41	16.80			
	m	2.35	2.14	2.77	2.60	3.00	2.76	2.72			
	s	1.18	1.11	1.11	1.10	.83	.96	1.00			

strong support. One of the items received positive limited consensus while one received significant negative consensus. Two received negative strong consensus, and two items received divergent responses from the groups.

A significant consensus (> 75.0%+) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisor should:

8. Interpret and explain university philosophy policies, expectations, and regulations to individual students and to student groups in the halls. Five of the six groups indicated significant support for the item. Counselors, however, indicated only limited consensus for the item. The reported mean score for counselors was also much lower than the other groups.
35. Encourage residents to establish social policies and regulations to govern the hall. All groups were strongly supportive of student self-government. Hall managers, Head Resident Advisors, and Student Affairs Personnel indicated over 90.0 per cent agreement for the concept.
57. Encourage students to participate in the selection and evaluation of residence hall staff. Four of the six groups indicated significant consensus for the idea of participation in staff selection and evaluation. Head Resident

Advisors indicated strong consensus for the idea while hall managers reflected a divergence of opinion. Forty-three per cent of the managers, however, were opposed to the idea of student participation.

76. Let students assume responsibility for their social and recreational activities. All groups indicated significant support for this concept.

A strong consensus (> 65.0% to 74.9%+) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisor should:

10. Serve as a model for students through his own actions and patterns of living. All groups were supportive of this concept; however, they were sharply divided in their degree of support. Three of the groups--managers, Head Resident Advisors, and Student Affairs Personnel--indicated a significant consensus for the item; while counselors, faculty, and students only indicated a limited consensus for the idea.
18. Act in an advisory capacity to Ad Hoc groups as they develop in the hall. Head Resident Advisors and Student Affairs Personnel indicated a significant consensus for the item. Managers and faculty indicated a strong consensus while counselors and students indicated a limited consensus

for the item. The data would suggest a division in attitude among Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, and students on the need for staff in put with Ad Hoc groups.

26. Serve as chief advisor to the hall student government program and should attend hall government meetings. Managers, Head Resident Advisors, and Student Affairs Personnel indicated significant consensus for the expectation that the Head Advisor should be chief advisor to student government. Faculty and students indicated a strong consensus for the idea, while counselors indicated a limited consensus.
33. Coordinate and administer an orientation program for new students to help them adjust to the hall and the university. Three of the groups, managers, Head Advisors, and Student Affairs Personnel indicated significant consensus for this concept. Counselors and faculty supported the idea strongly while students indicated limited support for the idea of an orientation program.
39. In addition to providing alternatives to a topic or concern, make his position known on the subject. All groups except students indicated

strong support for the item except students. They reflected a limited consensus.

90. Function primarily as a counselor and advisor to students. All groups supported this concept; however, there was a broad range in the degree of support. The faculty indicated significant consensus for the idea. Head Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, and students indicated strong consensus while counselors and managers reflected consensus for the item.

A limited consensus (50.0% to 64.9%) of the groups indicated that the Head Resident Advisor should:

34. Provide training for student government officers and committee members which will better enable them to carry out their elected functions. Counselors, managers, and Head Advisors indicated limited consensus for this item while Student Affairs Personnel indicated a significant consensus for it. Faculty and students reflected a divergence of opinion, neither supporting nor rejecting the item.

Divergent opinions (less than 50% agreement indicated in any one category) were held by the groups for the following items indicating that the Head Resident Advisor may or may not:

22. Socialize with residents outside the hall. All groups except students indicated a divergence of opinion for this item. Students indicated slightly over 50 per cent (51.11%) agreement with the item.

67. Act as a representative for the students rather than the administrator. Four of the groups, counselors, Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, and faculty, indicated a divergence of opinion on the question. Students indicated limited support while hall managers strongly opposed the idea.

The following items were rejected by the groups as inappropriate expectations for the position of Head Resident Advisor. A significant consensus (> 75%) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisor should not:

71. Focus his efforts primarily on the organized student government group within the hall. Four of the groups indicated significant opposition to this idea while two strongly opposed it.

A strong consensus (64.9% to 75.0%) of the groups felt that Head Resident Advisors should not:

13. Act as editorial consultant to house and hall newspapers. Counselors, Head Resident Advisors, faculty, and students strongly

rejected the idea of Head Advisors acting as editorial consultant to student publications. Hall managers and Student Affairs Personnel reflected a divergence of opinion on the question.

44. Influence elected student officers through advice or organized training programs. Counselors and managers indicated significant opposition to the question; Student Affairs Personnel indicated strong consensus in opposition; students and faculty indicated limited negative consensus; and counselors reflected a divergence of opinion. Thus the data would suggest that five of the six groups strongly support the expectation that the Head Resident Advisor function in the role of student government advisor.

Analysis of Sub-Scale III

The chi square analysis indicated significant differences at the .05 level between the groups on eight of the ten items in Sub Scale III.

As Table 4.8 indicates two of the questions received positive significant consensus, and one received negative significant consensus. One of the questions received strong consensus. Three of the questions received positive limited consensus, and one received negative, limited consensus. Two of the questions received divergent responses from the groups.

TABLE 4-8.--Expectations for individual advising.

The Head Resident Advisor Should:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Couns.	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	05	01
11. Work directly with individual students in helping solve family or personal problems.	Conc.	Lt.+	Lt.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	St.+	Lt.+	St.+	39.124	S	S
	%a	60.00	57.14	92.31	86.67	73.33	61.88	65.44			
	%d	35.00	33.33	7.69	3.33	16.67	20.99	20.04			
	m	2.15	2.29	3.23	2.97	2.73	2.54	2.59			
	s	1.27	1.27	.82	.76	1.05	1.06	1.06			
12. Should consider human factors above business, administrative, or regulatory factors when dealing with students.	Conc.	Sig.+	Div.	Sig.+	Lt.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	94.121	S	S
	%a	90.00	42.86	80.77	56.67	86.67	89.74	85.09			
	%d	5.00	47.61	7.69	20.00	3.33	3.67	6.76			
	m	3.35	2.05	3.04	2.63	3.27	3.41	3.27			
	s	.81	1.24	.87	1.19	.78	.80	.91			
15. Be expected to consult with students who overemphasize dating, sports, and other extracurricular activities at the expense of their academic program.	Conc.	Lt.-	Div.	Lt.-	St.+	St.-	St.-	St.-	69.199	S	S
	%a	20.00	42.86	34.62	70.00	13.33	15.75	21.27			
	%d	60.00	42.86	50.00	20.00	73.34	73.34	68.23			
	m	1.35	2.00	1.73	2.57	1.03	1.27	1.39			
	s	1.09	1.22	1.08	1.10	1.03	1.09	1.15			
36. Assist students having academic problems by providing counseling, tutoring, and study skills programs.	Conc.	Lt.+	Lt.-	Sig.+	St.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	32.513	S	NS
	%a	50.00	61.90	80.77	70.00	53.33	51.53	54.71			
	%d	35.00	19.05	15.38	16.67	20.00	27.70	25.82			
	m	2.25	2.57	3.00	2.83	2.40	2.28	2.37			
	s	1.07	.98	1.02	1.05	1.00	1.10	1.10			
37. Personally interview each new student in the residence hall.	Conc.	Sig.-	St.-	St.-	Div.	Sig.-	Sig.-	Sig.-	58.630	S	S
	%a	5.00	4.76	15.38	43.33	6.67	6.91	9.41			
	%d	80.00	71.43	73.08	43.33	80.00	81.77	78.32			
	m	.95	1.10	1.23	1.93	.90	.85	.95			
	s	.83	.83	.95	1.14	.88	.91	.95			

TABLE 4-8.--Continued.

		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
The Head Resident Advisor Should:			Couns.	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	05	01
46.	Be primarily responsible for providing students with better alternatives for decision making rather than making decisions for them.	Conc.	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	26.414	NS	NS
		%a	75.00	85.72	96.15	96.67	93.34	90.06	90.18			
		%d	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.33	3.86	3.68			
		m	3.00	3.00	3.54	3.57	3.57	3.28	3.29			
		s	1.21	.55	.58	.57	.72	.79	.78			
61.	Try to cultivate and draw out introverted students who tend to be "loners" through personal contact.	Conc.	Div.	Lt.+	St.+	Lt.+	Div.	Div.	Div.	33.615	S	NS
		%a	40.00	52.39	69.23	63.33	46.66	38.40	42.74			
		%d	35.00	14.28	11.54	20.00	16.67	32.60	29.04			
		m	2.15	2.48	2.62	2.53	2.27	2.03	2.13			
		s	1.04	1.03	.75	1.04	.94	1.00	1.00			
73.	Be familiar with any special health problem a student may have.	Conc.	Lt.+	Lt.+	St.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	24.108	NS	NS
		%a	60.00	61.91	69.23	63.33	53.33	59.39	59.92			
		%d	25.00	4.76	19.23	10.00	20.00	20.72	19.43			
		m	2.65	2.71	2.62	2.53	2.37	2.44	2.47			
		s	1.18	.78	1.06	.82	.96	1.00	.99			
79.	Assist students with academic and career planning.	Conc.	Div.	Div.	St.+	Lt.+	Div.	Div.	Div.	34.484	S	NS
		%a	35.00	33.33	69.23	53.33	40.00	29.56	34.15			
		%d	30.00	38.09	15.38	16.67	43.33	39.50	36.61			
		m	2.00	1.95	2.54	2.43	1.97	1.85	1.94			
		s	.92	1.02	.76	.86	1.03	.98	.98			
93.	Assist students in integrating and relating classroom experiences to the academic and social life of the campus.	Conc.	Lt.+	Lt.+	St.+	Sig.+	Lt.+	Div.	Div.	59.833	S	S
		%a	50.00	57.14	73.07	90.00	56.67	42.54	48.87			
		%d	10.00	00.00	7.70	00.00	13.33	19.89	16.36			
		m	2.45	2.62	2.77	3.13	2.40	2.24	2.36			
		s	.94	.59	.91	.57	.81	.86	.87			

A significant consensus (> 75.0% or greater) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisor should:

12. Consider human factors above business, administrative, or regulatory factors when dealing with students. Counselors, Head Resident Advisors, faculty, and students indicated significant consensus for this question. Student Affairs Personnel indicated a limited consensus, and hall managers reflected a divergence of opinion on the item.
46. Be primarily responsible for providing students with better alternatives for decision making rather than making decisions for them. All six groups indicated a significant consensus for the item thus giving further reinforcement to the overall expectation that the Head Resident function primarily as an advisor to students.

A strong consensus (65.0% to 74.9%) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisor should:

11. Work directly with individual students in helping solve family or personal problems. Head Resident Advisors and Student Affairs Personnel indicated a significant consensus for the item. Faculty supported the item strongly while counselors, hall managers, and students gave a limited consensus to the item.

A limited consensus (50.0% to 64.9%) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisor should:

36. Assist students having academic problems by providing counseling, tutoring, and study skills programs. Head Resident Advisors indicated a significant consensus for the item, and Student Affairs Personnel reflected a strong consensus. All others reflected a limited consensus in favor of the question.
73. Be familiar with any special health problems a student may have. Head Resident Advisors indicated a strong consensus for the item; all others indicated a limited consensus.
93. Assist students in integrating and relating classroom experiences to the academic and social life of the campus. Student Affairs Personnel indicated a significant consensus for the item, and Head Resident Advisors indicated a strong consensus. Counselors, managers, and faculty indicated a limited consensus. Students reflected a divergence of opinion on the role the Head Resident Advisor should play in integrating academic experiences into the residence hall.

Divergent opinions (less than 50.0% agreement in any one category) were held by the groups for the

following items, indicating that the Head Resident Advisor should:

61. Try to cultivate and draw out introverted students who tend to be "loners" through personal contact. Head Resident Advisors indicated a strong consensus for the item. Residence hall managers and Student Affairs Personnel indicated a limited consensus while the remaining groups indicated a divergence of opinion on the question.
79. Assist students with academic and career planning. Head Resident Advisors indicated a strong consensus for the question, Student Affairs Personnel indicated limited consensus, and the remaining groups reflected a divergence of opinion on the extent to which the Head Resident Advisor should assist with academic and career planning.

The following questions were rejected by the groups as inappropriate expectations for the position of Head Resident Advisor. A significant consensus (> 75.0%) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisor should not:

37. Personally interview each new student in the residence hall. Eighty per cent of the counselors rejected this question. Managers, Head

Resident Advisors, faculty, and students also reflected a strong negative consensus for the question. Student Affairs Personnel indicated a divergence of opinion on the question.

A limited consensus (50.0% to 64.9%) of the group felt that the Head Resident Advisor should not:

15. Be expected to consult with students who over-emphasize dating, sports, and other extra-curricular activities at the expense of their academic program. Opinion was sharply divided on this question. Student Affairs Personnel showed strong consensus in favor of the expectation while faculty and students indicated a strong negative consensus for the item. Counselors and Head Resident Advisors reflected a negative limited consensus, and hall managers indicated a divergence of opinion for the item.

Analysis of Sub-Scale IV

An inspection of Table 4.9 indicates significant differences at the .05 level have been found on twelve of the sixteen items in the sub-scale. Significant consensus was indicated for five of the items in the sub-scale. Five of the items received strong positive consensus while two of the items received strong negative consensus. One of the items received limited consensus from

TABLE 4-9.--Expectations for student behavior.

The Head Resident Advisor Should:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Couns.	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	05	01
7. Enforce regulations established by hall governing groups.	Conc.	Div.	Sig.+	Div.	Lt.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	40.324	S	S
	%a	40.00	80.95	46.15	53.33	60.00	55.96	55.94			
	%d	35.00	14.29	42.31	36.66	23.67	29.69	30.13			
	m	1.85	2.86	2.00	2.10	2.43	2.34	2.31			
	s	1.18	.91	1.23	1.24	1.28	1.21	1.21			
14. Notify parents when a student is charged with a violation of law, ordinance, or university regulation.	Conc.	Sig.-	Div.	Sig.-	St.-	St.-	Sig.-	St.-	50.220	S	S
	%a	15.00	47.62	0.00	13.33	23.33	14.68	15.67			
	%d	75.00	42.86	96.15	66.67	66.67	75.35	73.97			
	m	1.05	2.00	.85	1.27	1.13	1.02	1.08			
	s	1.05	1.41	.46	1.05	1.22	1.14	1.14			
20. Rely on acceptance and under- standing of individual behavior rather than rules and regu- lations when working with students.	Conc.	St.+	Div.	St.+	Lt.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	56.096	S	S
	%a	73.68	42.86	68.00	63.33	76.67	80.06	76.34			
	%d	5.26	47.62	16.00	23.33	0.00	9.69	11.72			
	m	3.21	1.95	2.68	2.70	3.20	3.10	3.01			
	s	.98	1.12	.95	1.15	.81	.98	1.02			
21. Delegate disciplinary responsibility to student judiciaries.	Conc.	Lt.+	Div.	St.+	St.+	St.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	38.411	S	S
	%a	60.00	47.62	69.23	70.00	68.97	61.50	62.22			
	%d	5.00	47.62	15.38	10.00	10.35	19.94	19.19			
	m	2.80	2.00	2.81	2.80	2.79	2.58	2.71			
	s	.89	1.14	1.13	.89	.90	1.13	1.10			
25. Enforce regulations estab- lished by university policy- making bodies.	Conc.	Div.	Sig.+	St.+	Sig.+	Sig.	Lt.+	Lt.+	45.554	S	S
	%a	40.00	90.48	65.38	90.00	76.67	53.87	59.10			
	%d	20.00	4.76	23.08	10.00	13.33	24.31	21.68			
	m	2.35	3.38	2.54	3.07	2.70	2.32	2.45			
	s	1.14	.80	1.10	1.05	.92	1.05	1.07			
27. Confront students who illegally enter a cafeteria for the purpose of securing food.	Conc.	Div.	Sig.+	Lt.-	Lt.+	Lt.-	Lt.-	Lt.-	48.547	S	S
	%a	45.00	80.95	45.97	60.00	20.00	26.52	31.29			
	%d	40.00	19.05	53.85	26.67	56.67	56.63	52.35			
	m	2.00	2.81	1.69	2.33	1.43	1.53	1.66			
	s	1.30	1.12	1.16	1.35	1.22	1.25	1.28			

TABLE 4-9.--Continued.

The Head Resident Advisor Should:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Couns.	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	05	01
28. See that a student's rights are protected when the student is charged with a violation of ordinance, law, or university regulation.	Conc.	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	12.959	NS	NS
	%a	90.00	100.00	88.46	83.33	90.00	85.31	86.48			
	%d	5.00	00.00	3.95	3.33	00.00	6.10	5.12			
	m s	3.30 .80	3.24 .44	3.15 .73	3.13 .78	3.27 .64	3.16 .86	3.18 .82			
29. Always follow due process procedures when handling a student disciplinary case.	Conc.	Lt.+	St.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	49.905	S	S
	%a	50.00	71.43	80.77	93.33	50.00	54.42	58.49			
	%d	35.00	23.81	11.54	3.33	33.34	27.35	25.56			
	m s	2.30 1.49	2.71 1.10	3.12 .99	3.43 .73	3.37 1.33	2.43 1.18	2.53 1.20			
31. Establish expectations for student behavior and communicate them to students.	Conc.	Div.	St.+	Div.	Lt.+	Div.	Div.	Div.	44.066	S	S
	%a	20.00	71.61	34.62	60.00	43.34	36.85	39.35			
	%d	45.00	19.05	34.62	20.00	33.33	40.17	37.50			
	m s	1.60 1.14	2.81 1.08	2.08 1.09	2.57 1.19	2.03 1.10	1.89 1.13	1.98 1.15			
45. Counsel with students who display disruptive behavior in the hall.	Conc.	St.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	41.412	S	S
	%a	70.00	95.24	92.31	96.67	90.00	78.67	81.56			
	%d	15.00	00.00	00.00	00.00	6.67	8.31	7.14			
	m s	2.60 .82	3.43 .60	3.38 .64	3.23 .50	3.03 .72	3.03 .72	2.92 .81			
52. Report known instances of alcohol and drug violations to university authorities.	Conc.	St.-	St.+	St.-	Div.	Lt.-	St.-	St.-	113.914	S	S
	%a	25.00	66.67	0.00	43.33	13.33	7.46	12.88			
	%d	70.00	28.57	69.23	30.00	63.33	77.07	70.56			
	m s	1.35 1.23	2.43 1.25	1.15 .67	2.13 1.17	1.30 1.06	.94 .96	2.13 1.07			

TABLE 4-9.--Continued.

The Head Resident Advisor Should:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Couns.	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	05	01
65. Expect students to assume responsibility for their own conduct and behavior.	Conc.	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	16.123	NS	NS
	%a	80.00	90.48	92.31	93.34	90.00	91.44	91.01			
	%d	5.00	9.52	3.85	3.33	00.00	2.21	2.66			
	m	3.30	3.24	3.31	3.57	3.40	3.40	3.39			
	s	.92	.89	.74	.73	.67	.71	.72			
69. Be working with student behaviors rather than enforcing regulations.	Conc.	Sig.+	Lt.+	St.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Sig.+	St.+	31.417	S	NS
	%a	80.00	61.91	73.07	56.67	63.33	77.01	74.18			
	%d	10.00	19.05	3.85	6.66	10.00	10.25	10.04			
	m	2.95	2.57	2.85	2.67	2.67	2.93	2.88			
	s	1.05	1.12	.73	.96	.84	.91	.92			
75. Promote peer control and self-discipline in residents rather than assume responsibility for regulating and controlling student behavior.	Conc.	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	23.697	NS	NS
	%a	85.00	90.48	80.77	93.33	80.00	84.80	85.07			
	%d	5.00	4.76	3.85	00.00	3.33	6.91	5.93			
	m	3.35	3.05	3.27	3.47	3.10	3.13	3.16			
	s	.88	.67	1.00	.63	.80	.89	.87			
94. Assist in resolving roommate problems and conflicts.	Conc.	Lt.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	34.618	S	NS
	%a	60.00	95.24	84.62	76.66	56.67	60.38	63.94			
	%d	15.00	4.76	11.54	13.33	30.00	19.67	18.64			
	m	2.50	3.14	2.85	2.87	2.33	2.45	2.52			
	s	.83	.85	.78	.94	1.09	.99	.99			
96. Have his staff enforce quiet hours in living units.	Conc.	Div.	St.+	Lt.-	Lt.-	Div.	Lt.-	Div.	36.073	S	NS
	%a	30.00	66.67	23.08	36.67	43.33	26.51	29.86			
	%d	30.00	14.28	50.00	53.33	43.34	50.28	47.65			
	m	1.85	2.62	1.62	1.83	1.93	1.59	1.68			
	s	1.04	1.16	1.10	1.23	1.31	1.21	1.22			

the groups, and one received limited negative consensus. The groups indicated a divergence of opinion on two of the expectations.

A significant consensus (> 75.0%) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisor should:

25. Enforce regulations established by university policy-making bodies. Hall managers, Student Affairs Personnel, and faculty indicated significant consensus for the expectation that Head Resident Advisors enforce duly established university policies. Head Resident Advisors indicated strong consensus, and students indicated a limited consensus for the item.
28. See that a student's rights are protected when the student is charged with a violation of ordinance, law, or university regulation. All six groups supported this expectation at the significant consensus level.
45. Counsel with students who display disruptive behaviors in the hall. Five of the six groups indicated significant consensus for this question. Counselors gave strong support to the item.
65. Expect students to assume responsibility for their own conduct and behavior. All groups

indicated significant consensus for the concept of student self-discipline.

75. Promote peer control and self-discipline in residents rather than assume responsibility for regulating and controlling student behavior. All six groups agreed at the significant level of consensus with the concept of promoting peer control among students.

A strong consensus (65.0% to 74.9%) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisor should:

20. Rely on acceptance and understanding of individual behavior rather than rules and regulations when working with students. Faculty and students indicated a significant consensus for this question. Counselors and Head Resident Advisors reflected strong consensus, and Student Affairs Personnel indicated limited consensus in favor of working with behavior rather than regulations. Hall managers could neither agree nor disagree on the item; however, 47.6 per cent indicated that they did not support working in isolation of rules and regulations.
21. Delegate disciplinary responsibility to student judiciaries. Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, and faculty indicated a

strong consensus for delegating judicial responsibility to students. Counselors and students, however, only indicated limited consensus for the idea. Hall managers indicated a divergence of opinion on the question.

29. Always follow due process procedures when handling a student disciplinary case. Head Resident Advisors indicated significant consensus for the question while managers and Student Affairs Personnel indicated strong consensus. Counselors, faculty, and students reflected a limited consensus for the item.
69. Be working with student behaviors rather than enforcing regulations. Counselors and students indicated significant consensus for the expectation for Head Advisors to work with student behaviors. Head Resident Advisors supported the concept strongly. Managers, Student Affairs Personnel, and faculty indicated limited consensus for the idea.
94. Assist in resolving roommate problems and conflicts. Managers, Head Resident Advisors, and Student Affairs Personnel saw this area as an important expectation for the Head Resident Advisor. They indicated significant consensus for the item. Counselors, faculty, and students

saw less importance for the item. They did, however, indicate limited consensus in favor of having the Head Advisor assume responsibility for helping resolve roommate problems and conflicts.

A limited consensus (50.0% to 64.9%) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisor should:

7. Enforce regulations established by hall governing groups. Hall managers indicated significant consensus for the expectation while Student Affairs Personnel, faculty, and students indicated limited consensus. Counselors and Head Resident Advisors indicated a divergence of opinion on the items.

A divergence of opinion (less than 50.0% agreement or disagreement in any one category) was expressed for the expectations that the Head Resident Advisor should:

31. Establish expectations for student behavior and communicate them to students. Four of the groups--counselors, Head Resident Advisors, faculty, and students--indicated a divergence of opinion on the expectation. Managers, however, indicated strong consensus in support of the item; and Student Affairs Personnel indicated limited consensus in favor of the expectation.

96. Have his staff enforce quiet hours in living units. Hall managers expressed strong concensus in favor of the expectation. Counselors and faculty reflected a divergence of opinion; and, in contrast, Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, and students indicated a negative limited concensus in opposition to the item.

A strong concensus (65.0% to 74.9%) felt that the Head Resident Advisor should not:

14. Notify parents when a student is charged with a violation of law, ordinance, or university regulation. Counselors, Head Resident Advisors, and students indicated significant opposition to this expectation. Student Affairs Personnel and faculty opposed it strongly. Managers indicated a divergence of opinion on the expectation.
52. Report known instances of alcohol and drug violations to university authorities. Counselors, Head Resident Advisors, and students indicated strong opposition to the expectation. Faculty indicated limited opposition. Student Affairs Personnel indicated a divergence of opinion on the question. Hall managers indicated strong concensus in favor of the expectation. The

data would suggest an area of conflict between hall managers and Head Resident Advisors.

A limited consensus (50.0% to 64.9%) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisor should not:

27. Confront students who illegally enter a cafeteria for the purpose of securing food. Head Resident Advisors, faculty, and students indicated limited consensus in disagreement with this expectation. Counselors indicated a divergence of opinion, and Student Affairs Personnel indicated limited consensus in favor of the expectation. Hall managers, however, indicated significant consensus in favor of the expectation. Thus, another area of possible conflict is suggested between managers and advisors.

Analysis of Sub-Scale V

An inspection of Table 4.10, expectations for liaison with residence hall management, indicates that the chi square analysis indicated significant differences between the groups on eight of the nine items in the sub-scale.

The groups indicated significant consensus for three of the expectations. Strong consensus was shown for two of the items, and limited consensus was indicated for one item. Divergence of opinion was

TABLE 4-10.--Expectations for liaison with residence hall management.

The Head Resident Advisor Should:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Couns.	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	05	01
38. Coordinate programs with the hall manager in trying to keep within the operating budget of the hall.	Conc.	Lt.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	St.+	St.+	39.318	S	S
	%a	60.00	80.95	80.77	90.00	76.66	65.19	68.71			
	%d	15.00	14.28	3.85	3.33	10.00	12.43	11.45			
	m	2.40	2.95	3.00	3.07	2.63	2.59	2.65			
	s	.88	1.12	.75	.78	.89	.89	.90			
50. Give as much consideration to cost factors as he does educational value or need when planning programs or activities.	Conc.	Lt.-	Sig.+	St.+	Lt.+	Div.	Div.	Div.	34.338	S	NS
	%a	35.00	76.19	65.38	56.67	43.33	40.60	42.38			
	%d	50.00	23.81	15.39	30.00	30.00	31.49	30.88			
	m	1.85	2.67	2.54	2.40	2.13	2.09	2.15			
	s	.93	1.02	.95	1.16	.97	1.02	1.03			
72. Assist the manager in the selection and evaluation of cafeteria personnel, reception desk personnel, and custodial personnel.	Conc.	Lt.-	Div.	Lt.+	Lt.+	Div.	Lt.-	Lt.-	46.020	S	S
	%a	35.00	28.57	34.62	60.00	23.33	23.21	26.79			
	%d	50.00	49.62	53.84	26.66	43.33	59.94	55.62			
	m	1.90	1.62	1.77	2.63	1.60	1.41	1.53			
	s	1.29	1.12	1.31	1.10	1.07	1.14	1.18			
80. Meet regularly with the hall manager to discuss hall business and the food-service operation.	Conc.	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	62.066	S	S
	%a	84.21	90.48	80.77	96.67	83.33	67.96	72.95			
	%d	5.26	4.76	15.38	3.33	6.67	13.53	11.89			
	m	2.95	3.33	3.08	3.27	2.83	2.63	2.75			
	s	.71	.80	1.06	.78	.65	.94	.93			
82. Assist the residence hall manager with room assignments, room changes, and other administrative tasks.	Conc.	Div.	Sig.+	Sig.+	Lt.+	Div.	Lt.+	Lt.+	39.042	S	S
	%a	47.37	76.19	88.46	60.00	40.00	51.10	53.90			
	%d	42.11	15.28	7.70	13.34	30.00	32.60	30.12			
	m	1.95	2.71	2.85	2.40	2.17	2.17	2.23			
	s	1.51	1.01	.78	1.10	1.23	1.14	1.15			

TABLE 4-10.--Continued.

The Head Resident Advisor Should:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Couns.	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	05	01
83. Assume responsibility for student behavior in the cafeteria, grill, and other public areas of the residence hall.	Conc.	Sig.-	Lt.+	Lt.-	Div.	St.-	Sig.-	St.-	80.908	S	S
	1a	15.00	57.15	26.92	36.67	10.00	9.34	14.31			
	1d	75.00	38.09	53.85	40.00	70.00	75.11	73.62			
	m	1.00	2.24	1.62	1.87	1.10	.98	1.13			
	s	1.08	1.30	1.02	1.31	.96	.93	1.04			
87. Personally inspect the residence hall at least once a week to determine the general comfort and condition of the building.	Conc.	Div.	Div.	Lt.+	Lt.+	Div.	Div.	Div.	32.819	S	NS
	1a	35.00	47.62	53.84	56.66	46.66	33.14	36.81			
	1d	30.00	38.10	23.07	20.00	40.00	43.92	40.69			
	m	2.15	1.90	2.27	2.50	1.97	1.81	1.91			
	s	1.14	1.45	1.04	.97	1.35	1.18	1.19			
92. Mix with the students in the cafeteria and eat with a different group as often as possible.	Conc.	Lt.+	Sig.+	St.+	Sig.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	29.060	NS	NS
	1a	55.00	80.98	73.07	80.00	63.34	59.12	62.16			
	1d	5.00	14.28	3.85	6.67	13.33	15.19	13.49			
	m	2.75	2.67	2.85	2.93	2.77	2.57	2.63			
	s	.91	1.06	.73	.78	1.01	.99	.97			
99. Should assist the hall management staff in interpreting the housing contract to students.	Conc.	Lt.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	St.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	36.510	S	NS
	1a	55.00	85.71	82.30	90.00	73.34	75.35	76.64			
	1d	5.00	4.76	3.85	3.33	6.67	10.25	8.81			
	m	2.55	3.10	2.96	2.97	2.73	2.76	2.79			
	s	.89	.94	.54	.56	.69	.83	.81			

expressed for two expectations. Strong consensus was expressed in opposition to one of the questions.

A significant consensus (> 75.0% or greater) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisor should:

38. Coordinate programs with the hall manager in trying to keep within the operating budget of the hall. Four of the groups--hall managers, Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, and faculty--indicated significant consensus with this expectation. Students indicated strong consensus, and counselors indicated limited consensus for the question.
80. Meet regularly with the hall manager to discuss hall business and the food-service operation. All groups indicated significant consensus for this expectation.
99. Assist the hall management staff in interpreting the housing contract to students. Four of the groups--managers, Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, and students--indicated significant consensus for the expectation. Faculty indicated strong consensus, and counselors indicated limited consensus for the item.

A strong consensus (65.0% to 74.9%) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisors should:

82. Assist the residence hall manager with room assignments, room changes, and other administrative tasks. Response to the expectation that the Head Resident Advisor assist with room changes was mixed. Managers and Head Resident Advisors expressed significant consensus for the expectation. Student Affairs Personnel and students indicated limited consensus for the question. Counselors and faculty expressed a divergence of opinion on the question.

92. Mix with the students in the cafeteria and eat with a different group as often as possible. Hall managers and Student Affairs Personnel expressed significant consensus for the item while Head Resident Advisors supported it strongly. Counselors and faculty indicated limited consensus for the expectation.

A limited consensus (50.0% to 64.9%) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisor should:

50. Give as much consideration to cost factors as he does educational value when planning programs or activities. Managers indicated significant consensus for this expectation, and Head Resident Advisors indicated strong support. Student Affairs Personnel indicated limited consensus for

the item. Faculty and students indicated a divergence of opinion on the question. Counselors indicated negative limited consensus in opposition to the expectation.

A divergence of opinion (less than 50.0% agreement or disagreement in any one category) was expressed for the expectations that the Head Resident Advisor should:

72. Assist the manager in the selection and evaluation of cafeteria personnel, reception desk personnel, and custodial personnel. Head Resident Advisors and Student Affairs Personnel indicated limited consensus for the item. Managers and faculty indicated a divergence of opinion while counselors and students indicated a negative limited consensus to the question.

87. Personally inspect the residence hall at least once per week to determine the general comfort and condition of the building. Head Resident Advisors and Student Affairs Personnel indicated limited consensus for the expectation. All other groups indicated a divergence of opinion for the expectation.

A strong consensus (65.0% to 74.9%) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisor should not:

83. Assume responsibility for student behavior in the cafeteria, grill, and other public areas of the residence hall. Counselors and students indicated negative significant consensus for the expectation. Faculty registered strong opposition while Head Resident Advisors indicated negative limited consensus. Student Affairs Personnel indicated a divergence of opinion for the question, and hall managers gave it positive limited consensus.

Analysis of Sub-Scale VI

Table 4.11 presents the individual items of sub-scale VI. A review of Table 4.11 indicates that eleven of the twenty-nine items were found to have significant differences at the .05 level. No significant differences were found between the groups on eighteen of the items.

Ten of the twenty-nine items in sub-scale VI received significant consensus from the groups. Seven of the items received strong consensus, and three received limited consensus. A divergence of opinion was expressed for five of the items. One of the items was rejected by a negative significant consensus of the groups, and three of the items were rejected by a negative limited consensus.

A significant consensus (> 75.0% and above) of the group felt that the Head Resident Advisor should:

TABLE 4-11.--Expectations for general administration.

		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
The Head Resident Advisor Should:			Couns.	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	05	01
5.	Know something about the home background of students.	Conc.	Div.	Lt.+	Lt.+	Sig.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	26.284	NS	NS
		%a	45.00	52.38	61.54	83.33	56.67	50.28	53.17			
		%d	20.00	23.81	23.08	6.67	30.00	31.22	28.42			
		m	2.35	2.33	2.42	2.90	2.27	2.18	2.26			
		s	1.09	.91	.90	.84	1.20	1.11	1.10			
9.	Be responsible for approving hall social policies.	Conc.	Lt.-	Lt.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Div.	Div.	26.658	NS	NS
		%a	30.00	52.38	57.69	50.00	50.00	37.02	39.08			
		%d	55.00	38.10	47.62	36.67	40.00	48.90	45.83			
		m	1.75	2.33	2.15	2.10	2.13	1.79	1.87			
		s	1.33	1.43	1.16	1.18	1.28	1.24	1.25			
17.	Live in the residence hall where he works.	Conc.	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	36.880	S	NS
		%a	75.00	85.71	84.62	83.33	93.10	91.14	89.53			
		%d	15.00	4.77	11.15	3.33	0.00	4.16	4.72			
		m	3.00	3.57	3.15	3.23	3.66	3.53	3.48			
		s	1.34	.87	.97	.82	.61	.83	.86			
23.	Be available to students twenty-four hours a day and on most week-ends.	Conc.	Lt.-	St.-	St.-	Lt.-	Div.	Lt.-	Lt.-	16.258	NS	NS
		%a	30.00	34.29	26.92	40.00	36.67	36.74	35.17			
		%d	60.00	71.43	65.38	56.67	43.33	52.76	54.19			
		m	1.70	1.38	1.42	1.73	1.93	1.80	1.76			
		s	1.22	1.12	1.10	1.28	1.11	1.22	1.21			
41.	Be familiar with campus service agencies--counseling, health, intramurals, financial aids, public safety, registrar's office--and make use of them for referral purposes.	Conc.	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	30.467	NS	NS
		%a	90.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.05	98.14			
		%d	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.40	1.44			
		m	3.45	3.67	3.77	3.93	3.76	3.67	3.69			
		s	.94	.48	.43	.25	.44	.60	.59			
42.	Carry out decisions of his supervisor even though he may consider them unreasonable.	Conc.	Lt.-	Sig.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Div.	Lt.-	Div.	91.940	S	S
		%a	30.00	90.48	53.84	63.33	23.33	21.27	29.04			
		%d	50.00	9.52	23.68	23.33	43.34	51.66	46.01			
		m	1.65	3.00	2.38	2.53	1.77	1.59	1.77			
		s	1.09	.95	.94	1.28	.97	1.04	1.10			

TABLE 4-11.--Continued.

The Head Resident Advisor Should:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Couns.	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	05	01
48. Communicate with parents about matters of social or academic concern regarding their sons and daughters.	Conc.	Lt.-	Lt.+	Lt.-	Div.	Lt.-	Lt.-	Lt.-	39.081	S	S
	%a	15.00	19.05	3.85	26.66	20.00	11.60	12.09			
	%d	50.00	57.14	50.00	46.67	63.33	69.34	65.24			
	m	1.43	1.38	1.31	1.77	1.33	1.16	1.24			
	s	1.00	1.07	.88	1.01	1.32	.99	1.02			
49. Participate in the selection and training of new residence hall advisory staff members--Head, Assistant, and Graduate Advisors.	Conc.	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	17.692	NS	NS
	%a	95.00	81.96	100.00	96.67	93.33	91.99	92.44			
	%d	0.00	9.52	0.00	3.33	6.67	4.14	4.09			
	m	3.40	2.90	3.54	3.40	3.23	3.28	3.29			
	s	.60	.83	.51	.67	.77	.77	.76			
51. Voice his dissatisfaction with policies of his division or the university only through official channels within the system.	Conc.	Div.	Sig.+	St.+	Sig.+	Div.	Div.	Div.	75.388	S	S
	%a	45.00	90.95	69.23	90.00	40.00	35.63	43.35			
	%d	40.00	19.05	26.92	6.67	40.00	40.60	36.81			
	m	2.05	3.00	2.62	3.27	2.07	1.97	2.13			
	s	1.23	1.10	1.10	.94	1.20	1.13	1.18			
54. Publically support his staff or other Head Advisors even though he disagrees with their decisions or actions.	Conc.	Lt.-	Div.	St.+	Div.	Div.	Div.	Div.	28.722	NS	NS
	%a	25.00	42.86	69.23	40.00	46.67	36.18	38.65			
	%d	60.00	28.57	19.23	33.34	43.34	41.99	40.49			
	m	1.70	2.24	2.54	2.13	2.03	1.96	2.00			
	s	1.13	1.26	.99	1.07	1.16	1.16	1.15			
55. Encourage informal faculty-student contact in the residence hall.	Conc.	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	20.660	NS	NS
	%a	85.00	85.71	88.56	93.33	93.34	83.71	85.28			
	%d	0.00	4.76	0.00	0.00	3.33	4.14	3.58			
	m	3.25	3.10	3.15	3.57	3.20	3.11	3.15			
	s	.72	.94	.61	.63	.66	.84	.81			
59. Recruit able candidates for staff positions rather than accept only those who make application.	Conc.	St.+	Sig.+	St.+	Sig.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	25.861	NS	NS
	%a	70.00	80.95	73.07	90.00	63.34	59.56	63.73			
	%d	15.00	4.76	15.38	3.33	20.00	25.76	22.13			
	m	2.90	3.00	2.85	3.27	2.50	2.50	2.61			
	s	1.23	.95	1.01	.87	1.20	1.25	1.21			

TABLE 4-11.--Continued.

		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
The Head Resident Advisor Should:			Couns.	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	05	01
60.	Assist students in securing financial assistance, scholarships, and loans.	Conc.	Lt.+	Sig.+	St.+	Sig.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	21.568	NS	NS
		%a	60.00	80.95	73.07	76.66	50.00	56.90	59.71			
		%d	25.00	14.28	15.38	10.00	16.67	19.33	18.40			
		m	2.45	2.86	2.73	2.73	2.43	2.49	2.53			
		s	1.15	1.06	.92	.98	.90	1.01	1.01			
62.	Coordinate staff coverage in the residence hall so that an advisory staff member is always on duty.	Conc.	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	22.991	NS	NS
		%a	85.00	95.24	100.00	93.33	93.33	94.20	94.07			
		%d	5.00	4.76	00.00	00.00	1.93	1.84				
		m	3.00	3.19	3.46	3.53	3.37	3.36	3.36			
		s	.92	.68	.51	.63	.61	.68	.68			
63.	Seek to have regulations affecting students updated and changed rather than reacting to changes proposed by student groups.	Conc.	Sig.+	Sig.+	St.+	Sig.+	St.+	Lt.+	St.+	33.492	S	NS
		%a	75.00	95.24	72.08	93.34	70.00	61.88	66.25			
		%d	10.00	4.76	3.85	3.33	10.00	14.36	12.27			
		m	2.95	3.29	2.88	3.27	2.60	2.60	2.70			
		s	1.10	.72	.77	.69	.93	.99	.98			
64.	Assist in working with practicum and seminar students who want experience in residence hall work.	Conc.	Sig.+	St.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	St.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	44.356	S	S
		%a	75.00	66.67	88.46	93.33	70.00	58.29	63.81			
		%d	5.00	4.76	3.85	0.00	3.33	6.62	5.72			
		m	3.00	2.71	2.92	3.20	2.70	2.60	2.68			
		s	.86	.90	.56	.55	.60	.78	.77			
66.	Prepare written reports about student psychological behaviors for the counseling center and psychiatric services.	Conc.	Lt.-	Lt.-	Lt.+	Div.	Lt.-	Lt.-	Lt.-	58.175	S	S
		%a	25.00	9.52	57.69	43.33	26.67	16.30	20.86			
		%d	55.00	61.40	15.38	30.00	50.00	55.25	51.53			
		m	1.40	1.43	2.35	2.13	1.67	1.41	1.52			
		s	1.19	.93	.94	1.17	1.18	1.06	1.10			
70.	Be available to students only during posted office hours.	Conc.	Sig.-	Sig.-	Sig.-	Sig.-	Sig.-	Sig.-	Sig.-	19.126	NS	NS
		%a	15.00	9.52	7.70	13.33	3.33	6.63	7.36			
		%d	75.00	85.71	88.47	80.00	93.34	85.08	85.07			
		m	1.05	1.00	.88	1.13	.87	.92	.93			
		s	1.05	.84	.95	.90	.78	.89	.89			

TABLE 4-11.--Continued.

The Head Resident Advisor Should:		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			Couns	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Pac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	05	01
77. Serve as the primary referral agent from the residence hall to the counseling center.	Conc.	Div.	Sig.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Div.	Div.				
	%a	40.00	76.19	53.85	63.34	50.00	32.27	46.01	31.567		S	NS
	%d	40.00	4.76	23.08	26.67	40.00	31.77	30.76				
	m	2.10	2.90	2.27	2.53	2.13	2.15	2.21				
	s	1.21	.94	.92	1.07	1.11	1.04	1.05				
78. Exert his primary influence through his staff rather than be directly involved with students.	Conc.	Lt.+	Div.	Lt.+	Lt.-	Div.	Div.	Div.				
	%a	60.00	42.86	53.84	33.34	43.33	35.08	37.84	16.028		NS	NS
	%d	30.00	28.57	34.61	50.00	43.33	47.79	45.40				
	m	2.30	2.19	2.27	1.80	2.03	1.85	1.91				
	s	1.22	.93	1.25	1.16	1.27	1.15	1.16				
81. Participate with students in hall social, recreational, or academic activities.	Conc.	St.+	Lt.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Lt.+	Lt.+	Lt.+				
	%a	65.00	61.93	80.77	77.66	50.00	63.53	64.42	17.177		NS	NS
	%d	5.00	4.76	4.70	10.00	16.67	9.12	9.20				
	m	2.70	2.71	2.81	2.80	2.43	2.68	2.68				
	s	.73	.78	.85	.81	.90	.85	.84				
84. Be familiar with the academic requirements, regulations, and grading procedures of the various colleges within the university.	Conc.	St.+	Div.	Lt.+	Sig.+	Lt.+	St.+	St.+				
	%a	70.00	47.62	61.54	90.00	60.00	65.74	66.05	25.881		NS	NS
	%d	15.00	23.81	26.93	6.67	23.33	18.78	18.81				
	m	2.75	2.38	2.35	3.03	2.53	2.57	2.58				
	s	1.25	1.16	1.02	.72	1.14	1.02	1.03				
86. Make no major policy, nor physical changes within the halls without first seeking student opinion and support.	Conc.	Sig.+	Lt.+	St.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	Sig.+				
	%a	90.00	61.91	73.08	92.33	90.00	90.31	88.32	40.613		S	S
	%d	0.00	33.33	15.38	0.00	6.67	4.98	6.35				
	m	3.40	2.48	2.92	3.40	3.30	3.29	3.24				
	s	.68	1.29	1.06	.62	.84	.80	.84				
88. Invite students into his apartment for social events and informal discussions.	Conc.	Sig.+	Div.	St.+	Sig.+	Sig.+	St.+	St.+				
	%a	75.00	47.62	69.23	80.00	80.00	73.89	73.30	25.178		NS	NS
	%d	5.00	14.28	15.38	6.67	6.67	4.72	5.95				
	m	2.90	2.33	2.69	3.10	2.93	2.89	2.87				
	s	.79	.91	.93	.88	.78	.80	.83				

TABLE 4-11.--Continued.

		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
The Head Resident Advisor Should:			Couns.	Mgt.	H.R.A.	S.A.P.	Fac.	Stu.	Group Total	χ^2	05	01
89. Maintain a record system of hall activities, student academic programs, and other records necessary for the operation of the hall program.	Conc.											
	%a	80.00	90.96	80.77	86.66	80.00	61.60	66.87	29.347	NS	NS	
	%d	5.00	9.52	3.85	13.33	10.00	14.09	12.68				
	m	2.80	2.90	2.88	2.93	2.83	2.52	2.61				
	s	.62	.83	.65	.87	.79	.90	.88				
95. Not be expected to function as an advisor and counselor on one hand and as a disciplinarian on the other.	Conc.											
	%a	45.00	19.04	34.62	40.00	36.67	46.96	43.97	46.195	S	S	
	%d	40.00	76.19	64.54	50.00	56.67	35.63	41.10				
	m	2.25	1.19	1.73	1.87	1.83	2.30	2.16				
	s	1.45	1.29	1.28	1.43	1.44	1.26	1.32				
97. Be able to articulate the various sides of controversial issues which are of concern to students and the university.	Conc.											
	%a	80.00	80.96	92.31	96.67	96.66	82.82	84.84	26.544	NS	NS	
	%d	15.00	9.52	3.85	00.00	3.33	3.32	3.89				
	m	2.80	2.86	3.19	3.33	3.17	3.02	3.04				
	s	.89	.79	.69	.59	.59	.73	.72				
98. Use his own judgment in interpreting university policies and regulations in specific cases.	Conc.											
	%a	70.00	33.34	92.30	76.67	90.00	83.14	80.98	116.545	S	S	
	%d	10.00	66.67	3.85	20.00	6.67	7.18	10.43				
	m	2.65	1.81	3.15	2.57	3.03	3.00	2.92				
	s	.93	1.21	.67	1.04	.85	.84	.91				
100. Be a professionally trained full-time staff member.	Conc.											
	%a	65.00	76.19	88.45	93.33	73.36	79.03	76.42	31.826	NS	NS	
	%d	20.00	14.28	3.85	3.33	13.32	12.26	13.22				
	m	2.80	3.00	3.23	3.57	2.93	2.91	2.97				
	s	1.28	1.18	.91	.73	1.11	1.14	1.17				

17. Live in the residence hall where he works. All groups indicated a significant consensus for the expectation that the Head Resident Advisor live in the hall where he works.
41. Be familiar with campus service agencies--counseling, health, intramurals, financial aides, public safety, registrar's office--and make use of them for referral purposes. All groups reported a significant consensus for this expectation. It received the strongest percentage response and highest mean scores of all the stated expectations.
49. Participate in the selection and training of new residence hall advisory staff members--Head, assistant, and graduate advisors. All groups indicated significant consensus for the question.
55. Encourage informal faculty student contact in the residence hall. All groups indicated significant consensus for the item.
62. Coordinate staff coverage in the residence hall so that an advisory staff member is always on duty. All groups indicated significant consensus for the expectation of always having an advisory staff member on duty in the hall.

86. Make no major policy nor physical changes within the halls without first seeking student opinion and support. Counselors, Student Affairs Personnel, faculty, and students indicated significant consensus for the question. Head Resident Advisors indicated strong support for the question while hall managers indicated limited consensus for the expectation.
89. Maintain a record system of hall activities, student academic programs, and other records necessary for the operation of the hall program. All groups indicated significant consensus for the item except students. Students indicated limited consensus for the idea.
97. Be able to articulate the various sides of controversial issues which are of concern to students and the university. All groups indicated significant consensus for the question.
98. Use his own judgment in interpreting university policies and regulations in specific cases. Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, faculty, and students indicated significant consensus for the expectation. Counselors expressed strong consensus for the idea while, in contrast, hall managers indicated strong

negative consensus for the expectation. The difference in group consensus between hall managers and Head Resident Advisors suggests another area of potential conflict.

100. Be a professionally trained full-time staff member. Four of the six groups--managers, Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, and faculty--indicated significant consensus for the expectation. Counselors and students indicated strong consensus for the expectation. Thus, all groups strongly supported the idea that the Head Resident Advisor should be a full-time professionally trained individual.

A strong consensus (65.0% to 74.9%) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisor should:

59. Recruit able candidates for staff positions rather than accept only those who make application. Hall managers and Student Affairs Personnel indicated significant consensus for the item. Counselors and Head Resident Advisors indicated strong consensus. Faculty and students indicated limited consensus for the expectation.
60. Assist students in securing financial assistance, scholarships, and loans. Hall managers and

Student Affairs Personnel indicated significant consensus for the expectation. Head Resident Advisors indicated strong consensus in favor of the expectation. Counselors, faculty, and students indicated limited consensus.

63. Seek to have regulations affecting students updated and changed rather than reacting to changes proposed by student groups. Counselors, hall managers, and Student Affairs Administrators indicated significant consensus for the question. Head Resident Advisors and faculty indicated strong consensus while students indicated limited consensus for the expectation.
64. Assist in working with practicum and seminar students who want experience in residence hall work. Counselors, Head Resident Advisors, and Student Affairs Personnel indicated significant consensus for the expectation. Management and faculty indicated strong consensus, and students indicated limited consensus for the expectation.
81. Participate with students in hall social, recreational, or academic activities. Head Resident Advisors and Student Affairs Personnel indicated significant consensus for the item, and counselors indicated strong consensus. Hall managers,

faculty, and students indicated limited consensus for the expectation.

84. Be familiar with the academic requirements, regulations, and grading procedures of the various colleges within the university. Student Affairs Personnel indicated significant consensus for the expectation. Counselors and students indicated strong consensus while Head Resident Advisors and faculty indicated limited consensus for the item. Hall managers reflected a divergence of opinion on the question.
88. Invite students into his apartment for social events and informal discussions. Counselors, Student Affairs Personnel, and faculty indicated significant consensus for the expectation. Head Resident Advisors and students indicated strong consensus. Managers indicated a divergence of opinion on the question.

A limited consensus (50.0% to 64.9%) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisor should:

5. Know something about the home background of students. Student Affairs Personnel indicated a significant consensus for the question. Four groups--managers, Head Resident Advisors, faculty, and students--indicated limited

consensus for the expectation. Counselors indicated a divergence of opinion on the question.

9. Be responsible for approving hall social policies. Four groups--hall managers, Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, and faculty--indicated limited consensus for the item. Students reflected a divergence of opinion on the expectation, and counselors indicated a negative limited consensus in opposition to the question.
77. Serve as the primary referral agent from the residence hall to the counseling center. Hall managers indicated significant consensus for this question. Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, and faculty indicated limited consensus for the expectation while counselors and students reflected a divergence of opinion on the question.

A divergence of opinion (less than 50.0% agree or disagree in any one category) was expressed for the expectations that the Head Resident Advisor should:

42. Carry out decisions of his supervisors even though he may consider them unreasonable. Hall managers indicated significant consensus for the item. Head Resident Advisors and Student Affairs Personnel indicated limited consensus for the

expectation while counselors and students expressed negative limited concensus in opposition to the item. Faculty indicated a divergence of opinion on the question.

51. Voice his dissatisfaction with policies of his division or the university only through official channels within the system. Hall managers and Student Affairs Personnel indicated significant concensus with the question. Head Resident Advisors indicated strong support while the three remaining groups--counselors, faculty, and students--reflected a divergence of opinion on the question.
54. Publically support his staff or other Head Resident Advisors even though he disagrees with their decisions or actions. Head Resident Advisors indicated strong support for the expectation. Managers, Student Affairs Personnel, faculty, and students reflected a divergence of opinion on the expectation while counselors indicated negative limited concensus in opposition to the expectation.
78. Exert his primary influence through his staff rather than be directly involved with students. Counselors and Head Resident Advisors indicated

limited consensus in favor of the expectation. Hall managers, faculty, and students indicated a divergence of opinion while Student Affairs Personnel reflected negative limited consensus for the question.

95. Not be expected to function as an advisor and counselor on the one hand and as a disciplinarian on the other. Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, and faculty indicated limited consensus in agreement with the expectation. Counselors and students reflected a divergence of opinion on the question. Hall managers indicated significant negative consensus in opposition to the expectation.

A significant consensus (> 75.0% or greater) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisors should not:

70. Be available to students only during posted office hours. All groups expressed significant consensus in opposition to the expectation.

A limited consensus (50.0% to 64.9%) of the groups felt that the Head Resident Advisor should not:

23. Be available to students twenty-four hours a day and on most week-ends. Managers and Head Resident Advisors indicated strong consensus in

opposition to the expectation. Counselors, Student Affairs Personnel, and students indicated negative limited consensus in opposition to the question while faculty reflected a divergence of opinion on how much the Advisor should be available.

48. Communicate with parents about matters of social or academic concern regarding their sons or daughters. Counselors, Head Resident Advisors, faculty, and students indicated negative limited consensus in opposition to communicating with parents regarding social or academic concerns. Student Affairs Personnel expressed a divergence of opinion on the question while hall managers expressed limited consensus in favor of the expectation.
66. Prepare written reports about student psychological behavior for the counseling center and psychiatric services. Counselors, managers, faculty, and students indicated negative limited consensus in opposition to the expectation. Student Affairs Personnel reflected a divergence of opinion on the item, and Head Resident Advisors indicated limited consensus in favor of the expectation.

Summary

The major null hypothesis that there were no differences among the groups in their expectations for the role of the Head Resident Advisor as measured by the instrument may be rejected at the .05 level of significance. The minor hypothesis that there were no differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor and those held by students for the role of Head Resident Advisor as measured by the instrument can be rejected at the .05 level of significance. The remaining minor hypotheses must be accepted.

The descriptive data reported for the six subscales of the questionnaire indicate specific areas of consensus and disagreement for role expectations held for the position of Head Resident Advisor by the significant reference groups.

Chapter V reports the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The basic purpose of this study was to describe and analyze expectations held by significant reference groups for the role of the Head Resident Advisor at Michigan State University. The study was based on the assumption that each of the groups holds specific expectations which have a primary influence on the way the position is defined by role incumbents. Significant reference groups were defined as: (1) counselors working in residence halls, (2) residence hall managers, (3) Head Resident Advisors, (4) Student Affairs Personnel, (5) University college faculty assigned to residence halls, and (6) undergraduate students living in residence halls.

Methodology

The study was conducted during Spring Term, 1971. A questionnaire containing ninety-seven items within six sub-scales was distributed to 672 subjects representing the six groups. Four hundred eighty-nine, or 72 per cent

usable questionnaires, were returned and used for statistical and descriptive analysis. The instrument used for the study was developed from a pilot study completed during Fall Term of 1970. The instrument contained six sub-scales which covered selected job functions of the Head Resident Advisor. The six sub-scales were: (1) expectations for program functions, (2) expectations for group advising, (3) expectations for individual advising, (4) expectations for student behavior, (5) expectations for management liaison, and (6) expectations for general administration. Hoyte's Reliability Coefficients were used to test the reliability of the instrument. The reliability scores ranged from .74 to .90. All sub-scales were determined to be usable for the study by the Office of Research Consultation. A summated rating scale or Likert-Type Scale was used for the instrument. Five degrees of responses ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" were used as alternatives for the questions. Values ranging from zero (0) to four (4) were assigned to the responses. A weight of four (4) was assigned to the "strongly agree" response and a weight of zero (0) was assigned to the "strongly disagree" response. The responses were arranged so that the higher the response score, the greater the expressed need for the Head Resident Advisor to perform the stated role expectation. The degree of support for

each expectation was determined by rating the percentage response of each group for each stated expectation according to the Crossland Scale. Items receiving more than 75 per cent response for the groups were ranked as receiving significant consensus. Those items receiving 65.0 per cent to 74.9 per cent support from the groups were ranked as receiving strong consensus. Those items receiving 50.0 per cent to 64.9 per cent were said to receive limited consensus. Divergence existed if less than 50.0 per cent of the group indicated agreement or disagreement for the expectation.

The null Hypothesis was tested by a multi-variate analysis of variance test of significance and by a one-way analysis of variance test of significance. The hypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance for 5 and 489 degrees of freedom. The Scheffé post hoc technique was used to more precisely locate differences between mean scores for the six groups and to test the minor hypotheses.

Conclusions

It was the major null hypothesis of this study that divergent expectations exist among significant reference groups for the position of Head Resident Advisor at Michigan State University. The major null hypothesis tested in the study was:

There are no significant differences in expectations that residence hall counselors, residence hall managers, Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, faculty, and students hold for the position of Head Resident Advisor at Michigan State University as measured by the instrument developed for this study.

On the basis of the data analysis, this hypothesis must be rejected. The multi-variate analysis of variance indicated that there were significant differences between the groups on each of the six sub-scales. In addition, the one-way analysis of variance which treated the questionnaire as a single scale indicated overall significant differences between the six groups. The Scheffé post hoc comparisons using 95 per cent confidence intervals indicated that specific significant differences existed between:

1. Counselors and Student Affairs Personnel
2. Student Affairs Personnel and faculty
3. Head Resident Advisors and students, and
4. Student Affairs Personnel and students

The remaining comparisons did not indicate any significant statistical differences between the groups.

The following is a summary of the findings of the minor null hypotheses of the study:

Minor Null Hypothesis A:

There are no significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by residence hall counselors as measured by the instrument developed for this study.

Based on the Scheffé post hoc analysis, this null hypothesis must be accepted. There were differences found between the two groups as they responded to individual items of the questionnaire; however, the overall differences were not statistically significant.

Minor Null Hypothesis B:

There are no significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by residence hall managers as measured by the instrument developed for this study.

Based on the Scheffé post hoc analysis, this null hypothesis must be accepted. There were differences found between the responses of the two groups to individual items of the questionnaire; however, the overall differences were not statistically significant.

Minor Null Hypothesis C:

There are no significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by Student Affairs Personnel as measured by the instrument developed for this study.

Based on the Scheffé post hoc comparisons, this null hypothesis must be accepted. There were differences found between the responses of the two groups to individual items of the questionnaire; however, the overall differences were not statistically significant.

Minor Null Hypothesis D:

There are no significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by faculty working in residence halls as measured by the instrument developed for this study.

Based on the Scheffé post hoc comparisons, this null hypothesis must be accepted. There were differences found between the responses of the two groups to individual items on the questionnaire; however, the overall differences were not statistically significant.

Minor Null Hypothesis E:

There are no significant differences in expectations held by the Head Resident Advisor for his position and those held by students living in residence halls as measured by the instrument developed for this study.

This null hypothesis must be rejected. Based on the Scheffé post hoc comparison, overall differences were found to exist between Head Resident Advisors and students on expectations held for the position of Head Resident Advisor.

In addition to the overall tests for significance, the individual items of the questionnaire were tested by the chi square test of significance at the .05 level. It was determined that significant differences existed between the group responses to the individual items if the obtained chi square score exceeded 31.410. Of the ninety-seven items on the questionnaire, fifty-two were

found to have significant differences between the groups. Twenty-nine items received significant consensus. Twenty-seven items received strong consensus, twelve items received limited consensus, and a divergence of opinion was expressed for sixteen of the items.

Negative significant consensus was indicated for six of the items, strong negative consensus was indicated for two items, and limited consensus was expressed in opposition to five of the items. Thus, sixty-eight of the items were supported by the groups as expectations to be accomplished. Thirteen of the items were rejected as inappropriate, and the groups indicated a divergence of opinion to sixteen of the items.

The following is a discussion of the significant findings from the sub-scales of the questionnaire.

In analyzing the percentage responses of the groups to sub-scale I, it may be concluded that all groups were in favor of the Head Resident Advisor assuming major responsibility in the program area. The basic differences found were in degrees of support. Head Resident Advisors indicated significant consensus for ten of the items; strong consensus for three, limited consensus for two, and a divergence of opinion for two. Head Resident Advisors and faculty differed from other groups on the expectation that Head Resident Advisors should work to coordinate programs among halls. All other

groups indicated strong support for the concept while Head Resident Advisors and faculty indicated a divergence of opinion for the expectation. It may be concluded that the Head Resident Advisor and faculty do not consider coordination of programs among halls to be very important while all other groups see it as more important to the hall operation.

A further exploration of the sub-scale indicated a difference of opinion on the value of group dynamics and sensitivity training for Head Resident Advisors. Head Resident Advisors indicated a significant response for the value of such training. Counselors and students indicated strong support for the expectation. On the other hand, Student Affairs Personnel and faculty indicated only limited support and managers indicated a divergence of opinion for the item. Thus it may be concluded that differences do exist between the Head Resident Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, and hall managers on the value of group and sensitivity training.

Another area of difference in degree of support was found for the expectation that the Head Resident Advisor take responsibility for seeing that adequate recreational facilities and programs are made available to students. Head Resident Advisors and Student Affairs Personnel indicated strong support for this expectation while all other groups indicated limited support. These

findings would suggest that the Head Resident Advisor and Student Affairs Personnel see a much stronger role for the Head Advisor than all other groups.

Another area of difference was found for the expectation that the Head Resident Advisor organize study skills programs for students needing academic assistance. Head Resident Advisors and Student Affairs Personnel indicated strong support for the expectation while all other groups indicated a divergence of opinion. These findings would suggest that counselors, managers, faculty, and students do not expect the Head Resident Advisor to get directly involved in providing academic assistance.

Head Resident Advisors also differed from managers and Student Affairs Personnel on the expectation that Head Advisors encourage the development of special interest houses in residence halls. It may be concluded that counselors, Head Resident Advisors, students, and faculty prefer to let the initiative for special living units develop from student interest.

Overall, all the expectations stated in Sub-Scale I were supported by a majority of the groups.

On Sub-Scale II, expectations for group advising, Head Resident Advisors gave significant concensus to seven items, strong concensus to three, and limited concensus to one item. Two items received a divergence of opinion, and three were rejected as inappropriate.

Students also gave positive support to twelve of the expectations. Counselors, managers, and Student Affairs Personnel indicated positive support for eleven of the sixteen items while faculty gave positive support to ten items.

All groups rejected the expectation that Head Resident Advisors function as editorial consultant to hall newspapers. Further, they rejected the idea that the Head Resident Advisor should influence elected student officers through advice or organized training programs. The groups also rejected the expectation that the Head Resident Advisor should focus his efforts primarily on the organized student government group in the hall. It may be concluded from these data that the groups do not want the Head Resident Advisor to use his influence to restrict hall publications, nor do they want the Head Resident Advisor to use his influence with elected hall groups.

The expectation that the Head Resident serve as a model for student behavior also elicited mixed responses. Hall managers, Head Resident Advisors, and Student Affairs Personnel indicated significant consensus for the expectation while counselors, faculty, and students only gave limited consensus to the item. Another point of difference was noted between Head Resident Advisors and Student Affairs Personnel on providing training for

student government officers. Student Affairs Personnel gave significant support to the item while Head Resident Advisors indicated limited concensus. Counselors and managers indicated limited support while faculty and students indicated a divergence of opinion for the expectation. Thus it may be concluded that some degree of difference exists as to the extent to which Head Resident Advisors should assume responsibility for student government training.

It may be noted that four of the groups indicated a divergence of opinion on the expectation that the Head Advisor act as a representative of students rather than the administration. Managers opposed the idea while students gave it limited support. The findings would suggest that none of the groups hold strong feelings about the expectation.

An inspection of Sub-Scale III indicates that significant reference groups do not hold strong expectations for the Head Resident Advisor to assume responsibility for individual advising functions. Comparisons between the groups show that Head Resident Advisors and Student Affairs Personnel expect the Head Resident Advisor to assume major responsibility for individual advising. However, counselors, hall managers, faculty, and students tend to reject the expectation. It may be concluded that groups other than Head Resident Advisors and Student

Affairs Personnel assume that the Head Resident Advisor would be delving into a counseling therapy area for which he lacks adequate skill and training. The data would suggest that further clarification is needed on the nature of the work done with individual students by the Head Resident Advisor.

An examination of Sub-Scale IV indicates a number of differences between the groups on expectations held for working with discipline and student behavior. It may be concluded that all groups support the idea of the Head Resident Advisor promoting self-discipline among students, using student judiciaries, using due process in adjudication of violations, and seeing that a student's rights are protected when charged with a violation of law or university regulation and in mediating conflicts between roommates. A pattern of differences was also observed between the responses of hall managers and all other groups. Managers, in contrast to other groups, felt that the Head Resident Advisor should enforce regulations established by hall groups; that he should not delegate disciplinary authority; that he should confront students who enter a cafeteria illegally to take food; that the Head Resident Advisor should establish expectations for student behavior; that he should report known instances of drug and alcohol violations; and that the Advisor should have his staff enforce quiet

hours in the living units. These data suggest that differences do exist between the Head Resident Advisor and the hall manager on expectations for working with discipline and student behavior. All other groups tended to indicate responses similar to those of the Head Resident Advisor for dealing with student behavior.

An inspection of Sub-Scale V indicates a divergence of expectations for the Head Advisor's involvement with residence hall management. Hall managers, Head Resident Advisors, and Student Affairs Personnel indicate a congruence of expectations for the Head Advisor to maintain liaison relations with hall managers while counselors, faculty, and students give a low priority or reject a number of the expectations for management responsibility.

It may be concluded that all groups expect the Head Resident Advisor to coordinate programs with the hall manager in order to keep within budgetary constraints. Counselors rejected the expectation that the Head Advisor should give as much consideration to cost as educational value when planning programs. Faculty and students indicated a divergence of opinion for the expectation while managers, Head Advisors, and Student Affairs Personnel indicated support for the idea. The groups indicated a divergence of opinion on the expectation that Head Resident Advisors should be involved in the selection

and evaluation of management personnel; however, all groups indicated significant support for the expectation that the manager and Advisor meet regularly to coordinate the hall program and discuss the food and business operation.

It was concluded that a difference existed between the manager and all other groups on the expectation that the Head Resident Advisor should assume responsibility for supervising student behavior in the cafeteria, grill, and other public areas of the residence hall. Hall managers indicated that they expected Advisors to assist with the supervision of student behavior; however, all other groups rejected the expectation. The data would suggest an area of possible conflict between the manager and Head Resident Advisor which needs clarification.

All groups gave support to the expectation that the Head Advisor should spend time in the cafeteria talking to students. They also supported the expectation that the Head Advisor should assist the manager in the interpretation of the housing contract to students.

An examination of Sub-Scale VI, Expectations for General Administration, indicates that all groups indicate support for expectations that the Head Resident function as an administrator. Head Resident Advisors indicated positive support for twenty-six of the items;

faculty supported twenty-one of the expectations; Student Affairs Personnel supported twenty-three of the expectations; managers supported twenty of the items; and counselors and students each supported eighteen of the expectations.

A review of individual items indicated that Student Affairs Personnel expressed significant consensus for the expectation that the Head Resident Advisor should know something about the home background of students in his hall. All other groups expressed limited support for the idea. A divergence of opinion was expressed for the expectation that the Head Resident Advisor should approve hall social policies. Managers, Head Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, and faculty expressed limited support; however, counselors rejected the idea.

One of the more strongly supported expectations stated that the Head Resident Advisor should live in the hall where he works. All groups indicated significant consensus for the expectation. The groups also indicated significant consensus for the expectation that the Head Resident Advisor should coordinate staff coverage so that someone is always available in the hall. The groups did, however, reject the expectation that the Head Advisor should be available in the hall twenty-four hours per day and on most week-ends. It may be concluded that significant reference groups see

a need for the Head Resident Advisor to live where he works and to provide around-the-clock coverage in the hall.

The most strongly supported expectation found in the study stated that the Head Resident should be familiar with campus service agencies and use them for referral purposes. All groups indicated over 90 per cent support for the expectation. Thus, the data would suggest that the significant reference groups see the position of Head Resident Advisor as a provider of information and services for students.

The groups were divided in their responses to the expectation that the Head Advisor should carry out decisions of his supervisors even though he disagrees with them. Head Resident Advisors, managers, and Student Affairs Personnel indicated support for the concept while counselors and students rejected the idea.

All groups expressed support for the expectation that the Head Advisor should assist with the selection and training of new Head Resident Advisors, assistant, and graduate advisors. All groups also supported the idea that the Head Advisor should encourage informal faculty-student contact in residence halls. A divergence of opinion was noted, however, on the expectation that the Head Resident Advisor should voice dissatisfaction with university policies only through official channels.

Managers, Head Advisors, and Student Affairs Personnel expressed strong support for the expectation while all others indicated a divergence of opinion. Along the same line was the expectation that the Head Resident publically support his staff or other staff even though he disagrees with their actions. Head Resident Advisors supported this expectation. All other groups expressed a divergence of opinion or rejected the expectation.

All groups supported the expectation that Head Resident Advisors should recruit staff candidates rather than accept only those who apply for positions.

Expectations for working with practicum students, helping students secure financial assistance, and seeking to have regulations affecting students were all given full support by the groups. Thus, it may be concluded that the service nature of the position holds primary importance with the groups being studied. The expectations that Head Advisors should prepare written reports on student psychological behavior was rejected. This finding would suggest that further clarification is needed on the role the Head Resident Advisor plays in working with student mental health.

All groups agreed that the Head Resident Advisor should participate with students in hall, social, and recreational programs, that he should invite students into his apartment for informal discussions, and that

he should make no major policy changes in the hall without first seeking student opinion and support. All groups indicated that the Head Resident Advisor should be familiar with general academic requirements of the university and know how to make use of university academic referral services. All groups also gave strong support to the expectation that the Head Advisor devise and maintain an adequate record system of hall activities and student academic programs. The groups also gave unanimous support for the expectation that the Head Resident Advisor should be able to articulate all sides of controversial campus issues which are of concern to students. They also gave significant support to the idea that the Head Advisor should be a full-time professionally trained staff member. The groups differed, however, on the expectation that the Head Advisor should not be expected to function as an advisor and counselor on the one hand and as a disciplinarian on the other. Managers indicated a significant rejection of this idea. Counselors and students expressed a divergence of opinion while Head Advisors, Student Affairs Personnel, and faculty indicated limited support for the idea. It may be concluded from these responses that the groups do not see any great problem with the advisor-administrator role conflict.

Another area of disagreement was found for the expectation that the Head Resident Advisor should use his own judgment in interpreting university policies and regulations. All groups except managers indicated significant support for this expectation. Managers, however, indicated strong opposition to such flexibility of judgment on the part of Head Resident Advisors.

In summary, Head Resident Advisors, managers, and Student Affairs Personnel tend to hold similar expectations for the administrative responsibilities of the Head Resident Advisor's position while counselors, faculty, and students tend to ascribe lower importance to these dimensions of the position. It is concluded from these findings that more adequate communication needs to be established with these groups to help clarify and explain the importance of administrative functions to the position.

General Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on conclusions drawn from the study:

1. The Office of Student Affairs should extend the commitment of Michigan State University by developing a more comprehensive statement of philosophy for the housing program. Specific goals and expectations for operational

performance should be generated from the philosophical position for the role of Head Resident Advisor.

2. Since the statistical analysis indicated significant differences among the group under study, it is recommended that a committee comprised of members from the groups be appointed to further study the position for the purpose of developing a more adequate job description.
3. In keeping consistent with a redefinition of the housing program, appropriate measures should be taken to provide status, recognition, and an adequate level of compensation for the position of Head Resident Advisor. The status and pay adjustment should be similar to professional reference groups with whom the Head Resident Advisor works on a regular basis.
4. When the redefinition of the philosophy, goals, and objectives of the housing program have been updated, all appropriate university channels should be utilized to communicate objectives and expectations held for the housing program.
5. The significant statistical differences between Head Resident Advisors and students should be examined in greater detail. It should be

determined if differences result from lack of adequate information about the position, a lack of clear communication on the part of the Head Resident Advisor, or from a basic difference of opinion on the appropriate role of the position.

6. A comparison between expectations held for the position by Head Resident Advisors and those held by hall managers suggests a pattern of disagreement in the area of interpreting and enforcing university policy. Hall managers tend to view the expectations in a structured way while Head Resident Advisors prefer to exercise judgment on the enforcement of policy and regulations. This difference suggests a need for further clarification of responsibility in this area. A more specific statement on expectations for enforcement of policy should be developed by housing administrators. In addition, an in-service education program involving hall managers and Head Resident Advisors should be conducted during early fall term as a means of resolving the differences in expectations held by the two groups.
7. A more broadly based examination of the position of Head Resident Advisor should be conducted to determine similarities and differences held for the position by significant reference groups in

schools where a commitment has been made to enhancing residential education.

Implications of the Study

The conclusions of this study have implications for all people involved in residential housing at Michigan State University.

1. The data provide a base of information about an effort to more adequately define and describe expectations held for the position of Head Resident Advisor.
2. The results of the study give a Head Resident Advisor a reference point to compare his perceptions of the position with those of his colleagues and other groups with whom he works or serves.
3. The study provides a starting point for further defining and delimiting the professional dimensions of the position.
4. The study provides a base of data for use in establishing expectations for the housing program and for updating the job description for the position of Head Resident Advisor.
5. The expectations expressed by "others," however incomplete they may be, provide insight for

role incumbents as they attempt to define needs in residence halls and build service and educational programs.

6. The findings of the study should result in greater organizational effectiveness as areas of identified conflict are clarified and others develop a greater understanding of the position. Role incumbents should have higher morale and enjoy greater personal job satisfaction as other significant reference groups come to recognize the value of the position.
7. The outcomes of the study provide a body of information for others to use in better clarifying their perceptions of the position of Head Resident Advisor.

Concluding Statement

This study was undertaken to provide a greater understanding of the role of the Head Resident Advisor at Michigan State University. Through an analysis of selective expectations held for the position by significant reference groups, a consensus of expectations has been presented which should assist housing administrators at Michigan State University to better articulate and define formal expectations for the position in a way that minimizes role conflicts. As significant reference

groups become more familiar with the data generated from the study, a greater understanding of areas of agreement and areas of disagreement and conflict should result. Such insight should provide a greater understanding of expectations held by the Student Affairs division for role incumbents and should point up areas of disagreement held by significant reference groups. Such understanding should bring about a more effective administrative structure and should result in expanded programs and services for residence hall students.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Arthur, et al. Improving Undergraduate Education.
East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1967.
- Backstrom, Charles H., and Hursh, Gerald D. Survey Research. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1963.
- Bass, Floyd. "Duties of Tennessee High School Principals." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLV (October, 1961), 79-88.
- Beder, Harrold, and Rickard, Scott T. "Residence Hall Regulations and Staff Roles: A Substitute Model for In Loco Parentis." NASPA Journal, IX, No. 1 (July, 1971), 57-62.
- Bentley, Joseph. The Counselor's Role: Commentary and Readings. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.
- Biddle, Bruce J. Bibliographies of Role Terms, Role Conflict and The Role of the Teacher. Vol. B: Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher. University of Missouri: Social Psychology Laboratory, 1961.
- _____, and Thomas, Edwin J. Role Theory: Concepts and Research. New York: John Wiley, 1966.
- Blackman, Edward. "Residence Halls as an Integral Part of the Learning Environment." Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Washington National Education Association, 1966.
- Blue, Fermin K. "The Flint Community School Director: Analysis of Role Conflict and Expectations." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970.
- Bock, D. R., and Haggard, E. A. "The Use of Multivariate Analysis of Variance in Behavioral Research." Handbook of Measurement and Assessment in Behavioral Sciences. Edited by D. K. Whitla. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

- Brookover, Wilbur B. "Public Images and Expectations of Teachers." College of Education Quarterly. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1957.
- _____. "Research on Teacher and Administrator Roles." The Journal of Educational Sociology, XXXIX (September, 1955).
- _____, and Gottlieb, David. A Sociology of Education. New York: American Book Company, 1964.
- Charters, W. W. "The School as a Social System." Review of Educational Research, XXII (February, 1952).
- Cowan, Alton W. "The Flint Building Director: Role Expectations Held by Relevant Groups." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1960.
- Cowley, W. H. "The History of Student Residential Housing." School and Society, XL (December 1, 1934), 705, 712 (December 8, 1934), 758-64.
- Crossland, Ronald. "Role Expectations for Chief Administrators of Community Service Programs in Selected Community Colleges in the United States." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.
- Davis, Kingsley. Human Society. New York: The McMillian Company, 1948.
- Doyle, Andrew Lewis. "A Study of the Expectations Which Elementary Teachers, Administrators, School Board Members, and Parents Have of the Elementary Teachers' Roles." Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, Michigan State University, 1956.
- Faculty Committee on Student Affairs. "Report on Off-Campus Council's Proposal Regarding Housing Regulations." East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1968.
- Finn, J. D. Multivariate: Fortron Programs for Univariate and Multivariate Analysis of Variance and Co-Variance. Buffalo: State University of New York at Buffalo, 1967.
- Garrison, Ann, et al. The Residence Hall Study. The Provost's Ad Hoc Committee on the Residence Halls. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1969.

- Getzels, F. W., and Guba, E. G. "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in a Teaching Situation." Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIX (1955), 30-40.
- Greenleaf, Elizabeth A. "Residence Halls, 1970's." NASPA Journal, VII, No. 2 (October, 1967), 72-76.
- Gross, Neal C.; Mason, Ward S.; and McEachern, A. W. Exploration in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley, 1958.
- Hannah, John A. Address to Faculty and Administration, Michigan State University, March, 1961.
- Hays, William L. Statistics for Psychologists. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Hoyte, C. J. "Test Reliability Estimated by Analysis of Variance." Psychometrika, VI (1941), 153-60.
- Ivey, Allen E., and Robin, Stanley S. Role Theory, Role Conflict and Counseling, A Conceptual Framework." Journal of Counseling Psychology, XIII (Spring, 1966).
- Keller, Barbara. "Status, Role Training and Salary of Residence Hall Directors." NAWDC Journal (Summer, 1965).
- Kerlinger, Fred. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Kilbourn, Donald. "A Study of the Status and Roles of Head Resident Advisors in College and University Residence Halls for Women." Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, Michigan State University, 1959.
- _____. "The Status and Role of Head Residents." The Personal and Guidance Journal, XXXIX, No. 3 (November, 1960).
- Leonard, Eugene A. Origins of Personnel Services in American Higher Education. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.
- Lindzey, Gardner. Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
- Linton, Ralph. The Cultural Background of Personality. New York: Appleton Century Co., 1945.

- Linton, Ralph. The Study of Man. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, Inc., 1936.
- Mead, George H. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Michigan State University Catalog, 1970. East Lansing, Michigan.
- Neiman, L. J., and Hughes, J. W. "Problems of the Concept of Role--A Re-Survey of the Literature." Social Forces, XXX (1951), 141-49.
- Nelson, Lawrence O. "Role Expectations for Selected College and University Presidents." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1960.
- Neville, Howard R. "How to Live With Bigness." Phi Delta Kappa, April, 1966, pp. 430-32.
- Newcomb, Theodore M. Social Psychology. New York: The Dryden Press, 1951.
- Nonnamaker, Eldon R. "The Role of the Enrollment Officer at Michigan State University." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1959.
- Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951.
- _____, and Shills, Edward A. Toward a General Theory of Action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.
- Pool, Cynthia. "Head Resident Behavior." NAWDC Journal, XXX, No. 4 (Summer, 1967), 178-80.
- Powell, John R.; Plyler, Samuel A.; Dickson, Barbara A.; and McClellan, Stephen D. The Personnel Assistant in College Residence Halls. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969.
- Riker, Harold. College Housing as Learning Centers. Washington: The American College Personnel Association, 1965.
- Roeber, Allen. "Role and Functions of Professionally Trained Counselors." Counselor Development in American Society. Washington, D.C.: Office of Manpower Automation and Office of Education, 1965, p. 6.

- Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University-- A History. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
- Sarbin, Theodore. "Role Theory." Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. I. Edited by Gardner Lindzey. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
- Sargent, Stansfeld. "Concepts of Role and Ego in Contemporary Psychology." Social Psychology at the Crossroads. Edited by John H. Rohrer and Muzafer Sherif. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.
- Seeman, Melvin. "Role Conflict and Ambivalence in Leadership." American Sociological Review, XVIII (1953), 373-80.
- Smith, Ewart E. "Effects of Clear and Unclear Role Expectations of Group Productivity and Defensiveness." Journal of Abnormal Psychology, LV (1944), 213-29.
- Smith, Rex B. "A Comparative Study of the Expectations Which Teachers, School Board Members and Citizens of Three School Districts Have of the Teacher's Role in School and Community." Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, Michigan State University, 1960.
- Snyder, Clinton. "Variations in Expectations for the Teacher Role, As Related to General and Specific Roles, Expectation Categories, and Social Distance." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.
- Sweitzer, Robert E. "The Superintendent's Role in Improving Instruction." Administrator's Notebook, VI (April, 1958), 1-4.
- Upcraft, Lee. "Role Expectations for Chief Student Personnel Administrators in Large Universities." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.
- Waller, Willard. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1932.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

Dear Participant:

I am currently conducting a study of expectations that significant reference groups hold for the role of the Head Resident Advisor at Michigan State University.

Enclosed is a questionnaire concerning several dimensions of the Advisor's role. I would appreciate it very much if you would complete the questionnaire and return it to me at your earliest convenience in the enclosed envelope.

Sincerely yours,

Gary B. North
Michigan State University

All responses will be kept confidential!

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENT USED IN THE STUDY

A QUESTIONNAIRE ON JOB EXPECTATIONS HELD FOR THE
ROLE OF HEAD RESIDENT ADVISOR
AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine the expectations you hold for the position of Head Resident Advisor at Michigan State University. The Student Affairs staff is attempting to determine the perceptions held for the position by various groups on campus so that a job description can be developed which reflects a minimum of ambiguity and conflict. The items listed in the questionnaire include selected activities and functions which may be performed by a Head Resident Advisor. Please respond to each question as you perceive the role of a Head Resident Advisor. Your cooperation in completing this questionnaire will be greatly appreciated. Please use the following scale when responding to the questions. Mark only one response for each question. Please do not sign the questionnaire.

(0) Strongly Disagree (1) Disagree (2) No Opinion (3) Agree (4) Strongly Agree

1. Please indicate the category which reflects your classification: (0) Undergraduate Student (1) Counselor (2) Management Staff (3) Head Resident Advisor (4) Student Affairs Staff (5) Faculty
2. Please indicate the area in which you live and/or work (0) Brody (1) Cedar Woods (2) East Campus (3) Red Cedar (4) South Complex (5) West Circle (6) Other
3. Please indicate your sex (0) female (1) male

The Head Resident Advisor:

4. Should have primary responsibility for the selection and training of his staff members.
5. Should know something about the home background of the students in his hall.
6. Should participate in regular inservice education programs.
7. Should enforce regulations established by hall governing groups.
8. Should interpret and explain university philosophy, policies, expectations and regulations to individual students and to student groups in the hall.
9. Should be responsible for approving hall social policies.
10. Should serve as a model for students through his own actions and patterns of living.
11. Should work directly with individual students in helping solve family or personal problems.
12. Should consider human factors above business, administrative or regulatory factors when dealing with students.
13. Should act as editorial consultant to house and hall newspapers.
14. Should notify parents when a student is charged with a violation of law, ordinance or university regulations.
15. Should be expected to consult with students who overemphasize dating, sports, and other extracurricular activities at the expense of their academic program.
16. Should consult with staff and students before filling vacant staff positions.
17. Should live in the residence hall where he works.
18. Should act in an advisory capacity to Ad. Hoc. groups as they develop in the hall.

19. Should work closely with other Head Resident Advisors in coordinating programs and activities among halls.
20. Should rely on acceptance and understanding of individual behavior rather than rules and regulations when working with students.
21. Should delegate disciplinary responsibility to student judiciaries.
22. Should socialize with residents outside the hall.
23. Should be available to students twenty-four hours a day and on most weekends.
24. Should encourage students to plan concerts, lectures, seminars and play reading in the residence hall.
25. Should enforce regulations established by University policy-making bodies.
26. Should serve as chief advisor to the hall student government program and should attend hall government meetings.
27. Should confront students who illegally enter a cafeteria for the purpose of securing food.
28. Should see that a student's rights are protected when the student is charged with a violation of ordinance, law or University regulation.
29. Should always follow due process procedures when handling a student disciplinary case.
30. Should spend as much time as possible in the living areas talking with students.
31. Should establish expectations for student behavior and communicate them to students.
32. Should give consideration to the needs of minority groups when selecting his undergraduate staff.
33. Should coordinate and administer an orientation program for new students to help them adjust to the hall and the University.
34. Should provide training for student government officers and committee members which will better enable them to perform their elected functions.
35. Should encourage residents to establish social policies and regulations to govern the hall.
36. Should assist students having academic difficulty by providing counseling, tutoring, and study skills programs.
37. Should personally interview each new student in the residence hall.
38. Should coordinate programs with the hall manager in trying to keep within the operating budget of the hall.
39. Should, in addition to providing alternatives to a topic or concern, make his position on the subject known.
40. Should be trained in group dynamics and sensitivity training techniques.
41. Should be familiar with the campus service agencies--counseling, health, intramurals, financial aides, public safety, registrar--and make use of them for referral purposes.
42. Should carry out decisions of his supervisors even though he may consider them to be unreasonable.
43. Should be the key personnel for establishing an intellectual environment in the residence hall.
44. Should not influence elected student officers through advice or organized training programs.
45. Should counsel with students who display disruptive behaviors in the hall.
46. Should be primarily responsible for providing students with better alternatives for decision making, rather than making decisions for them.
47. Should assist students with problems of socialization--social and personal adjustment.
48. Should communicate with parents about matters of social or academic concern regarding their sons or daughters.
49. Should participate in the selection and training of new residence hall advisory staff members. (Head, Assistant, and Graduate Advisors).

50. Should give as much consideration to cost factors as he does educational value or need when planning programs or activities.
51. Should voice his dissatisfaction with policies of his division or the University only through official channels within the system.
52. Should report known instances of alcohol and drug violations to University authorities.
53. Should use student advisory committees to provide feedback on student needs and concerns.
54. Should publicly support his staff or other Head Advisors even though he disagrees with their decisions or actions.
55. Should encourage informal faculty-student contact in the residence hall.
56. Should be trained in first aid and safety procedures.
57. Should encourage students to participate in the selection and evaluation of residence hall staff.
58. Should see that adequate recreational facilities and programs are made available to students.
59. Should recruit able people for staff positions rather than accept only those who make application.
60. Should assist students in securing financial assistance, scholarships, and loans.
61. Should try to cultivate and draw out intraverted students who tend to be "loners" through personal contact and discussion.
62. Should coordinate staff coverage in the residence hall so that an advisory staff member is always available to students.
63. Should seek to have regulations affecting students updated and changed rather than reacting to changes proposed by student groups.
64. Should assist in working with practicum and seminar students who want experience in residence hall work.
65. Should expect students to assume responsibility for their own conduct and behavior.
66. Should prepare written reports about student psychological behaviors for the counseling center and psychiatric services.
67. Should act as a representative for the students rather than the administration.
68. Should take the lead in instituting new programs and activities in the hall.
69. Should be working with student behaviors rather than enforcing regulations.
70. Should be available to students only during posted office hours.
71. Should focus his efforts primarily on the organized student government groups in the residence hall.
72. Should assist the hall manager in the selection and evaluation of cafeteria personnel, reception desk personnel and custodial personnel.
73. Should be familiar with any specific health problems a student may have.
74. Should organize study skills programs for students needing academic assistance.
75. Should promote peer control and self-discipline in residents, rather than assume responsibility for regulating and controlling student behavior.
76. Should let students assume responsibility for their social and recreational activities.
77. Should serve as the primary referral agent from the residence hall to the counseling center.
78. Should exert his primary influence through his staff rather than to be directly involved with students.
79. Should assist students with academic and career planning.
80. Should meet regularly with the hall manager to discuss hall business and the food service operation.
81. Should participate with students in hall social, recreational or academic activities.

82. Should assist the residence hall manager with room assignments, room changes, and other administrative tasks.
83. Should assume responsibility for student behavior in the cafeteria, grill and other public areas of the residence hall.
84. Should be familiar with the academic requirements, regulations and grading procedures of the various colleges within the university.
85. Should encourage the organization of special interest living groups such as "academic houses," "social action houses," or "current issues houses."
86. Should make no major policy nor physical changes within the hall without first seeking student opinion and support.
87. Should personally inspect the residence hall at least once a week to determine the general comfort and appearance of the building.
88. Should invite students into his apartment for social events and informal discussions.
89. Should maintain a records system of hall activities, student academic progress, and other records necessary for the operation of the hall program.
90. Should function primarily as a counselor and advisor to students.
91. Should organize programs and make information available to students on such topics as sexuality, drugs, alcohol, self-identity and personal adjustment.
92. Should mix with students in the cafeteria and eat with a different group as often as possible.
93. Should assist student in integrating and relating classroom experience to the academic and social life of the campus.
94. Should assist in resolving roommate problems and conflicts.
95. Should not be expected to function as an advisor and counselor on the one hand and as a disciplinarian on the other.
96. Should have his staff enforce quiet hours in living units.
97. Should be able to articulate the various sides of controversial issues which are of concern to students and the university.
98. Should use his own judgment in interpreting university policies and regulations in specific cases.
99. Should assist the residence hall management staff in interpreting the housing contract to students.
100. Should be a professionally trained full-time staff member.

Thank you for your cooperation in responding to this questionnaire.

APPENDIX C

**JOB DESCRIPTION, HEAD RESIDENT
ADVISOR POSITION, MEN
AND WOMEN**

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY . East Lansing . Michigan 48823
Office of the Dean of Students . Student Services Building

Job Description
Head Resident Advisor Position
Men and Women

Responsible to: Area Director, Office of the Dean of Students

I. Personnel

- A. Assume primary responsibility of the student personnel program as it relates to the population of a residence unit.
- B. Responsible for the recruitment, selection, training, and evaluation of resident assistants.
- C. Supervise and evaluate the graduate resident advisor and/or assistant resident advisor.
- D. Work closely with other head resident advisors, coordinating programs among halls.

II. Advising

- A. Serve as advisor to various hall student government leaders, committees, and boards; or delegate specific advisory responsibilities to other staff members.
- B. Act in an advisory and consulting capacity to individual students living in the residence halls.
- C. Provide encouragement and motivation for students in the hall with regard to their academic work.
- D. Interpret and explain University philosophy, policies, expectations, and regulations to individual students in the hall.
- E. Be sensitive and perceptive to student problems and act as a referral agent to appropriate agencies for students with particular problems.

III. Management

- A. Interpret to the management in the hall the role and responsibilities of the advisory staff.
- B. Confer regularly with the hall manager concerning hall programs and mutual problems.
- C. Assist the management in the selection and evaluation of various student employees in the hall.

IV. Discipline

- A. Assume primary responsibility for the administrative action of disciplinary problems involving students in the hall in accordance with the Academic Freedom Report For Students at Michigan State University.

- B. Assist student judiciary boards to work effectively with disciplinary problems and procedures.

V. Records

- A. Maintain records of hall activities, financial transactions, student academic progress, equipment inventory, and other records consistent with current policies.
- B. Submit an annual report to the Dean of Students Office.

VI. Liaison with Various University Services

- A. Serve as the principle coordinator for hall programs with the total University community.
- B. Where appropriate, establish working relationships with academic personnel working in the hall and involve them in various hall programs and planning.
- C. Understand the role of, and work closely with, various University services such as the Counseling Center, Financial Aids Office, the University College, and the Department of Public Safety.
- D. Understand and be able to interpret the history, philosophy, and objectives of Michigan State University to the students in the hall.

VII. General

- A. Assist in defining the student population of the residence unit.
- B. Be responsible for handling of and appropriate execution of policies, expectations, and procedures defined in the residence hall advisor's manual.
- C. Keep the Dean of Students Office informed of problems or unusual situations within the residential unit.
- D. Remain on duty for the full term of employment extending from the fall workshop and through official residence hall opening to closing of each term including vacations if hall is open.
- E. Represent the University to parents and guests of students visiting the hall.
- F. Assist the Dean of Students Office in the formulation and facilitation of policies and procedures.
- G. Assist the Dean of Students Office in the selection process of new Residence Hall Advisory Staff.
- H. Assist with research projects as undertaken by the Dean of Students Office.