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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"Educational institutions exist to foster learning, student development, and ultimately an improved existence for mankind" (Chickering, 1969, p. 34) and "...colleges and universities will be educationally effective only if they reach students where they live" (p. 3). In the past fifteen years, many institutions of higher education have responded to challenges such as these by attempting to provide developmentally stimulating living environments (Riker, 1965; Powell, Phyler, Dickson, and McClellan, 1969; Scott, 1975).

Undergraduate student paraprofessionals have filled many student service roles on college campuses for years. These have included peer counselor, new student orientation assistant, campus judicial commissioner, resident advisor and many others. The effective, widespread and increasing use of paraprofessionals in higher education has been studied and documented by many researchers (Hutchins, Yost, and Hill, 1976; Snodgrass, 1977; Oravitz, 1974; German, 1979; Allen, 1974; Nickerson and Harrington, 1971).

Bucci (1979) found that approximately 83% of the college student population he studied turned to friends and student paraprofessionals for help with personal problems. Other studies...
revealed that paraprofessionals were evaluated as equal to or better than professional counselors (Hutchins, Yost, and Hill, 1976; Snodgrass, 1977) in some problem areas. Hence, one of the most important and common tools universities use to accomplish the goal of providing for the total education of students is the undergraduate paraprofessional resident advisor or resident counselor (Zunker, 1975).

The paraprofessionals known as resident advisors have been shown to be key persons in implementing an effective housing program (Duncan, 1967; Powell, Phyller, Dickson, and McClellan, 1969; Riker, 1965; Murphy and Ortensi, 1966; Hutchins, Yost, and Hill, 1976). Researchers have found that resident advisors play a crucial "front line," outreach function. They can identify and respond to a variety of student problems and needs, help promote students' personal growth and development, and provide feedback to the university (Allen, 1970; Riker, 1965; Zunker, 1975; Murphy and Ortensi, 1966; Atkinson, Williams, and Garb, 1973).

The importance of the particular roles filled by these undergraduate counselors has created the need for selecting the most qualified individuals as resident advisors. The research which has been done in this area has focused primarily on the use of personality inventories for selection procedures. The results have been equivocal. Some studies have indicated a relationship between certain psychological inventories and effectiveness as a resident advisor (Badden and Walsh, 1968; German, 1975; Rodgers, 1971; Graff and Bradshaw, 1970), but others have not (Schrage, 1977; Atkinson, Williams, and Garb, 1973; Murphy and Ortensi, 1966).
Another focus of study has been the selection process itself. The studies of leaderless group discussions as a means for predicting resident advisor job effectiveness also have revealed mixed results (Mullozzi and Spees, 1971; Haldane, 1973). Several other selection methods have also been examined with inconsistent findings. These include analyzing performance on a job related task (Wyrick and Mitchell, 1972); role playing or socio-drama (Nair and Sonders, 1969); information about past experiences, grade point average, recommendations, peer rating, self report activities questionnaires (Brown and Zunker, 1966; Schilling, 1974; Banta, 1969); examining job viewpoints and interpersonal behavior patterns (Piggs, 1971; Bodden and Walsh, 1968); measuring physical fitness and energy levels (Cannon and Porterman, 1973); and, measuring an applicant's learning acquisition curve (Renz, 1976). Although investigators have attempted to demonstrate a relationship between particular selection processes and subsequent job performance, all general selection procedures seem to yield inconsistent results across institutions.

While various psychological criteria were utilized in selection procedures, no method has yet attempted to relate the contributions of developmental psychology to successful prediction of resident advisor effectiveness. Many investigators have shown the importance of the resident advisor position in stimulating (or hindering) human development (Schroeder, Hill, Gormally, and Anthony, 1972; Scott, 1975; Riker, 1965; Nickerson and Harrington, 1971; Powell, Phyler, Dickson, and McClellan, 1969). Further, it appears that the
resident advisor's performance of his or her responsibilities could be related to his or her level of cognitive and psychosocial development. Thus an investigation of the selection and prediction of resident advisor performance based on developmental psychology constructs and inventories seems warranted.

Two families of developmental theories which may be relevant to such study of resident advisor development and performance are cognitive-structural and psychosocial theories. These families of theory propose that development occurs as the result of several factors, one which is the degree of challenge and support in the environment (Chickering, 1969; Blocker, 1978). Thus, in order to study student development within a residence hall, an examination of the sources of challenge and support in the hall atmosphere or environment must be examined. Challenge or dissonance is provided by environmental elements such as residents from different cultural backgrounds, student government and staff programs, governance experiences, and judicial responsibilities. Support comes from the hall staff as well as from the same elements as the challenge. The resident advisor is in a good position, therefore, to serve as a stimulus and/or support for cognitive-structural and psychosocial development. The resident advisor stimulates or directly provides programming on a hall floor, facilitates floor governance processes, and deals with discipline matters. In addition, she/he also acts as a paraprofessional counselor and friend to resident students.

In addition to challenge and support, cognitive-structural and psychosocial developmental theories indicate that development is
fostered if staff members are more advanced in development than the persons with whom they work (Kohlberg, 1971; Chickering, 1969). It would seem that resident advisors at more advanced developmental stages should be more effective in facilitating development than resident advisors at developmental levels equal to or below those of their residents. As Kohlberg (1971) points out, individuals recognize the highest stage of moral reasoning that they are able to comprehend as most desirable. This indicates that resident advisors at higher stages of reasoning should be more effective than those at lower stages.

Theories of psychosocial development describe the tasks or issues with which most college students are preoccupied. One major theorist in this area, Chickering (1969), has found that residence halls provide important reference groups for students living away from home and facing many questions about their identity, competencies, and social skills. In his studies, Chickering discovered two main sources of development in residence halls: close friendships and reference groups and the general attitudes and values inherent in the goals and objectives (i.e., the culture) of the hall itself. These growth stimulating aspects of residence hall life are part of resident advisor job responsibilities. Resident advisors are expected to work toward building a sense of community where close friendships and development can take place. This involves facilitating the development of good communication, advising groups and individuals, promoting personal interaction and designing
effective, relevant programs and activities for the residents. A resident advisor whose own development is more advanced will have completed psychosocial tasks of social and interpersonal competence, autonomy, and managing emotions. Those individuals who have resolved these issues in a positive manner should be better able than someone at a less advanced stage to facilitate a sense of community and assist residents in the resolution of normal psychosocial developmental tasks.

Cognitive-structural development also provides relevant information for understanding and predicting resident advisor performance. For instance, Perry's theory (1968) of intellectual and ethical reasoning explains the different ways individuals perceive and make sense of their encounters with questions of knowledge and valuation. Resident advisors at developmentally different Perry levels may approach and perform personal counseling, group advising, activity planning, organizing, and administrative duties differently. Presumably the individuals at the higher levels of intellectual and ethical development are better able to understand and cope with diversity and ambiguity.

The other cognitive-structural theory that may be particularly relevant to the resident advisor job is Kohlberg's theory of moral reasoning (1971). Moral reasoning can be thought of as a guide for making decisions on "what one ought to do" in moral situations where there are competing claims. He projects six stages of moral development, and also believes that persons can best facilitate development in this domain if they are more advanced in moral reasoning than the persons with whom they work.
Moral development is an especially relevant aspect of a resident advisor’s role in a group living situation. Group living inevitably involves disciplinary matters, establishing and enforcing rules of living together, allocating limited resources and individual counseling. All of these roles or functions involve the resident advisor and require moral reasoning. A resident advisor who can understand more complex moral reasoning supposedly can cope more effectively with his or her job responsibilities and stimulate the moral development of others.

Purpose of the Study

The importance of the resident advisor position in stimulating human development and the possible relationship between the resident advisor’s cognitive and psychosocial development and his/her ability to perform parts of his/her job stimulated this study. The investigation sought to determine the existence of a relationship between level of psychosocial development, moral development, and intellectual and ethical reasoning and job performance effectiveness of resident advisors.

The following questions were examined:

1. Is there a relationship between resident advisor effectiveness, as rated by student residents and directors, and his/her level of moral reasoning?
2. Is there a relationship between resident advisor effectiveness, as rated by student residents and directors, and his/her level of intellectual and
ethical reasoning?

3. Is there a relationship between resident advisor effectiveness, as rated by student residents and directors, and his/her psychosocial stage of development?

The following hypotheses were developed and tested based on these questions:

1. More effective resident advisors, as rated by their directors, are more likely to be at a higher level of moral reasoning than less effective resident advisors.

2. More effective resident advisors, as rated by their floor residents, are more likely to be at a higher level of moral reasoning than less effective resident advisors.

3. More effective resident advisors, as rated by their directors, are more likely to be at a higher level of intellectual and ethical reasoning than less effective resident advisors.

4. More effective resident advisors, as rated by their floor residents, are more likely to be at a higher level of intellectual and ethical reasoning than less effective resident advisors.

5. More effective resident advisors, as rated by their directors, are more likely to be at a more
advanced stage of psychosocial development than less effective resident advisors.

6. More effective resident advisors, as rated by their directors, are more likely to be at a more advanced stage of psychosocial development than less effective resident advisors.

Definitions

1. Resident Advisor: Resident advisors are junior, senior, or graduate male or female students who serve as paraprofessional staff members in the residence halls at The Ohio State University. A resident advisor is responsible for a floor or unit of approximately 45 students and works under the supervision of a residence hall director. Resident advisors' duties include: communicating information to residents on their floor; assisting in academic and personal growth of residents; insuring personal safety of residents in emergencies; promoting a harmonious and friendly floor environment; enforcing rules and regulations; assisting in developing educational, social, athletic, and cultural programs/activities for floor and resident hall; assisting and supporting residence hall government; recording and reporting maintenance problems and conditions of rooms and floor; miscellaneous routine duties; special tasks.
assigned by supervisor (See Appendix A for a copy of the Resident Advisor Job Description).

2. **New Resident Advisor:** Resident Advisors selected for the 1979-1980 academic year at The Ohio State University serving for their first year.

3. **Returning Resident Advisor:** Resident Advisors selected for the 1979-1980 academic year at The Ohio State University serving for their second or third year.

4. **More Effective Resident Advisor:** Resident Advisors scoring as the highest 15 (plus ties) on the Goodman/Rodgers Rating Scale as rated by floor residents and directors.

5. **Less Effective Resident Advisor:** Resident Advisors scoring as the lowest 15 (plus ties) on the Goodman/Rodgers Rating Scale as rated by floor residents and directors.

6. **Resident:** Undergraduate student who lives on the floors where resident advisors served during the 1979-1980 academic year. These students are freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors; males and females; returning Ohio State students and transfer students; returning to the same residence hall or floor and new to the residence hall or floor.

7. **Director:** Professionally trained Student Personnel Worker at The Ohio State University. They have
earned at least a Master's Degree in Student Personnel Administration, Counseling Psychology or some related discipline. They have supervisory responsibility for 12 to 22 resident advisors and approximately 800 residents in one, two or three buildings.

8. **Residence Hall**: Living environment at The Ohio State University campus under the direction of the Residence and Dining Hall system. The buildings range from 4 to 12 floors, house 400 to 800 residents, and are supervised by professional and paraprofessional staff members.

9. **Effectiveness**: Effectiveness is defined as the degree to which resident advisors fulfill their job responsibilities as perceived by their floor residents and directors and measured by the Goodman-Rodgers Rating Scale. Many instruments have been developed to measure student and supervisor perceptions of resident advisor performance, but most of them were designed and tested for individual campuses and therefore may not be valid for other institutions. The Goodman-Rodgers Rating Scale, however, was systematically developed and tested for reliability and validity on The Ohio State University campus, and subsequently has been validated at five other institutions. It is a 24-item, paper and pencil,
Likert-type attitude scale. In this study, the instrument was administered to residents and directors. (See Instrumentation Section for further details and Appendix C for a copy of the instrument.)

10. Moral Reasoning: Moral reasoning is defined as stages on Kohlberg's (1971) theory of moral development and measured by the Defining Issues Test (DIT) (Rest, 1974). The DIT is a paper and pencil instrument consisting of six moral dilemmas and 12 issue-statements for each dilemma. Subjects rate each statement according to its importance in making a decision about what ought to be done for each dilemma. Then subjects select the four best issue-statements as they perceive it for each dilemma. These data are scored according to a weighted point system. For the purposes of this study, therefore, moral reasoning is defined as the computed Principled morality ("P") score on Rest's DIT. (See Instrumentation Section for further details and Appendix C for a copy of the DIT.)

The other widely used measure of moral reasoning is the original Kohlberg interview. This is a time consuming, technically complex method of scoring. It is also expensive and not practical for use in
applied contexts with large numbers of subjects. Since a resident advisor selection process would involve large numbers of applicants and require a short time for scoring, the DIT was selected for use in this study.

11. Intellectual and Ethical Reasoning: Intellectual and ethical reasoning is defined as positions on Perry’s (1968) theory of intellectual and ethical development as measured by the Perry Instrument (PI) (Widick, 1974; Knefelkamp, 1974). Perry positions are structural forms of reasoning used in perceiving, organizing and evaluating questions of knowledge and valuation. The PI is a paper and pencil instrument consisting of five sentence stems and two projective essays. Subjects give free response reactions to the stems and essays and these data are then rated by trained raters using a manual of position protocols and rating criteria. For the purposes of this study, therefore, intellectual and ethical reasoning is defined as the computed stage score (continuous) on the PI. (See Instrumentation Section for further details and Appendix C for a copy of the instrument.)

Another measure of intellectual and ethical reasoning is the Reflective Judgment Interview.
(King, 1977). This method has the same limitations as Lohberg's interview method.
The time and expense needed for scoring make it an impractical method of assessment for large numbers of subjects in applied settings.

12. Psychosocial Development: Psychosocial development is defined as Chickering's vectors of Sense of Competence, Managing Emotions, Autonomy, Identity, Freeing Interpersonal Relationships and Developing Purpose. Parts of the vectors of Sense of Competence, Autonomy, Managing Emotions and Identity will be measured by the Erwin Identity Scale (EIS) (Erwin, 1978). Freeing Interpersonal Relationships will be measured by the Mines-Jensen Interpersonal Relationship Inventory (IRI) (Mines, 1978). Developing Purpose will be measured by the Developing Purpose Inventory (DPI-2) (Barrett, 1978).

The EIS, DPI-2, and IRI are Likert-type, paper and pencil, self administered instruments. They consist of questions probing an individual's thoughts and adjustment on Chickering's vectors. For the purposes of this study then, psychosocial development is defined as the computed scores on the EIS, DPI-2, and IRI subscales. (See Instrumentation Section for further details and
Appendix C for copies of these instruments.)

There are several other instruments which can be used to measure selected vectors of Chickering.

The Student Development Task Inventory (SDTI) (Miller, Prince, and Winston, 1976) purports to measure Autonomy, Freeing Interpersonal Relationships and Developing Purpose. Rodgers (1979), however, indicates the SDTI may not discriminate on the vectors for college populations. The Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI) was used by Chickering to measure selected vectors; however, the OPI scores cannot be interpreted in terms of the vectors without longitudinal data on subjects. The EIS, DPI-2, and IRI are new instruments and it is hoped that this study will help determine their usefulness in student development applications.

Subjects

The subject sample in this study were 38 resident advisors working in residence hall in the South Area of The Ohio State University. There were a total of 38 resident advisors, 16 male and 23 female: 3 are 19 years old, 20 are 20 years old, 12 are 21 years old, 2 are 22 years old, and 1 is 24 years old. Each resident advisor was selected by participating in the systemwide selection process held from January, 1979, through June, 1979.
Twenty-seven are new resident advisors and 11 are returning resident advisors. Thirty-four resident advisors chose not to participate in the study. See Table 12 (Appendix D) for demographic data.

There is a total of approximately 45 residents ranging from freshmen to seniors on each resident advisor's floor or unit. All residents on each resident advisor's floor were solicited and asked to evaluate their resident advisor using the Goodman-Rodgers Scale. There were twelve floors from which no evaluations were returned; therefore, the resident advisor from that floor was excluded from the study.

There was a total of five directors also participating. They supervise all of the resident advisors used in the study.

Procedure

During the Fall Quarter Staff Orientation Program, resident advisors were assembled by building on two separate evenings. The EIS, DPI-2, and IRI were administered in the first session, and the PI and DTR were administered in the second session.

Prior to testing, the subjects were told the general nature of the study and then asked to participate. Participation was strictly voluntary. Those willing to take part in the study completed consent forms. See Appendix B for a script of the introduction to the study and request for participation and consent forms.

Each hall director or assistant director conducted the testing sessions having subjects read and follow the instructions
on the instruments.

After one and a half quarters, each resident on every resident advisor's floor and the director of each building received a letter describing the general nature of the study and requesting their assistance in evaluating the resident advisors. A consent form was also enclosed along with a copy of the Goodman-Rodgers Rating Scale. Residents and directors were asked to return the consent form and Goodman-Rodgers Scale in a sealed envelope within one week to a person on their floor (not the resident advisor) who volunteered to be the reception person and had been briefed on the importance of not discussing the study in any way. This person then returned the envelopes to the residence hall director. The researcher then collected the instruments from the directors and scored them.

Confidentiality

Resident advisors were identified through their instruments by sex, age, year in the position, residence hall, and floor they served on. The identification information that residents recorded was their residence hall, floor, age, and sex. The only identification information that directors recorded was the building they supervise and the floor of each resident advisor they rated. Resident advisor, resident, and director instruments were matched in sets according to this identification data. Each set was given a code number for analysis purposes.
Briefings on the procedure prior to conducting the study and on the results after the data has been analyzed were made to the staff of the residence halls. Individual resident advisors, residents, or directors will not be identified or used in this presentation in any way. An opportunity for each resident advisor to have his or her scores interpreted on all scales was made.

**Statistical Analysis**

The Erwin Identity Scale and the Developing Purpose Inventory yield three separate scores each representing a specific scale of the instrument. The Interpersonal Relationship Inventory yields two scores, one for each subscale. The Defining Issues Test provides a single Principled Reasoning ("P") score while the Perry Instrument yields a single score computed from the individuals' three most dominant modes (stages) of reasoning. Together these ten scores represent the predictor or independent variables. The Goodman-Rodgers Rating Scale produces one criteria score for director evaluations and one for resident (student) ratings.

First, the mean, standard deviation, range, and frequency distribution were computed for all predictor and criteria variables.

Next, a two-tailed t-test was used to determine the significance of the difference between scores of male and female resident advisors for each predictor and criteria variable and between the two criteria variable scores for each predictor variable. Comparisons between the means of more effective and less effective resident advisors on each of the predictor scales were also computed using a two-tailed t-test.
Pearson Correlation Coefficients were computed to examine the correlation between each of the predictor variables and both of the criteria variables, also between each predictor variable and sex.

Finally, as the hypotheses indicate, this study is concerned with finding the predictive ability of the independent variables. A Stepwise Regression Program, BMDP2R, was conducted in order to determine the degree of correlation between the predictor variables and the criteria variables. A multiple regression program studies the linear relationship between several independent and dependent variables taking into account the intercorrelations among the independent variables. The goal is to come up with the best possible combination of independent variables which correlates as highly as possible with the dependent variable. (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, 1975).
CHAPTER II
INSTRUMENTATION
Cognitive Development Assessment Instruments

The common problem in the measurement of cognitive developmental theories is how to elicit a representative sample of an individual's thinking structure. A thinking or cognitive structure is defined as a framework or set of assumptions for thinking about and making meaning of experiences. When cognitive development is measured, only a sample of this framework is tapped. Hence, the quality of the stimulus which elicits the subject's thinking response is crucial. That is, the measurement stimulus needs to solicit a representative response from the subjects.

After working through the problem of eliciting representative samples of a cognitive structure, measurement techniques must deal with the difficulties of converting qualitative responses into quantitative differences and reducing quantitative scores into a single score that is a characterization of the person. These concerns require the development of a quantification strategy and a scoring algorithm.

Most cognitive development theorists use some form of interviews as part of their measurement methodology. This method, with the one-to-one contact it provides, may serve to increase motivation and ownership in answering questions. It also enables
the subjects to respond in their own words and allows the researcher to clarify ambiguous answers. Therefore, the data can be a more accurate representation of an individual's cognitive development. However, the interview technique also presents several drawbacks. For instance, it is impractical (expensive and time consuming) for use with a large number of people. Subjects are restricted by their ability to express themselves verbally, and may feel inhibited in responding, particularly to personal moral and ethical questions. The interviewer also presents a problem by increasing the risk of interviewer bias interfering with the presentation, recording, and analysis of responses. This makes data comparison between subjects or from different interviewers precarious.

A second cognitive assessment technique is the use of inventories or instruments. An instrument is efficient, inexpensive and can be administered to a large number of subjects easily. Instruments are usually taken individually and anonymously, therefore, allowing for more spontaneous, less biased responses. Sampled opinions are in writing and can be referred to at a later date thereby diminishing distortion due to time lapse. All respondents are also receiving identical stimuli which increases the objectivity of the data through consistency of presentation.

This study is concerned with collecting data on a large number of individuals in a short time. Hence, paper and pencil instruments will be used rather than structured interviews. To date, there is only one paper and pencil instrument based on Perry's theory
(Knefelkamp, 1974, and Widick, 1974) and only one instrument based on Kohlberg's theory (Rest, 1974).

**Perry Instrument (PI).**

According to William Perry (1968), intellectual and ethical development is a progression in the set of assumptions or interpretations used in perceiving, organizing, and evaluating questions of knowledge, valuation, and responsibility. Positions are qualitatively different, relatively stable forms or ways in which individuals construe their experiences in these domains. Each position, therefore, delineates different ways of viewing and evaluating the nature of knowledge, values and responsibility. Development consists of the progression of these forms from simple to complex structures.

The Perry Instrument (PI), developed by Knefelkamp (1974) and Widick (1974) consists of five sentence stems and two essay questions requiring written responses. Each item and essay is designed to sample an individual's intellectual and ethical reasoning:

1. My main concern . . .
2. When I think about my future . . .
3. Choices . . .
4. For me to say "I believe" . . .
5. Choosing a career . . .

**Essay A.** Describe the best class you've taken since you've been in college. What made it positive for you? Be as specific as possible. Feel free to go into as much detail as you think will give us a clear idea of
the class; for example, you might want to discuss areas such as what the teacher was like, the subject matter, the particular content (readings, films, etc.), the atmosphere of the class, grading procedures, etc.

We want your thoughts and comments - a complete description of your experiences and how you felt about it.

Essay B. Think of the last time you had to make a decision about something that had major importance to you or the last time you had to choose between some significant alternatives. 1) How did you feel about having the alternatives? 2) How did you go about making the decision? 3) How did you feel about it afterwards? Be as detailed as possible in your description.

Scoring is done by trained raters, usually in threesomes. Each subject's responses are matched (using a manual of position protocols) with detailed rating criteria to assign a stage score or scores. Sentence stems receive one rating number that represents the modal form of reasoning. Essay questions receive three rating numbers that reflect the stages evident and amount or strength or them according to stated guidelines.

Raters use (1) structural cues; (2) language analysis; and (3) behavioral correlates as guidelines. Structural cues refer to the basic assumptions or the cognitive structure that would generate the specific statement. For instance, the number and nature of categories used would indicate if the response is dualistic (two categories: good/bad), multiplistic (many categories: equivalent and unordered) or relativistic (multiple categories within categories: ordered in context).

The second guideline concerns the use of concepts and language analysis. The dimensions may include: absolute/qualified
statements, internal/external locus of control, ability to assume responsibility and take on new roles, ability to synthesize or integrate ideas, ability to empathize with others and complex analytic thought. The writing sample can then provide language cues in the abstractness of words used, complexity of sentence structure, length of response and active versus passive voice.

Finally, the third guideline for rating stems or essays concerns behavioral correlates. The rater looks for the pattern of attitudinal/behavioral cues in the form and style of language. For instance, answers expressing the role of the learner, characteristics of a good teacher, purpose and appropriate method of evaluation, type of ideal classroom atmosphere and sources of frustration would indicate an individual's stage of reasoning.

After each sentence stem and essay question has been appropriately scored, the position numbers are then converted to either a rank or continuous scale in order to assign a single position score representing an individual's central reasoning tendency or dominant position.

To find a rank score, the frequency of scores for each stage is divided by the total number of scores. If the result is between 25% and 49%, the stage is assigned and placed in parentheses: (4). If the result is greater than 50%, the stage is assigned as a regular number: 4. When no subscore is strong enough (less than 25%), a dash is used: 4-4.

By converting scores into continuous data, every score is added into the final score. Therefore, this is a more sensitive
measure, especially in picking up subtle changes. The method involves multiplying each position by its frequency and then dividing by the total number of scores.

There has been little documentation of the validity and reliability of the PI. It seems to have face validity. The rating manual's criteria logically relate to Perry's descriptions of positions. There have been no studies correlating the PI and Perry's interview method. However, the instruments did discriminate among freshmen and seniors in a cross-sectional study at three kinds of colleges (Rodgers, 1979) and among freshmen and senior women at a large state university (Rodgers, 1979).

**Defining Issues Test (DIT)**

Lawrence Kohlberg conceptualizes moral judgment as how people think and reason about moral situations (1971). More specifically, moral reasoning can be defined as how one decides what is right, what reasons one would give for adjudication among persons with competing claims in a moral situation; and, the social perspective one holds. Kohlberg describes stages as qualitatively different, "structured wholes" or ways of viewing and evaluating social-moral situations. He believes that development consists of directional (from pre- to post-conventional stages) progression through these stages.

James Rest developed the Defining Issues Test (DIT) which is an objective paper and pencil instrument consisting of six moral dilemmas or stories and twelve issue-statements for each one.
Individual issue-statements represent distinctive characteristics of a specific Kohlberg moral development stage. The issue statements are written to display the following features:

1. The underlying structure of the item is emphasized so that higher stage statements appear abstract rather than simply esoteric ways of expressing a lower stage idea.
2. Pretentious or meaningless items are included to indicate when a subject attempts to "fake it" or in wanting to score high on the instrument, chooses a response because it appears complex.
3. Issues from the same stages were carefully matched on word length, complexity of syntax and use of technical or unusual terms.
4. In each response set of twelve issue-statements, several items of each stage are presented so that if one example of a stage's orientation is not suitable to a particular subject, there are still other examples of that orientations from which to choose. (Straub, 1976)

A subject reads a moral dilemma then evaluates a set of twelve issues related to the situation. On a Likert scale, the subject rates the importance of each issue in deciding what ought to be done for each dilemma, she/he also ranks the four best issue statements as they perceive it for each dilemma. Since each statement represents a specific moral reasoning stage, the way a subject judges what are the most important issues pertaining to each moral dilemma is an indication of the relative importance given to different conceptual frameworks (or stages) in making a moral decision.

Scores on the DIT are computed for each stage (2,3,4,5A,5B,6) based on a weighted point system. There are three other scores also included: the "p" or principled morality score, which has
proven to be the most useful and reliable index on the DIT (Rest, 1974); the "A" or antiestablishment score; the "M" or meaningless score. A "P" score is the sum of the weighted ranks for stage 5 and 6 items. It is interpreted as "the relative importance attributed to principled moral considerations" in making moral decisions. The "A" score indicates transition between stages 4 and 5 in terms of condemnation of tradition and the existing social order for its arbitrariness. Finally, Rest included the "M" score as a cheat or faking index. It does not represent any stage, rather a tendency to select meaningless, abstract statements.

The DIT was developed from normative data; therefore, it has no absolute standard with which to compare individual scores. So, stage-typing interpretations could result in error. For this reason, the "P" score tends to be the best measure on the DIT. There are, however, a few problems with the principled morality score. First, out of a total of 72 responses on the DIT, 23 are scores "P" which indicates a high probability of getting a principled score even by chance. This means that there is a risk of inflation factor that must be taken into account when interpreting scores.

The fact that the DIT is a recognition response assessment and not a self generated response instrument also creates a problem. Since it may be easier to recognize a form of reasoning than to create it, the DIT may rate subjects higher than the Kohlberg interview.
The "P" score correlates (.67) with assessments made by Kohlberg's method. Rest (1975) indicates, however, that the "facet of judgment assessed by Kohlberg tests may not be identical with that assessed by the DIT; therefore, the validity of either measure cannot be established by simply correlating the two tests." (p. 748).

In spite of these drawbacks, the DIT has thus far demonstrated good test-retest reliability, produces comparable information with each testing, minimizes variance due to differences on verbal expressivity, and scored objectively thus minimizing scorer bias and saving time (Rest, 1974).

Another important feature of the DIT is that the inflated score factor lends this instrument more useful for group assessment purposes than for individual evaluations.

These facts in addition to the impracticality of using Kohlberg's interview technique certainly support the use of the DIT in the current study.

**Erwin Identity Scale (EIS)**

One conceptual approach to student development is Chickering's seven vectors of development (1969). He introduced seven major issues or tasks that are common among 17 to 25-year-old college students: Managing Emotions, Developing Competence, Developing Autonomy, Establishing Identity, Freeing Interpersonal Relationships, Developing Purpose, Developing Integrity. The Establishing Identity vector seems to be a most critical vector in the development of the other
six vectors. Chickering claims that it "...provides a framework for interpersonal relationships, purposes and integrity." (1969, p. 80).

Identify, as Chickering refers to it, is an internal process of relating to oneself and developing a greater degree of personal integration and stability. The Establishing Identity vector, as conceptualized by Erwin, consists of three main components: confidence (the assuredness in oneself and in one's capabilities); sexual identity (clarification, understanding and acceptance of one's sexual feelings); and concept about body and appearance (accurate perception and acceptance of one's body and one's appearance).

An instrument that focuses on this vector of development could provide valid information about how an individual relates to oneself and the world and thus be useful in a university setting. Thomas Erwin (1978) stated:

Lack of objective, economic and efficient assessment instruments has hindered further study in student development. Such instruments would allow for further refinement of the development approaches, provide accountability data to measure the impact of college upon students and suggest areas in the college environment which could be redesigned for greater effectiveness. (p. 1)

With this in mind, Erwin developed the EIS to measure the three subscales of Arthur Chickering's vector of Establishing Identity.

The EIS consists of 58 rated items and two experimental non-scored items. It is a paper and pencil assessment scale. The statements represent development along each of the three subscales of Establishing Identity. Subjects are instructed to rate how accurately each item represents them on a five-point Likert scale.
(1 = very true of me; 2 = somewhat true of me; 3 = not sure or neutral; 4 = somewhat untrue of me; 5 = not at all true of me).

The subscale (CON for confidence; SI for sexual identity; CAB for concepts about body and appearance) and a plus or minus sign are assigned to each item for scoring. The pluses are summed according to the appropriate item weight (1-5) to the respective subscale. For instance, item number 23 is assigned a plus on the CON subscale and reads: "I envy those people who know where they are going in life." If it is rated "very true of me," a score of one is added to all of the other Confidence scale item scores to find the representative score on this scale. The minuses, on the other hand, require the item weights be reversed from 1-5 to 5-1 before summing the items to their appropriate subscales.

For instance, item number 7 is assigned a minus on the CAB scale and reads: "It doesn't bother me that I am not as attractive as other people." If it is rated "very true of me," a score of five is added to all of the other Concepts About Body and Appearance scale item scores to find the representative score on this scale.

The original form of the EJS was designed in 1972. It consisted of 78 items and was based on data from male and female, freshmen and senior college students. Chronbach's alpha coefficient was used to test the degree to which items within each subscale measure a common characteristic and the reliability was found to be only satisfactory.

In subsequent research (1978) with sixty male, 103 female, graduate and high school students, reliability scores computed
for the Confidence, Sexual Identity, and Concepts About Body and Appearance scales were found to be .81, .75, and .79, respectively. This evidence gives the impression that the three subscales are consistently measuring three separate constructs. However, a factor analysis of the 58 items revealed only 36 items to be represented in the three subscales. The conclusion drawn from this was that three constructs may in fact be present but in a more complex manner than predicted; therefore, further conceptualization and research may be necessary.

Convergent and divergent validity was tested through the joint administration of the EIS, Identity Achievement Scale and Internal-External Scale and the ACT Inventory, and through examining school environments that affect change in identity. Findings indicate that further refinement is necessary, but the three subscales do in fact offer useful information about the general development of students.

Developing Purpose Inventory (DPI-2)

A problem facing many universities today is the extent to which the university influences students' developing a sense of purpose (Chickering, 1969). In the absence of an adequate assessment tool, William Barratt of the University of Iowa developed an instrument to measure the construct of developing purpose as defined by Arthur Chickering (Barratt, 1978).

Chickering's conceptualization of the vector of Developing Purpose consists of three subvectors: Avocational/Recreational
Interests, Vocational Interests, and Style of Life. These three subvectors are not mutually exclusive, but they do deal with different parts of an individual's life. Barratt's instrument attempts to measure each of these three categories of Developing Purpose.

Currently there are three forms of the DPI: Form 1, the pilot instrument; Form 2, the refined version; and a revised scoring version. All forms of the DPI are paper and pencil, Likert-type instruments (always true, often true, rarely true, never true). The scoring sheet has a plus assigned to every item that should be answered in the "always true" direction to indicate development. The items represent behaviors students would have in varying degrees according to their level of development. The DPI has greater number (33 of 45) of positively than negatively scored responses (always true versus never true). This could influence subjects to respond in predominantly one direction.

Chickering's definitions were used as the basis for the 70 items in Form 1. The 70 items (derived through an analysis of item to scale correlations) were dispersed among the three scales. Form 1 was administered to 21 freshmen and 19 seniors with high reliability for each scale.

Form 2 condensed the scales on Form 1 to 45 items by using only the 15 items with the highest item to scale correlations for each of the three subscales. The other revisions made on Form 2 were: reworking some items to allow for negative scoring and
minor alterations of Chickering's definitions from which the items were developed. For instance:

Avocational/Recreational Interests: active participation in fewer specific recreational interests, a broadening of general interest and occasional participation in a wider variety of recreational and social activities, prioritizing social interrelationships, changing dating attitudes and considerations of how marriage might affect one's life. This revision does not include life direction and career choice behaviors or relationships with a spouse in this section as did Chickering's vector. (p. 4)

Vocational Interests: Career considerations, both specific and general (transferred from Chickering's Avocational/Recreational Interests Scale), work and study habits and attitudes, tolerance for other points of view, level of interest in class work and major, level of socialization within major field and participation in work or study requiring extra effort. (p. 4)

Life Style: Relationships with the community, relationships with marriage partners, children and significant others, relationship with self. Interrelationships among these elements are also considered. Development is associated with increasing certainty of plans and actions in a long range framework. This revision has retained Chickering's idea, but has reclassified and narrowed the focus of behaviors being examined in the individuals to his or her life style. (p. 5)

Form 2 has been administered three times, with sample sizes of 167, 50, and 34 to collect longitudinal data.

Reliability measures using Chronbach's alpha coefficient indicate that the scales are measuring consistently. This data can be found in Table 1. However, due to low variance in the samples used, the measure or reliability is necessarily reduced. Inter-scale correlations indicate that separate constructs are being measured with moderate overlap between constructs. However, the results indicate that some of the interrelationships were
higher than intended .4 to .5 and, therefore, not all realms
of behavior are clearly delineated. This data can be found in
Table 2. Test-retest reliability using the Pearson correlation
coefficient over three and six month periods (Table 3) was
consistent, therefore supporting the relative stability of the
DPI. Finally, evidence from one-tailed t-tests revealed three
instances of significant change between testings: scores on the
Avocational/Recreational Interests scale declined significantly
(p less than .05) between the summer (52.2) and fall (50.9) testings;
scores on the Vocational Interests scale declined significantly
(p less than .01) between the summer (57.8) and fall (55.9) testings
and (p less than .001) between the summer (57.0) and spring (54.2)
testings.

The current data on Form 2 of the DPI indicates variable
reliability coefficients ranging from fair to good. The
instrument has detected change over three and six month periods
with good test-retest stability and has shown that freshmen
do change in several expected ways.

Due to the variable reliabilities, Barratt has developed
six new scales to provide more specificity in terms of behavior.
Reliability coefficients for these scales are included in Table 4
and show potential for the scaling concept. The inter-scale
correlations, which are lower than either Form 1 or Form 2, indicate
success in separating the factors that were overlapping on the
erlier scale forms. However, the revised scoring technique is
still experimental. Thus, Form 2 will be utilized in this study to measure psychosocial development in terms of Chickering.

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Reliabilities in Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING '77</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avocational/Recreational Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style of Life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inter-Scale Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMER, 1977</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: These tables are adapted from Moe (1978) page 15.
### TABLE 3
Test-Retest Correlations by Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3-month Retest</th>
<th>6-month Retest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARI</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4
Scale Reliabilities in Cronbach’s Alpha
Revised Scoring Technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Behaviors</td>
<td>10 .68</td>
<td>.61 .80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Behaviors</td>
<td>8 .49</td>
<td>.48 .84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Behaviors</td>
<td>8 .75</td>
<td>.78 .78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Activities</td>
<td>5 .41</td>
<td>.30 .46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Social</td>
<td>4 not available</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Style</td>
<td>10 .71</td>
<td>.70 .66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: These tables are adapted from Mines (1978) page 16.
Mines-Jensen Interpersonal Relationships Inventory (IRI)

Arthur Chickering's (1969) vector of Freeing Interpersonal Relationships consists of an increasing tolerance and respect for people of different backgrounds and a shift in the quality of relationships with peers and intimates. The IRI was developed at the University of Iowa to assess change on this vector in college students (Mines, 1978).

The IRI is a paper and pencil, Likert-type (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree) assessment scale. It is composed of two subscales (Tolerance and Quality of Relationships) with four content areas (peers, adults, friends, and significant others). The Tolerance scale consists of 20 items measuring changes in openness and acceptance of differences in people.

The Quality of Relationships scale consists of 22 items measuring shifts in the quality of relationships. The instrument also included scales to assess perceptions of various "environments on campus" and items to report certain behavior frequencies.

In the development of this instrument, 168 freshmen completed the IRI. To assess change over time, 62 subjects participated in a four-month retest and 36 subjects were retested after eight months. Paired sample t-tests were used to determine the statistical difference between the groups. The Tolerance scale scores were significantly higher at both the four month retesting ($t(61) = 3.67$, $p$ less than .001) and the eight month retesting ($t(75) = 4.56$, $p$ less than .0001). The Quality of Relationships scale was also significantly higher at both the four month retesting ($t(61) = 3.56$, $p$ less than .001).
p less than .001) and the eight month retest (t(61) = 2.17, p less than .037).

The data from both of these scales support Chickering's (1969) hypotheses on the types of experiences that should correlate positively and negatively with change in tolerance and quality of relationships.

The inter-scale correlations were low (.28, .31, .26 for summer, four months, and eight months, respectively); therefore, the Tolerance and Quality of Interpersonal Relationships scales seem to measure different yet related constructs.

Research evidence has led to the conclusions that significant change in Chickering's vector of Freeing Interpersonal Relationships occurs during the first semester of college. This finding is not consistent with Chickering's findings (1969) in that he found individuals do not resolve the vector of Freeing Interpersonal Relationships until approximately their junior and senior year. These differences may indicate that development in Freeing Interpersonal Relationships is now occurring earlier, or the IRI may not be measuring the same phenomena as Chickering's Freeing Interpersonal Relationships. For example, the IRI might be measuring the shift in the quality of relationships associated with social, interpersonal competence, and managing emotions rather than freeing interpersonal relationships. Another possibility is that IRI data reflects changes in tolerance and quality of interpersonal relationships as perceived by self but not as behaviorally described by Chickering. In any case, the instrument does show evidence of developmental change in some form of freeing interpersonal relationships and will be used in this study.
The Goodman-Rodgers Scale

Most instruments used for evaluating resident advisor performance have not been systematically developed, have only face validity and have not been used again in subsequent research (Dolan, 1965; Hutchins, Yost, and Hill, 1976; Thomas, 1974; Shelton and Mathis, 1976; Haldane, 1973). One scale that was systematically constructed and used more than once is the Duncan Scale (Ingram, 1967; Tan Pelt, 1968). Duncan (1967) asked professionals to judge the appropriateness of certain categories of the resident advisor job description for evaluation purposes. Students were then asked to describe positive and negative behaviors of resident advisors. From these two sources, the Duncan rating scale was developed with a split-half reliability of .74. Subsequent studies, however, have not clearly established its effectiveness in resident advisor evaluation (Ingram, 1967). So, in the absence of adequate measures of effectiveness (Boddien and Walsh, 1965; Murphy and Ostenzi, 1966; Harshman, 1974) the Goodman-Rodgers Rating Scale was developed.

The Goodman-Rodgers Rating Scale is a 24-item, paper and pencil, Likert-type (strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree) attitude scale which can be administered in a self-rating or rating-other form. Half of the items are favorably inclined which receive a score of 5 for a "strongly agree" response and a score of 1 for a "strongly disagree" response. The other 12 items are unfavorably inclined statements that receive a score of 5 for "strongly disagree" response and a score of 1 for a "strongly agree" response.
There were two methods employed in the systematic construction of this scale. First, the researchers developed statements that they believed might represent important resident advisor functions by analyzing the job description, holding discussions with resident advisors and directors, and analyzing past research and personal experiences. Second, 51 randomly selected students wrote short paragraphs describing the ideal traits that a resident advisor should and should not possess. There were 124 traits identified and converted into statements.

All of the statements derived from these two methods were then combined and administered to students. The result was a 64-item scale with approximately an equal number of favorable and unfavorable statements. This scale was completed by 106 students. The results were analyzed using the "Internal Consistency Item Analysis Routine" developed by P. T. Cleaver (1968). A Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficient was computed and found to be .9661. Based on this data, the statements were ranked and the best 24 items were selected for the final test form.

A frequency distribution was drawn to assess the scale's ability to discriminate among degrees of attitude. There was a distortion of bunched scores at the mode (93); but, the distribution was a wide range of 63. The results then support the fact that the scale is sensitive to a range of attitudes.

Finally, the 24 items were analyzed according to Cleaver's program of internal consistency. A Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficient was computed (.9394) and still found to be high.
The validation of this instrument consisted of questions on the original test asking for information about the students themselves, and information received from resident advisors. Specifically, it was believed that students who had been referred to a judicial commission would have more negative attitudes toward the resident advisor than those who had never been referred. The researchers also assumed that residents who planned on returning to the building would have more positive attitudes than those who did not intend to return. Finally, students who resident advisors identified as holding positive attitudes toward them should have scored significantly higher on the 24 items than those believed to hold negative or neutral attitudes. A one-tailed t-test on each of these assumptions proved significant as predicted. Therefore, these three sets of evidence support the validity of the Goodman-Rodgers Scale.

Based on the inconclusive evidence supporting other resident advisor rating instruments, the thorough development and positive results found for the Goodman-Rodgers Rating Scale and the fact that it was originally developed for The Ohio State University campus, made this instrument a logical choice for the current study.
CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Relevant literature to this topic is drawn from three areas of study: (1) Use of paraprofessionals in higher education; (2) Selection and evaluation of resident advisors; (3) Cognitive-Structural and Psychosocial Psychology theories of human development and the resident advisor's responsibilities.

Use of Paraprofessionals in Higher Education

The widespread importance and effectiveness of student paraprofessionals, particularly resident advisors, in higher education has been supported by findings from many research studies.

Zunker (1975) mailed questionnaires concerning the use of student paraprofessionals in colleges and universities to a random sample of four-year institutions in 48 states. Of the 87% that responded, 76% used student paraprofessionals. The result indicated that one of the two main functions of these paraprofessionals was as a resident advisor in a residence halls and the majority of reports on the use of these paraprofessionals make effective and positive contributions to college and university Student Personnel Programs.
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At the University of Southern Florida, Allen (1974) reported that a task force found paraprofessionals to be a valid source for evaluating Student Personnel Programs. Findings also indicated that resident advisors serve an important outreach function to the student population, provide university access to and for the student body and relay feedback to the university. Recognizing the significant role student paraprofessionals could serve in higher education, Allen believed that the objective should be to bring paraprofessionals to the point where they can recruit, screen, promote, select, evaluate, train, supervise, and administrate their own programs at an optimal level.

Nickerson and Harrington (1971) examined the counseling role of resident advisors. The researchers found that success as a counselor depended on the individual's maturity level and coping skills. They also claimed that the responsibilities of a resident advisor provide good opportunity for personal growth and satisfaction as well as provide an important tool for contributing significantly to the maturity of college students in residence halls. In fact, Duncan (1967) feels that the key person in the implementation of an effective housing program is the resident advisor and Riker (1965) claims that through the environment and residence hall staff, housing can significantly contribute to students' learning. Resident advisors, therefore, perform an invaluable function to the university and students by identifying roadblocks, helping clear them away and referring individuals to appropriate University services so that remedial action can be initiated rapidly.
The important "professional-like" functions resident advisors serve for both the university and students seem to have resulted from a growing demand for student services in higher education coupled with a shortage of professionals in the field. In response to this situation, several researchers have compared student paraprofessionals' performance effectiveness with that of professionals. Bucci (1979) was interested in what assisting agents students consulted and what the perceived effectiveness of these agents was. Bucci designed a questionnaire which was administered to 567 full-time undergraduates at two Eastern colleges. Evidence from this study indicated that non-professional University affiliated assisting agents (religious counselors, parents, friends, fellow students) were most effective. In fact, about 80% of the college student population in this study reported seeking help from friends and student paraprofessionals with their personal problems.

Snodgrass (1977) compared the effectiveness of undergraduate counselors and professional counselors. Client achievement data from actual counseling sessions revealed that students performed as well as or, in some cases, better than professionals.

Brown and Junker (1966) discovered a growing utilization of college students as paraprofessionals and that they could be as effective as professional counselors in assisting with academic adjustment and guidance of other students.

Finally, a similar study was conducted by Hutchins, Yost, and Hill (1976). These researchers sought to examine the
effectiveness of professionally trained head residents as compared with that of undergraduate resident advisors. The results revealed no significant difference in effectiveness, therefore, indicating that undergraduates can provide many of the same services with the same amount of success that professionals can.

Together the previously mentioned research studies point out the valuable, effective, widespread, and increasing use of resident advisors in colleges and universities. Therefore, these studies support the necessity for continued interest in and further investigation of resident advisor responsibilities, selection, training, and performance.

Selection and Evaluation of Resident Advisors

"The goal of a selection procedure should be to gain sufficient information about a candidate to make for an accurate evaluation of this person" (German, 1979, p. 31). Researchers have responded to this challenge and have studied a variety of methods employed for selecting resident advisors.

Many attempts have been made to use objective personality measures to identify certain personal characteristics or traits that are related to effective performance. These inventories could then be employed as selection tools to identify prospective resident advisors who possessed these personal qualities and would thus function more effectively in the job. Rodgers (1971) administered the Adjective Check List (ACL) to a group of resident advisor candidates at The Ohio State University to measure personality
characteristics. The Goodman Rating Scale and the Rodgers Rating Scale were used to measure effectiveness as rated by directors, residents, and resident advisors. The results indicated a significant relationship between the AGL and resident advisor effectiveness.

Dolan (1965) attempted to identify personal qualities for success as resident advisors and to determine if personality inventories and value inventories could be useful in objectifying the selection process. He found the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) discriminated among successful, average, and unsuccessful groups better than the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) or the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values and concluded that it could therefore be helpful in improving resident advisor selection procedures.

Graff and Bradshaw (1970) investigated the relationship between measures of self actualization using the Personality Orientation Inventory (POI) and resident advisor effectiveness using a semantic differential questionnaire. They hypothesized that a more actualized individual would tend to be living up to his full potential and therefore be more effective in performing the diverse responsibilities of his job. Data analysis revealed several scales as significantly related to resident advisor effectiveness: Inner Directed, Self-Actualization Value, Spontaneity, Acceptance of Aggression. The researchers therefore concluded that the POI may have practical value as a selection tool.
In contrast to these studies reporting a positive relationship between personality inventories and predicting resident advisor effectiveness, many researchers found opposite results.

Atkinson, Williams, and Carb (1973) evaluated the POI as a psychological measure for selecting resident advisors. They used director, resident, and self report ratings on a semantic differential questionnaire to collect effectiveness data. The results of this study did not support the hypothesis that the POI could successfully predict performance (and therefore be used to select resident advisors). Rather, an inverse relationship between the POI and effectiveness was found, if there was any at all. Schrage (1977) also investigated the POI as a possible selection tool in predicting resident advisor performance and again found no significant relationship.

As the previous research studies indicate, the results of investigations on the use of personality inventories for predicting performance have been neither consistent nor conclusive. So, a number of other selection methods have also been examined. Evaluation of actual candidate performance is one such method.

The leaderless group discussion (LGD) is a technique which allows candidates to show what they can do, not just talk about it, and it provides a way for presumed job functions like giving empathy, active listening, and providing leadership, to be used as selection criteria. In this method, candidates meet in groups of five to seven and are given a relevant topic to discuss for a certain period of time. No leader is appointed and trained observers rate group
members on specified criteria which were judged to be predictive of functions that a resident advisor must later exhibit. Mullerzi and Speas (1971) studied this selection method in conjunction with administering the FUI at Southern Illinois University. The researchers found the LGD method to be the best single predictor of selection. It also improved the efficiency of the selection procedure by allowing five to seven candidates to be interviewed at once.

Banta (1969) compared the LGD method and individual interviews to determine which was more valid in predicting resident advisor effectiveness for selection purposes. Although the LGD generally held the raters' interest and attention more than the standard interview, the correlation between the pre- and post- LGD and interview ratings for the chosen resident advisors were identical. Banta also found that a self report biodata sheet can be a valid predictor of job performance; in fact, it proved to be more valid than either the LGD or interview procedure. Haldame's research (1973) did not support the validity of the LGD method as a predictor of job performance either. He investigated the relationship between the California Psychological Inventory (CPI), frequency of social interaction and LGD, and predicting resident advisor performance. The findings did not reveal a significant correlation for the LGD and performance, nor for the social interaction and performance; and, the CPI scales were negatively correlated with subsequent resident advisor performance. So, as with the personality inventory selection method, the LGD technique provided inconsistent results.
Another method of evaluating actual candidate performance was investigated by Wyrick and Mitchell (1971). These researchers taped recorded candidates in a twenty-minute counseling interview with a student actor (the candidates were not certain whether the client was real or role playing). The tape was analyzed and head residents and peers rated the candidates' performance on the Duncan Rating Scale. The results revealed a significant relationship for female resident advisors between empathy and warmth (as rated from the tapes) and effectiveness, but no such relationship was found for male resident advisors.

Interpersonal attitudes and behaviors have also been utilized as selection tools, again with inconclusive results. Biggs (1971) designed a 120 question form to measure and compare head resident evaluations of job performance and resident advisor job viewpoints and interpersonal attitudes. He found that this information was useful for predicting job performance. Using the Fundamental Interpersonal Relationship Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B), which measures interpersonal relationship reported behavior, Rodgers (1971) also found a significant relationship between this measure and predicting resident advisor effectiveness. On the other hand, Bodden and Walsh (1968) used the FIRO-B instrument, director evaluations, and resident advisor self ratings to determine if there was relationship between interpersonal relationships and resident advisor performance. The results did not support any such relationship.
Another interesting approach (Cannon and Peterman, 1973) for which little research has been conducted, is examining an individual's physical fitness and energy level. Candidates were given the option of running, walking, swimming, or cycling to test heart-lung functioning, which is assumed to be the best single indicator of physical fitness and energy level. The researchers believed that these measures provided a more functional selection method than the other frequently used techniques.

Finally, Renz (1976) examined the validity of using a candidate's learning acquisition curve for predicting effectiveness. She assumed that resident advisors who were best able to incorporate the learning they received through training would be the most successful resident advisors. This notion was fully supported by Renz's study; however, few other researchers have investigated this possible method for resident advisor selection so its validity and reliability are still very much in question.

It seems then, that all general selection procedures studied for their relationship to subsequent job performance yield inconsistent results. While a variety of selection criteria have been utilized in selection processes, no method has yet attempted to relate the contributions of developmental psychology to successful prediction of resident advisor performance.

Cognitive-Structural Theories

Of the many cognitive-structural theories (Fowler-stage-development; Loevinger-ego development; Piaget-intellectual
Development of children), Kohlberg's and Perry's theories are of particular interest because of their specific nature and pertinence to the resident advisor job description. Kohlberg's delineates the individual's decision making process on "what ought to be done" in moral situations. This is particularly relevant for the resident advisor who, in a group living situation, must be involved in disciplinary matters, enforcing rules of living together, allocating resources and personal counseling. Perry's scheme, focusing on individual assumptions about the nature of knowledge, values, and responsibility, is germane for the resident advisor who is involved in personal and academic counseling and advising, administrative duties, and organizing educational activities and programs. Both Perry's and Kohlberg's theories describe the reasoning process and share the major cognitive-structural stage theory propositions.

Cognitive-structural theories focus on modes of reasoning or how people think, not what they think about. They are concerned with the form or structure of an individual's basic thinking pattern not the content or issues. Thought is viewed as a prerequisite of behavior; thus, one cannot act in mature moral or intellectual ways unless one can first think in advanced ways. However, Kohlberg cautions that actions in certain situations are not necessarily direct reflections of an individual's stage of reasoning since lower stage reasoning is always part of an individual's repertoire of reasoning modes. As Perry explains, it is possible to look back and use an earlier position since one
never loses a stage attained, instead, she/he is able to choose whether or not to use it (Perry, 1968).

Both Perry's and Kohlberg's theories were based on many formulations that were originated by Piaget, particularly the notion of stage, or as Perry refers to them, "positions of development." A stage (or position) is a relatively stable form and a transition is a less stable form that mediates between stages (Perry, 1968, p. 46). As is true of other cognitive-structural stage theories, these two theories delineate four major criteria or assumptions about stages.

1. Stages (positions) are "structured wholes" or total ways of thinking. They represent discrete mediational sources that filter or determine how individuals' interactions and experiences are translated and interpreted.

2. Stages (positions) are "hierarchically integrated." This implies that each stage incorporates and synthesizes the logic and reasoning of lower stages in such a way that it is a more differentiated, advanced, complex structure of reasoning. Advanced stages are presumably more adequate which implies a hierarchical order of preference for high stages over low stages (Kohlberg, 1971).

3. Stages (positions) occur in an invariant sequence. A stage cannot be lost or skipped and an individual must pass through each stage one at a time, although
the duration of each stage may vary.

4. Stages (positions) are universal. Cross-sectional data suggests that there is a universality of sequence in stages under varying conditions. Cognitive development reflects a common process of development (although the content that is judged may vary) that occurs across cultures.

Stage theories conceptualize development or growth as progression through increasingly complex discrete stages. Following Piaget's active interactional explanation of individual growth and development, Perry and Kohlberg delineate stage change as an interaction between persons and the environment. The environment creates dissonance or instability in which an individual is confronted with stimuli that cannot be handled by his/her existing cognitive structure. The individual then seeks stability by transforming simple earlier cognitive structure to allow for greater complexity. This process consists of applying one's current structure to a situation (by selecting, simplifying or distorting a challenging new experience), changing the external stimulus to "fit" the internal cognitive set of assumptions and restructuring his/her internal cognitive structure in a more refined, integrated, and differentiated manner. However, too much challenge or dissonance can become overwhelming and result in fixation at a stage rather than progression to the next stage.
Based on this notion of stage development and change, Perry's and Kohlberg's theories propose that growth can be induced by an environment of moderate challenge and adequate support. An individual who demonstrates behavior (reasoning) that is one stage above (+1) another person's dominant mode of reasoning can serve as a change agent to foster the growth and development of others.

In support for the idea of facilitating or inducing development through stages, these theorists view growth in the predicted direction (from lowest to highest stage) as desirable since the highest stage represents the "most adequate" mode of information processing, and since "...the word 'growth' suggests that it is better to grow than to arrest growth or to regress. Where the development is laid out as a kind of scale on which a person's position and rate of progress can be measured, then a value becomes assigned to a person in an advanced position relative to others of his age. A similar value is assigned a person with a relatively high rate of growth.... An advanced person showing a high rate of growth becomes somehow a 'better' person" (Perry, 1968, p. 44).

Perry and Kohlberg are in agreement about the nature of cognitive development and are similar in the major, general aspects of their theories. However, the specific type of reasoning (moral versus intellectual and ethical) and stage descriptions they delineate are different.
Kohlberg's Model of Moral Development

Kohlberg's theory of moral development proposes that, in their interactions with the environment, individuals acquire and refine moral judgments through an invariant sequence of six hierarchical stages. Each stage depicts a qualitatively different set of assumptions or rules to analyze and make decisions on 'what ought to be done' in moral situations where there are competing claims. The six stages span three general levels of moral development: Preconventional, Conventional, and Postconventional.

Preconventional

An individual is responsive to cultural rules and labels of good and bad, right and wrong, but interprets these labels in terms of either the physical or the hedonistic consequences of action (punishment, reward, exchange of favors) or in terms of the physical power of those who enunciated the rules and labels.

Stage 1: The punishment and obedience orientation. The physical consequences of action determine its goodness or badness regardless of the human meaning or value of these consequences. Avoidance of punishment and unquestioning deference to power are valued in their own right, not in terms of respect for an underlying moral order supported by punishment and authority.

Stage 2: The instrumental relativist orientation. Right action consists of that which instrumentally satisfies one's own needs and occasionally the needs of others. Human relations are viewed in terms like those of the market place. Elements of fairness, reciprocity and of equal sharing are present but they are always interpreted in a physical pragmatic way. Reciprocity is a
matter of "you scratch my back, and I'll scratch yours," not of loyalty, gratitude, or justice. Obligations are limited to self and one's own ends.

Conventional

Maintaining the expectation of the individual's family, group, or nation is perceived as valued in its own right, regardless of immediate and obvious consequences. The attitude is not only one of conformity to personal expectations and social order, but of loyalty to it, of actively maintaining, supporting, and justifying the order and of identifying with the persons or group involved in it.

Stage 3: The interpersonal concordance or "good boy-nice girl" orientation. Good behavior is that which pleases or helps others and is approved by them. There is much conformity to stereotypical images of what is considered "natural behavior." Behavior is frequently judged by intention—"he means well" becomes important for the first time. One earns approval for being "nice." Obligation is defined by role rules.

Stage 4: The "law and order" orientation. There is orientation toward authority, fixed rules, and the maintenance of the social order. Right behavior consists of doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, and maintaining the given social order for its own sake. Responsibility comes from being a member of society.

Postconventional

Effort to define moral values and principles which have validity and application apart from the authority of the group or persons holding these principles, and apart from the individual's
own identification with these groups.

Stage 5: The social-contract legalistic orientation generally with utilitarian overtones. Right action tends to be defined in terms of general individual rights, and standards which have been critically examined and agreed upon by the whole society. There is a clear awareness of the relativism of personal values and opinions and a corresponding emphasis on procedural rules for reaching consensus. The result is an emphasis upon the "legal point of view," but with an emphasis upon the possibility of changing law in terms of rational considerations of social utility (rather than freezing it in terms of Stage 4 "law and order"). Outside the legal realm, free agreement and contract is the bonding element of obligation; and, obligation is in contract to have one's own rights respected and protected and a concern for the welfare of others.

Stage 6: The universal ethical principle orientation. Right is defined by the decision of conscience in accord with self-chosen ethical principles appealing to logical comprehensiveness, universality, and consistency. These principles are abstract and ethical (the Golden Rule, the categorical imperative); they are not concrete moral rules like the Ten Commandments. At heart, these are universal principles of justice, of the reciprocity and equality of human rights and of respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons. Any right of just claim by an individual gives rise to a corresponding duty to another individual (Kohlberg, 1973).

While Kohlberg's original research was conducted with individuals of all ages and delineates the development of moral reasoning, Perry utilizes college students in his study to trace the development of intellectual and ethical reasoning.
Perry's Model of Intellectual and Ethical Reasoning

Perry proposes a series of positions (stages) that depict an invariant hierarchically ordered set of expectations with which to perceive, organize, and evaluate experiences pertaining to the nature and origin of knowledge, value, and responsibility. Progression of these positions is from concrete, egocentric, and undifferentiated reasoning to more abstract, objective, and differentiated relations with the world. The course of development consists of nine possible stages spanning three broad levels of intellectual and ethical reasoning: Dualism, Relativism, and Commitment in Relativism.

Dualism

All information can be classified as either right or wrong and ambiguity is an unnatural phenomenon which has to be explained away. Learning, knowledge, and values are matters of finding and mastering "right."

Position 1: The world is viewed in polar terms of we-right-good versus other-wrong-bad. Right answers for everything exist in the Absolute known to authority whose role is to mediate (teach) them. Knowledge and goodness are perceived as quantitative accretions of discrete rightness to be collected by hard work and obedience.

Position 2: Diversity of opinion and uncertainty are perceived and accounted for as unwarranted confusion in poorly qualified Authorities or as mere exercises set by Authority "so we can learn to find The Answers for ourselves." Right and wrong still exist.
Position 3: All knowledge and values are either right or wrong, yet uncertainty and diversity are accepted as legitimate but still temporary in areas where Authority "hasn't found The Answer yet." A student supposes Authority grades in these areas on "good expression" but remains puzzled as to standards. Uncertainty is explained by the use of time.

Relativism

Absolute right/wrong conceptions of knowledge and values are modified. The world of knowledge is seen as relativistic and uncertainty becomes legitimate. Students become aware that the "truths" they create emerge from their own experience and judgment as well as from external factors.

Position 4: (a) Uncertainty and diversity of opinion is legitimate and extensive. However, it exists in an unordered diversity in which everyone has a right to their own opinions, all ideas are equally valued. This takes precedent over and against Authority's realm where right/wrong still prevails or (b) Qualitative contextual relativistic reasoning as a special case of "What They want" within Authority's realm. Dualistic assumptions are broken down but the notion of evidence or qualitative distinctions are not yet integrated.

Position 5: Students perceive all knowledge and values as contextual and relativistic and subordinates dualistic right/wrong functions to the status of a special case, in context. "Better" and "worse" can be discriminated in terms of a variety of dimensions. Concern with the nature of knowledge intersects with personal life in terms of identity questions - if right answers do not exist, then how does one go about living one's life? Feelings of
being lost and alone often accompany this position.

Position 6: Students recognize that identity and values in a relativistic world will only emerge through personal commitment (as distinct from unquestioned or unconsidered commitment to simple belief in certainty).

Commitment in Relativism

A student attempts to define identity through the act of choice. Responsibility in a pluralistic world is accepted and identity is established by acts of commitment. The student understands and functions according to the recognition that events must be kept in perspective and interpreted in accordance with specific time, place, and person variables.

Position 7: The student makes an initial commitment in some area, usually vocational.

Position 8: The student experiences the implications of commitment and explores the subjective and stylistic issues of responsibility. The student recognizes that within oneself are many paradoxical personal themes and that identity resolution requires finding a point of equilibrium.

Position 9: The student experiences the affirmation of identity among multiple responsibilities and realizes commitment as an ongoing, unfolding activity through which he/she expresses his/her life style.

Development does not always advance in a smooth, consistent manner. It may be suspended or halted at certain points during normal progression through the positions. Unlike Kohlberg, Perry
introduces three alternatives to growth that can occur when an individual is presented with too much challenge and not enough support.

1. Temporizing describes a pause in development for a year or more. This is often a conscious decision when an individual is overwhelmed with the ambiguity and complexity of the steps that lie ahead (after absolutistic reasoning). It is as if the individual simply stops growing in order to gather strength to face the complex world awaiting him or her.

2. Escape is a situation in which an individual exploits detachment by avoiding personal responsibility. She/He recognizes that growth and commitment exist but are not emotionally ready to deal with this yet.

3. Retreat is a dramatic, more permanent situation in which an individual entrenches him/herself in the adhering or oppositional dualism of positions 2 or 3. This happens as a reaction to the complexity foreseen or experienced in the more advanced positions.

**Psychosocial Psychology Theories**

Both Kohlberg's theory of moral development and Perry's theory of intellectual and ethical development are cognitive-structural
theories in a stage orientation. They emphasize the structure of reasoning (how). In contract to this family of theories, psycho-
social theories emphasize the content (what) of development. Among
the many current psychosocial theories (Sheehy, Gould, and
Levinson—adult theories focusing on middle and late adult years),
Chickering's is most appropriate for a college age population.
His detailed description of development during college years is
pertinent for understanding a resident advisor's performance of
such duties as building a sense of community for close friendships,
assisting and designing effective developmental programs and
activities.

Chickering's Model

Chickering's concept of psychosocial development describes
the kind of development that can occur and focuses on what tasks
a person must deal with at certain times in their young adulthood
development. Development is the gradual, ongoing process of
resolving (either positively or negatively) a series of vectors
(stages). Each vector is defined by a particular task of issue
that must be resolved. Chickering's vectors are based on the
following major psychosocial assumptions:

1. Vectors are sequential but not invariant.

   Longitudinal and cross-sectional data support
   the notion that there is a general sequence
   through which an individual passes during the
course of development. However, the order is
not fixed, and there is a tendency for vector
tasks to recycle throughout life.

2. Vectors are culturally bound. Chickering believes
that up through puberty, tasks may be universal,
however after that when psychological aspects
of development predominate culturally bound
influencing factors take effect. This implies
different orders of particular vectors of
development. Also, there is no single right
way to resolve a task, rather, people apply
their individual styles to each developmental
crisis.

3. Vectors are cumulative and qualitatively different.
They are cumulative in the sense that the way
(positive or negative) that an individual resolves
a vector directly influences the healthy
resolution of any task thereafter. They are
qualitatively different in that every vector
represents a specific crisis or task. The
coping skills that they require, which determine
the adequate adjustment within each vector,
require qualitatively different coping skills
as well.

4. Vectors are cohesive, conscious, and general
in scope. Individuals are usually consciously
preoccupied with the tasks that are the predominant influences at particular points in their life. A vector is also all encompassing in the sense that it includes the realms of thinking, feeling, and behaving.

Chickering's conceptual approach to psychosocial development consists of seven vectors that describe student development between the ages 18-25: Developing Competence, Managing Emotions, Developing Autonomy, Establishing Identity, Freeing Interpersonal Relationships, Developing Purpose and Developing Integrity.

1. Developing Competence occurs in three areas: intellectual, physical and social.

INTELLECTUAL: This subvector focuses on ego development which depends on the ability to symbolize thoughts, language, and events abstractly. Positive resolution allows one to modify their own speech, clarify his/her own identity, autonomy and self direction, think clearly, handle abstractions and contribute in group discussions.

PHYSICAL: Development and integration in other areas is fostered as objects and events are tied to symbols through action. A high premium is placed on athletics which allows for the expression of a wide range of otherwise controlled emotions.

SOCIAL: This develops through effort and efficacy in interactions with others. Positive resolution results in an understanding and functioning in a cooperative effort where one is capable of talking and listening, leading and following, understanding motives and concerns of others, varying one's own role in response to different conditions and avoiding imposition of one's own opinions.
2. Managing Emotions is an issue of self control. Emotions must be recognised, felt, experienced and expressed honestly to develop a realistic awareness of and ability to manage them. This requires tentative testing through actions with delayed gratification which increases one's tolerance of anxiety and stimulates personal integration. Integration, awareness and tolerance foster self control which in turn allows for greater openness to new information and experiences, the ability to process it, and successful management of emotions.

3. Developing autonomy has three major components: emotional independence, instrumental independence, and interdependence.

EMOTIONAL INDEPENDENCE: This subvector involves resolving the conflicting pressure between parental and peer pressure in such a way as to decrease dependency on parents and increase reliance on peers. Earlier rebellion towards authority gives way to an openness to new experiences, initiate action and disagree with others.

INSTRUMENTAL INDEPENDENCE: This subvector is characterized by resourcefulness and organization. One can carry on activities independently, efficiently, and with flexibility.

INTERDEPENDENCE: This subvector depicts the recognition that an individual cannot exist in a vacuum. One develops an awareness of the whole, integrated picture of situations and relationships. Emotional support is given by peers and adults creates a basis for tolerating differences, accepting responsibility and recognizing strengths and weaknesses in oneself and others.

4. Establishing Identity has three major components: confidence, sexual identity and conceptions about body and appearance.

CONFIDENCE: This aspect describes an assuredness in oneself and in necessary dependence upon outside sources.
SEXUAL IDENTITY: This component is a clarification and an acceptance and control of one's own sexual feelings as natural and normal.

CONCEPTIONS ABOUT BODY AND APPEARANCE: This aspect reflects an accurate self-perception and acceptance of one's appearance. Appearance and dress represent a "varied balancing of personal preferences, the desires of others and situational expectations." (Chickering, 1969, p. 83).

5. *Freeing Interpersonal Relationships* consists of two aspects: increased tolerance and respect for other people of different backgrounds and a shift in the quality of relationships.

TOLERANCE: This component depicts an increasing acceptance of diversity which expands the person's sensitivities and range of alternatives for satisfying exchanges and friendships. There is a greater capacity to respond to persons in their own right.

QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIPS: This component involves a change in relationships with friends from dependency through independence toward interdependence which allows individuals more wide-ranging freedom of movement and behaviors. It is characterized by greater trust and stability. (Mines, 1978)


AVOCATIONAL/RECREATIONAL INTERESTS: This subvector reflects the extent to which an individual has formed a pattern of regular or frequent behaviors indicating a reduced set of activities of specific interest. This includes a broadening of general interests, general career choice and life direction, marriage considerations and stabilization of social relationships.

VOCATIONAL INTERESTS: This subvector indicates how seriously committed a person is to a specific direction in relation to career choice. Study habits, attitudes toward study and how much the student
considers him/herself as a member of his/her major field are three significant concerns of this subvector.

STYLE OF LIFE: This third subvector depicts the extent to which the student has integrated life vocational and non-vocational plans into a meaningful whole. Included are moral and ethical developments as they relate to the type of life that the student is leading and would like to lead in the future. (Barratt, 1978)

7. Developing Integrity involves three overlapping stages: humanizing of values, personalizing of values, and developing congruence.

HUMANIZING OF VALUES: This stage refers to a shift from a literal belief in the absoluteness of rules to a more relative view. Childhood values that were internalized are examined and consciously modified.

PERSONALIZING OF VALUES: This aspect occurs as the new, examined values are assembled. These values are selected to "fit" him/herself and the conditions of his/her existence and can be applied with greater flexibility.

DEVELOPING CONGRUENCE: Finally, in this stage, an individual deals with achieving behavior consistent with the personalized values held. Once the implications of a situation are understood and the consequences of options seem clear, the response is highly determined and made with conviction. An individual is ready to defend the dignity of his/her own personal life style. (Chickering, 1969)

Chickering found that through the college years individuals develop increasingly more effective ways of dealing with each of these vectors. He also found the "...students who spent four uninterrupted years in college changed more than their peers who
spent four years of job experience by becoming more intellectual and particularly by developing the critical, flexible, nonjudgmental kind of thinking assessed by measurements of autonomy" (p. 321). These findings support the strong influence colleges and universities can have on student development. To clarify this further, Chickering also discusses six major sources of influence: internal consistency and clarity of objectives; institutional size; curriculum, teaching, and evaluation; Residence Hall arrangements; faculty and administration; student culture.

1. **Clarity and Consistency of Objectives:** College impact is increased as objectives are clear and taken seriously. Stronger value commitments follow more explicit objectives.

2. **Institutional Size:** Excessive size can lead to redundancy. Redundancy creates a situation of reduced individual participation and satisfaction. Opportunities to cope are limited and experiences are less varied.

3. **Curriculum, Teaching, and Evaluation:** Choice, flexibility, direct experience, discussion, frequent communication, and evaluation fosters personal development.

4. **Residence Hall Arrangement:** Close friends, reference groups, the general attitude and values inherent in the goals and objectives in the hall itself all work together to build a
challenging and supportive atmosphere for
growth and development.

5. **Faculty and Administration:** Teachers can fill
in for parents and serve as models so that new
relationships with authorities and
interdependence develops. Frequent interactions
in diverse settings are optimal conditions for
this type of relationship.

6. **Student Culture:** Student culture interprets
the range of tolerance, consequences, and
responsibility individuals will develop.
It defines acceptable work conditions and
frameworks for attitudes and activities.

Chickering not only delineates major sources of influence
on the developmental process, but he also proposes three specific
ways in which change or growth in general takes place: epigenesis,
developmental dissonance, and challenge/support.

1. **Epigenesis** is the tendency for anything that
grows to have a plan of ascendency. Within
every person are two processes—physiological
and psychological. These are combined in a
ratio which determines when internal demands
"surface" or "unfold." This is a biological
function over which individuals have no
direct control. Thus, growth occurs whether
a vector has been adequately resolved or not.
2. Developmental dissonance is the tension that results when internal demands collide with external conditions (society). This is also referred to as a developmental crisis and occurs with each task of the seven vectors. If there is no dissonance, there will be no growth or change.

3. The amount of challenge and support one encounters over a vector determines the adequacy of its resolution. Balance between these two is essential for positive resolution of the task. Chickering refers to this situation as integration.

Although Chickering proposes a biological factor in the change process, his notions still bear similarities to the cognitive-structural theories. Both recognize the importance of appropriate challenge and adequate support and dissonance in the developmental process. Perry's and Kohlberg's cognitive-structural theories also agree with Chickering's psychosocial theory concerning how and why change should be induced. Chickering believes that moderate challenge and adequate support from the college environment is necessary for fostering development in college students. In support for actively intervening in the growth process, Chickering claims that "Educational institutions exist to foster learning, student development, and ultimately an improved existence for mankind" (Chickering, 1969, p. 34).
Adjustment to the university, diverse residence hall programs, community living, rules and regulations, and individuals from different cultures and backgrounds all provide challenge for the college resident. By examining residence hall life and the resident advisor job description, it is apparent that resident advisors can supply the appropriate support through programming efforts, facilitating governance processes, promoting a sense of community, handling disciplinary matters and providing paraprofessional counseling services.

In summary, with resident advisors becoming an integral part of the college learning experience, the necessity for a good selection procedure is more crucial. Although those responsible for the selection of resident advisors are aware of the importance of choosing those individuals who would be best suited to meet the needs of the program in providing a competent service, their efforts toward reflecting such an awareness in their selection procedures are generally informal, lacking in rationale and as a result, inconsistent (Riker, 1968).

As previously illustrated, resident advisor job responsibilities are intuitively related to the level of cognitive and psychosocial development. According to Kohlberg's, Perry's, and Chickering's theories, individuals at higher or more advanced stages are better able to cope with responsibility, ambiguity, and interpersonal interactions as well as stimulate the development of others. It would seem then, that measurements of cognitive and psychosocial
development could be utilized in resident advisor selection procedures to help choose those individuals best suited to perform the resident advisor responsibilities effectively. This could in turn strengthen the residence hall program. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to determine the existence of a relationship between the level of psychosocial, moral, intellectual, and ethical reasoning to job performance effectiveness of resident advisors as measured by several developmental assessment instruments.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Table 5 contains the mean scores, standard deviations and ranges obtained for each independent (predictor) variable for the coeducational group of resident advisors. Generally, the scores are consistent with theoretical predictions (Chickering, 1968; Rest, 1976; Rodgers, 1979).

The mean principled reasoning ("P") score for the coed group on the Defining Issues Test (DIT) was 44.38, which indicates that the resident advisors were making decisions based on "principled moral considerations" about 44% of the time. This score is consistent with the Rest et al. (1976a) findings for college students (mean = 42.3). However, close examination of the resident advisor range of scores indicates an unexpected result. Compared to the 21.9 mean "P" for junior high students and the 53.3 mean for graduate students which Rest et al. (1976a) found, the resident advisors' scores ranged from an exceptionally low 16.7 to an unusually high 73.3 for college age students.

Scores on the Intellectual and ethical reasoning assessment instrument (PI) for the coed group were consistent with studies conducted at the University of Maryland, University of Minnesota, The Ohio State University, and several small colleges (Rodgers, 1980).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIT</td>
<td>44.384</td>
<td>14.237</td>
<td>16.700 - 73.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>3.051</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>2.150 - 4.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRI 1 ( Tol)</td>
<td>56.789</td>
<td>4.714</td>
<td>47.000 - 67.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRI 2 ( Qual)</td>
<td>68.711</td>
<td>6.413</td>
<td>52.000 - 83.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFI 1 ( Avoc)</td>
<td>54.421</td>
<td>5.980</td>
<td>43.000 - 72.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFI 2 ( Voc)</td>
<td>56.711</td>
<td>7.304</td>
<td>44.000 - 90.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFI 3 ( SOL)</td>
<td>58.263</td>
<td>8.169</td>
<td>33.000 - 75.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 1 ( Con)</td>
<td>69.711</td>
<td>8.683</td>
<td>42.000 - 86.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 2 ( SI)</td>
<td>78.158</td>
<td>13.306</td>
<td>48.000 - 102.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 3 ( CABA)</td>
<td>59.895</td>
<td>9.203</td>
<td>42.000 - 75.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Eval.</td>
<td>76.366</td>
<td>4.197</td>
<td>69.230 - 83.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Eval.</td>
<td>70.763</td>
<td>11.495</td>
<td>52.000 - 88.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>3.097</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>2.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRI 1 (To1)</td>
<td>56.864</td>
<td>5.027</td>
<td>56.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRI 2 (Qual)</td>
<td>70.091</td>
<td>5.580</td>
<td>66.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI 1 (Avoc)</td>
<td>55.591</td>
<td>6.530</td>
<td>52.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI 2 (Voc)</td>
<td>58.500</td>
<td>8.394</td>
<td>54.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI 3 (Sol)</td>
<td>58.682</td>
<td>8.571</td>
<td>57.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 1 (Com)</td>
<td>70.227</td>
<td>10.565</td>
<td>69.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 2 (SI)</td>
<td>81.636</td>
<td>12.993</td>
<td>73.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 3 (CABA)</td>
<td>59.227</td>
<td>9.532</td>
<td>60.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Eval.</td>
<td>75.352</td>
<td>4.229</td>
<td>77.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Eval.</td>
<td>69.182</td>
<td>12.176</td>
<td>72.938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 22  
N = 16
The mean for the entire group was 3.05. This indicates that most resident advisors were in the last vestiges of dualism, still believing that right and wrong exist but granting temporary legitimacy to uncertainty and diversity until Authorities find the Answers.

Generally, mean scores on the Interpersonal Relationship Inventory (IRI), Developing Purpose Inventory (DPI), and Establishing Identity Scale (EIS) for the coed group are comparable to the findings of the original studies conducted with these instruments and consistent with theoretical predictions according to Chickering (1968). These studies were all done with college freshmen at the University of Iowa.

Mines (1978) found the Quality of Relationships (IRI2) scale mean to be higher than the Tolerance (IRI1) scale, indicating that college students were more effective in dealing with changes in the quality of their interpersonal relationships than they were in being open and accepting of differences in other people. This trend was also found in the current study with a resident advisor mean of approximately 12 points higher on the IRI2 scale than on the IRI1 scale. The actual mean scores obtained for college freshmen (Mines, 1978) and for the resident advisors are similar. This likeness would not be predicted according to Chickering's (1968) theory. It would be expected that juniors and seniors are more "mature" in their resolution of the task of freeing interpersonal relationships (which the IRI purports to measure) than freshmen; and, therefore, juniors and seniors should score higher on both scales.

For the DPI scales, the coed group of resident advisor scored highest on Style of Life (DPI3), second highest on Vocational
Interests (DPI2) and lowest on Avocational Interests (DPI1). In theoretical terms (Chickering, 1968), this implies that within the task of developing purpose, handling relationships with the community, family, and significant others seems to be more positively resolved than career and study habit/attitude issues which in turn is more positively resolved than the areas of recreational and social activities. These findings are somewhat different than those of Barratt (1978). First of all, Barratt found a greater difference in actual mean scores between each of the subscales than was evident in resident advisor scores. He also found his freshman population to be most advanced on the DPI1 scale, then the DPI3 scale and finally the DPI2 scale. This difference between resident advisor results and Barratt's results is consistent with Chickering's (1968) predictions. Chickering suggests that in contrast to the more social, recreational concerns of students in the first two years of college, during the last two years of college career and lifestyle concerns are a major focus of individuals' lives. The data presented here seem to support this notion in that the resident advisors scored highest (most positively developed) on the lifestyle and career issues while Barratt's (1978) freshmen scored highest on the social/recreational scale and lowest on the career, work, and study areas.

Finally, scores on the three EIS scales did in fact reflect the same trend as the original study conducted by Erwin (1978) with the Sexual Identity (EIS2) scale scored highest, Confidence (EIS1) second and Concepts About Body and Appearance (EIS3) third.
The junior and senior resident advisor mean scores on each scale were also higher than Irwin's freshmen mean scores as would be predicted according to Chickering (1968). This data indicates that the junior and senior population had resolved the establishing identity task more positively than the freshmen population. It also appears that the issue of understanding and accepting one's sexual feelings (EIS2) followed by an assuredness in oneself (EIS1) and finally by accepting one's perceptions about their body and appearance (EIS3) is the order in which college students resolve these issues within the task of establishing identity.

Table 6 shows the means and standard deviations for the female and male groups of resident advisors. On all predictor variables, female resident advisors scored higher than male resident advisors while on the two criteria variables male resident advisors scored higher. Table 7 summarizes the differences between female and male scores. Female resident advisor means on the DIT (48.109), DPI2 (58.500), and EIS2 (81.636) were all significantly higher than male means (39.263, 54.250, and 73.375, respectively). This indicates that female resident advisors define values and principles apart from the authority of individuals or the group more so than male resident advisors, they have resolved career considerations more positively, and hold more positive work/study habits and attitudes than the men and they are more accepting and understanding of their sexual feelings than are male resident advisors. On the other hand, female resident advisors (75.352) were rated significantly lower (p < .08) than male resident advisors.
TABLE 7
Summary of Differences Between Female and Male Resident Advisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIT</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>48.109</td>
<td>13.760</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.263</td>
<td>13.660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>3.097</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.988</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRI 1 (Sel)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>56.864</td>
<td>5.027</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56.688</td>
<td>4.408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRI 2 (Quant)</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>70.091</td>
<td>5.580</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.813</td>
<td>7.157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI 1 (Avoc)</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>55.591</td>
<td>6.329</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.813</td>
<td>4.873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI 2 (Voc)</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>58.500</td>
<td>8.394</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.250</td>
<td>4.669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI 3 (SOL)</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>58.682</td>
<td>8.571</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.688</td>
<td>7.821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 1 (Con)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>70.227</td>
<td>10.565</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69.000</td>
<td>5.367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 2 (SI)</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>81.636</td>
<td>12.993</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.375</td>
<td>12.580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETS 3 (CARA)</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>59.127</td>
<td>9.532</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETS 3 (CASA)</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>60.813</td>
<td>8.953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
<td>75.352</td>
<td>4.229</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77.759</td>
<td>3.840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Evaluation</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>69.182</td>
<td>12.176</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.928</td>
<td>10.472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant.
First mean scores are female resident advisors.
Second mean scores are male resident advisors.
(77.759) in effectiveness by their floor residents. This finding is consistent with all studies to date using the Goodman-Rodgers Scale. They have shown a pattern of male raters giving higher scores than female raters. This implies that in spite of the fact that females seem to be at higher levels of cognitive and psychosocial development than males, it is the male resident advisor who is rated as more effective by residents.

Intercorrelations among the predictor and criteria variables for the coed group of resident advisors are given in Table 8. A significant positive correlation was found between director ratings and the mean score on the DPI3 (p < .03). Two negative correlations were found for the entire resident advisor group, one between director ratings and Dit (p < .06) the other between resident ratings and DPI1 (p < .05).

For the female group (Table 9), no relationships were significantly positively correlated; however, several were negatively correlated. The IF was negatively correlated (p < .05) with student ratings and (p < .07) with the director rating. The Dit was negatively correlated (p < .01) with director ratings. A negative relationship was also found between director ratings and EIS1 (p < .06) and EIS2 (p < .04).

For the male group (Table 10), director ratings positively correlated (p < .07) with the DPI3 and with the EIS2 (p < .05). The IRI2 (p < .02), EIS2 (p < .08) and EIS3 (p < .06) were found to have positive correlations with student ratings. One negative correlation (p < .06) was found between student rating and DPI1.
### TABLE 8
Pearson Correlations Between Predictors and Evaluation Ratings for Coeducational Group of 38 Resident Advisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>RESIDENT</th>
<th></th>
<th>DIRECTOR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIT</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-0.256</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>-0.134</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRI 1 (Tol)</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRI 2 (Qual)</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFI 1 (Avoc)</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFI 2 (Voc)</td>
<td>-0.176</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFI 3 (SOL)</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 1 (Con)</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-0.225</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 2 (Sl)</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-0.117</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 3 (CaBA)</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>RESIDENT MEAN</th>
<th>RESIDENT SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</th>
<th>DIRECTOR MEAN</th>
<th>DIRECTOR SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIT</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-0.466</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>-0.361</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>-0.329</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRI 1 (Tol)</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRI 2 (Qual)</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI 1 (Avoc)</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI 2 (Voc)</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI 3 (SOL)</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 1 (Con)</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-0.346</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 2 (SI)</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-0.370</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 3 (GABA)</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Evaluation</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>RESIDENT</th>
<th></th>
<th>DIRECTOR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIT</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRI 1 (Tol)</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRI 2 (Qual)</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI 1 (Avoc)</td>
<td>-0.408</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI 2 (Voc)</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI 3 (SOL)</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 1 (Con)</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>3.172</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 2 (SI)</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 3 (CABA)</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Evaluation</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant
Significant relationships were also found between director and student evaluation ratings. The overall mean obtained by directors, 70.763, on the Goodman-Bodgers Rating Scale for the coed group of resident advisors was much lower than that obtained by students, 76.366 (see Table 5). The same trend was found for both the female and male groups as well (Table 6). For the female group, the director mean (69.182) was approximately 6 points lower than the mean for the students (75.352) while the director mean (72.938) for the male group was approximately 5 points lower than the student mean (77.759). Close examination of the range for director scores reveals that almost half of the 38 resident advisors were rated lower than the lowest score given by students. Hence, for the resident advisor evaluation scale, it appears that directors and students rate resident advisor effectiveness consistently differently with directors rating lower than students.

Intercorrelations among the criteria variables can be found in Tables 8, 5, and 10. For the coed group of resident advisors, a significant positive correlation of 0.493 (p < .001) was found between student and director ratings. For the female group, a significant positive relationship, 0.443 (p < .02), was found between student and director ratings. Finally, for the male group, a positive correlation, 0.525 (p < .02), was found between student and director ratings.

In order to determine whether there was a significant difference between more effective and less effective resident advisors, comparisons between variable means for both groups were computed using a two-tailed
t-test. For both criterion variables, the mean evaluation score for effective resident advisors was significantly greater (p<.001 for student evaluations and p<.02 for director evaluations) than the mean for less effective groups. It also appears that those resident advisors who were rated by students as more effective and less effective also received significantly different evaluation scores by directors (p<.004). Likewise, resident advisors rated by directors as more effective and less effective received significantly different evaluation scores by students (p<.0001).

To determine whether or not resident advisors who were rated as more effective also scored higher on the developmental assessment scales, mean scores on each predictor variable were compared for the more and less effective groups. Again, a two-tailed t-test was used to make the comparisons. Few predictor scales discriminated between more and less effective resident advisors. Table 11 contains a summary of this information for the entire cohort group. For student evaluations, the DPI1 and DPI2 differentiated between the more and less effective groups but in a negative relationship. In other words, more effective resident advisors scored significantly lower on the DPI1 and DPI2 than less effective resident advisors. On all other scales, except the PI, more effective resident advisors scored higher than less effective but the relationships were not statistically significant.

For the director evaluations, the DPI3 appears to differentiate between more and less effective resident advisors with more effective resident advisors scoring significantly higher (p<.02) than less
### TABLE 11
Summary of Differences Between More Effective and Less Effective Resident Advisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT EVALUATION</th>
<th>DIRECTOR EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>t</strong></td>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIT</strong></td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PI</strong></td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IRI 1 (Tol)</strong></td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IRI 2 (Qual)</strong></td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DPI 1 (Avoc)</strong></td>
<td>-1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DPI 2 (Vcc)</strong></td>
<td>-1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DPI 3 (JOL)</strong></td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KIS 1 (Con)</strong></td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KIS 2 (SI)</strong></td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KIS 3 (CABA)</strong></td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>16.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.004*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant

First mean and SD are more effective resident advisors
Second mean and SD are less effective resident advisors
effective resident advisors. Again, more effective resident advisors seem to score higher on most of the predictor scales than less effective resident advisors but not to a significant degree.

Interestingly, on almost all of the predictor scales for both more and less effective resident advisors, mean scores were higher for director evaluations than student evaluations. More effective resident advisors, as rated by directors, scored higher overall on predictor scales than more effective resident advisors as rated by students (see Table 5). This is because the total range of director evaluation scores (which determined who was considered more or less effective) was much wider than that for student evaluation scores.

So, more effective resident advisors, as rated by directors, had higher actual evaluation scores; and, therefore, as would be expected, had higher predictor scale means than those for student evaluations. On the other hand, it is surprising that although the less effective resident advisors (as rated by directors) received lower actual evaluation scores than less effective resident advisors as rated by students, on the average, they scored slightly higher developmentally.

To summarize, director and student ratings identified a few differences in the cognitive and psychosocial development of more effective and less effective resident advisors. Students rated higher those resident advisors who saw themselves as active in only a few recreational activities rather than holding broad general interests, who tended not to prioritize social relationships and who were not yet in depth in their attitudes about dating or
understanding of how marriage can affect one's life as measured by the DPI1. More effective resident advisors seemed to be those who saw themselves as not yet settled on career habits/attitudes and not yet very tolerant of diverse points of view, as measured by the DPI2. Resident advisors with a slightly more dualistic view of the world and education were also rated as more effective than resident advisors moving toward a more multiplicitic understanding approach. In all other areas of cognitive and psychosocial development (moral reasoning, openness to differences in people, shift in quality of relationships, self assuredness, acceptance of own sexual identity and perceptions of own body and appearance) more effective resident advisors, as evaluated by students, scored slightly higher in development than less effective resident advisors.

For directors, effective resident advisors saw themselves as holding healthy, interrelated relationships with the community, family and significant others, as measured by the DPI3. They also made plans within a long range framework, showing a more global, realistic understanding of life and relationships. More effective resident advisors also tended to be slightly more open and free in interpersonal relationships, slightly more advanced in work/study habits and attitudes and interested in a wide variety of recreational and social activities, and slightly more accepting of their sexual feelings and appearance by directors. However, directors rated resident advisors who scored lower on the DIT, PI, and EIS1 as more effective than those who scored higher. This implies that effective resident advisors, as rated by directors, were more dualistic, more likely to define moral values and
principles based on the authority of a person or group and somewhat less self assured than less effective resident advisors.

Finally, a step-wise regression procedure was used to determine the best linear equation of independent variables to predict the dependent variables. However, no combination of independent variables correlated highly enough with the dependent variables to produce a significant correlational equation. The Correlation Matrix (Table 13) for the predictor variables can be found in Appendix D.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the cognitive and psychosocial developmental levels of more effective and less effective resident advisors differed significantly. The study was also designed to determine whether cognitive and psychosocial development characteristics were significantly related to resident advisor effectiveness as evaluated by student residents and residence hall directors at The Ohio State University. Finally, if the cognitive and psychosocial development assessment instruments were able to predict performance effectiveness, the study was intended to investigate the potential use of these instruments in a resident advisor selection process.

The level of cognitive development was measured by a moral reasoning assessment instrument (DIT) and an intellectual and ethical reasoning assessment instrument (PI). Psychosocial development was measured by the two subscales of the Interpersonal Relationships Inventory (IRI), the three subscales of the Developing Purpose Inventory (DPI), and the three subscales of Erwin Identity Scale (EIS). Finally, effectiveness was defined by scores, as rated by student residents and directors, on the Goodman–Rodgers Rating Scale.
The sample population for the study was 38 resident advisors—22 females and 16 males. These resident advisors represented seven residence halls on the South Campus Residence Hall Area at The Ohio State University. The range of ages was 19 to 24, the modal age being 20. Twenty-seven resident advisors were returning for the second year and 11 were new to the position (see Table 12, Appendix D).

In order to determine whether there was a significant difference between more effective and less effective resident advisors, comparisons between the means of both groups for each variable were computed using a two-tailed t-test. Also in order to determine the degree of relationship between the predictor variables (scores on the DIT, PI, IRI1, IRI2, DPI1, DPI2, DPI3, EIS1, EIS2, EIS3) and criterion variables (scores on the Goodman-Rodgers Rating Scale by student residents and directors), Pearson Correlation Coefficients were computed. Finally, a stepwise regression analysis was conducted to determine the potential of the developmental assessment instruments to predict director and student evaluations.

Generally, two-tailed t-test computations revealed only a few significant differences on cognitive and psychosocial development characteristics for more effective and less effective resident advisors. Specifically, in terms of hypotheses 1 and 2, more effective resident advisors, as rated by directors and students, were not found to be at a significantly higher level of moral reasoning than less effective resident advisors; therefore, these hypotheses should be rejected. In fact, those resident advisors
who directors rated as more effective actually scored slightly lower on the DIT than less effective resident advisors, but the difference was not statistically significant. For hypotheses 3 and 4, more effective resident advisors did not score significantly higher on the measure of intellectual and ethical reasoning than less effective resident advisors, as rated by directors and students. These hypotheses, then, should be rejected. Again, the relationship was found to be just opposite of what was hypothesized: both students and directors saw more effective resident advisors as those who showed slightly less advanced intellectual and ethical reasoning, but the difference was not statistically significant. For hypothesis 5, more effective resident advisors, as rated by directors, scored statistically significantly higher (t = 2.41) in the area of relationships with the community, family and significant others, showing a more global, realistic understanding of life and relationships (DPI1) than less effective resident advisors. The trend for the other psychosocial development scales was for more effective resident advisors to score slightly higher than less effective resident advisors with the exception of the EISI (Confidence) scale in which more effective resident advisors scored lower than less effective resident advisors. However, none of these scales were statistically significantly different between the two groups. Finally, hypothesis 6 was only partially supported. Only two of the eight psychosocial developmental assessment scales (DPI1 and DPI2) showed statistically significant differences between more and less effective resident advisors and both of these were negative relationships (t = -1.90, t = -1.85,
respectively). In other words, in the areas of avocational-recreational interests and career/study habits and attitudes, more effective resident advisors were at significantly less advanced stages of psychosocial development than less effective resident advisors. In all other areas of psychosocial development, more effective resident advisors were found to be at more advanced stages but the difference between the more and less effective groups was not significantly different. In general then, the trend for more effective resident advisors, as rated by directors and students, is to score slightly higher overall (but not statistically significant) in psychosocial development and lower (again not statistically significant) in moral, intellectual and ethical reasoning than less effective resident advisors.

As a correlate to the t-tests described above, computations revealed that the means for more effective and less effective resident advisors, as rated by student residents, were significantly different and the means for more effective and less effective resident advisors, as rated by directors were also significantly different. It was also found that the directors' evaluative ratings of the same individuals who were rated as significantly more and less effective by the students were also significantly different as groups. Likewise, resident advisors who directors saw as significantly more and less effective were also seen by students as significantly different.

The Pearson Correlation Coefficients that were computed revealed a few significant correlations between evaluation rating and level of cognitive and psychosocial development. Generally, director and
student evaluation scores were not significantly related to the same predictor variables. Director ratings had more significant correlations with female resident advisor developmental characteristics while student evaluations had more significant correlations with male resident advisor developmental characteristics.

Director evaluation scores had statistically significant negative correlations with female scores on the DIT, PI, EIS1, and EIS2. This indicates that directors saw female resident advisors, who were more likely to define moral values and principles based on the authority of an individual or group, more dualistic, less self-assured and had a less advanced understanding of their own sexual identity, as being more effective in their job than those who were more "developed" in these areas. Student evaluations had only one statistically significant correlation with female resident advisor developmental levels. Students evaluated those female resident advisors significantly higher who scored more dualistically on the PI in intellectual and ethical reasoning.

Developmental levels of male resident advisors were found to be significantly correlated to student evaluations on several scales: IRI2, DP11, EIS2, and EIS3. This implies that students saw those male resident advisors as more effective who viewed themselves as possessing a high trust and stability level in relationships with friends, a narrow range of social and recreational interests (the only significant correlation that was negative), an advanced understanding of their sexual identity and an increased
certainty of plans and actions within a long range framework. Director evaluation ratings were significantly positively correlated with male resident advisors' level of development in the areas of style of life (DPI3) and sexual identity (RIS2).

In addition to the correlations found between evaluation ratings and scores on the developmental assessment scales, a high correlation was found between student and director ratings. This indicates that the two groups are using similar criteria in rating resident advisor effectiveness.

Unfortunately, due to the small sample size, the stepwise regression analysis did not yield any significant relationships between predictor and criterion variables, and therefore brings into question the potential use of developmental assessment scales as predictors of resident advisor performance.

**Interpretation of Results and Conclusions**

There were several results of this study that warrant further comment and speculation. First of all, it was surprising to find a DIT range of scores from 16.7 to 73.3 when earlier studies (Rest et al., 1976a) indicate that junior high age students average a "p" score of 21.9 and graduate students have a "p" score of 53.3. Perhaps a reason for this unusually wide range of resident advisor scores may be that some of the subjects were intentionally biasing their responses downward. In studies designed to check for deliberate bias, cheating upward seemed to be difficult while cheating downward was easy to accomplish (Rest, 1974). If the five subjects who
scored less than 30.0 "P" were deliberately biasing downward, all
the results reported here are confounded by their data.

According to theory (Chickering, 1969), junior and senior college
students should show more development on the task of freeing inter-
personal relationships than freshmen; therefore, they should score
higher on the IRI1 and IRI2. However, resident advisor scores on
the IRI subscales were expectantly consistent with earlier studies
(Mines, 1978). Several possible explanations may be offered here.
First of all, it may be that since freeing interpersonal relationships
is one of the last vectors to be resolved by college students, perhaps
the junior and senior population was not yet dealing with the vector,
and therefore their scores were similar to freshmen who also would
not be working on resolving the task of freeing interpersonal
relationships (Chickering, 1969). It is also possible, though not
theoretically predictable, that both groups have already accomplished
resolution of the freeing interpersonal relationship task and
therefore scored alike. Finally, the reason for the similarity
between the freshmen and and junior/senior populations may be that
the assessment instrument uses (IRI) may not accurately measure the
theoretical construct that it purports to measure. Therefore, the
predictor that freshmen should score lower than juniors or seniors
on the task of freeing interpersonal relationships does not
necessarily apply to groups that were tested using the IRI.

Comparisons between female and male mean scores on the
predictor and criterion variables revealed that although females
score higher overall on the developmental scales, they are rated
significantly lower than male resident advisors in performance effectiveness. Since most of the residence hall floors employed in the study were single sex, and student evaluations were solicited from each resident advisor's floor residents, the result is that female resident advisors are being evaluated by women; and male resident advisors, by men. As Rodgers (1980) pointed out, all studies to date using the Goodman-Rogers Rating Scale have found that men consistently rate resident advisor effectiveness higher than women rate resident advisor performance. Perhaps a reason is that women are responding more honestly and critically when evaluating resident advisor performance than men are. It could also be that due to the traditionally "masculine nature" of resident advisor job responsibilities (leadership, information resource person, educator, conflict resolution, insure personal safety of residents in emergencies, enforce rules and regulations, assist hall government, report maintenance problems, conduct meetings and write up incident reports). Women who successfully carry these out may be viewed as not feminine and therefore given negative reviews. Men, on the other hand, are culturally expected to be capable in these areas and performance of these functions confirms their effectiveness in leadership roles required of resident advisors. In spite of these possible reasons for female resident advisors to score lower in effectiveness but higher developmentally, the lower profile in general for females indicates that their relative effectiveness is still discriminated for both sexes.
Negative correlations between developmental characteristics and evaluation scores were unexpected but did occur. Director evaluations and scores on the DIT and on the PI were found to have a negative correlation for both the coed and female groups. This may indicate that directors prefer resident advisors who are more conventional, obedient and respond to the director's "Authority." The other obvious trend that is apparent from the correlational results is that female resident advisors have a large number of negative correlations between evaluation and predictor variable scores while the male resident advisors have very few. Since the majority of residents involved in the study were freshmen and sophomores, this result may indicate that female residents prefer a leader (resident advisor) who is more like themselves developmentally (at lower developmental levels) to someone who is more mature and therefore challenging. In other words, according to Perry (1968), an individual at one or more developmental levels above another individual (+1) can serve as a stimulus for personal development. However, it is possible that a resident advisor at a theoretically appropriate +1 level can be perceived by residents as different, which may be undesirable for the students, and, therefore, be viewed as less effective than a resident advisor who is at the same developmental level as the student.

The negative relationship between developmental levels and evaluation ratings for female resident advisors could also be accounted for by the notion that challenges two stages above an individual can be overstimulating and, therefore, not effective in promoting
growth. So, if female resident advisors were at a +2 level from their floor residents, they may be perceived as being not effective. On the other hand, it could be that the resident advisors are on the same developmental level as the residents and viewed as satisfying but not challenging and therefore rated as less effective.

This raises questions about what the Goodman-Rodgers Scale is actually measuring: satisfaction, effectiveness or a combination of the two. It is uncertain as to whether residents' personal attitudes about satisfaction or resident advisor growth promoting effectiveness are being evaluated by this scale. Therefore, behavior change studies should be included in the scale data or a set of behavioral measures should be used in addition to the Goodman-Rodgers Scale information. These behavior measures might include reviewing incident reports filled out by resident advisors, looking at program reports completed by resident advisors, attending or tape recording hall meetings conducted by resident advisors or observing resident advisor behavior in staff meetings.

Another interesting result was the fact that student and director ratings correlated positively with each other even though director mean ratings for the coed, female, and male groups were consistently lower. It appears that students and directors are using some similar criteria in rating resident advisor effectiveness; however, directors rate lower and somewhat differently than student residents overall on the continuum. This difference may be a result of directors having higher expectations of resident advisors' performance than students or weight aspects differently and, therefore, causing
director ratings to be generally lower. Perhaps, students are inflating their evaluation scores because they are afraid of making their resident advisor look unfavorably, or, it may just be that students do not discriminate very well between levels of performance effectiveness.

Reviewing the means for more effective and less effective resident advisors for director and student evaluations, ratings show that directors gave lower evaluation scores to resident advisors at higher levels of development than students did. What could be happening again is that director evaluations are much stricter (at the lower end of the continuum) than student evaluations.

Finally, with regards to the insignificant results of the stepwise regression procedure, Kerlinger and Pedhazur (1973, p. 446) point out that "any multiple regression analysis, and especially those with many independent variables, should have at least 100 subjects, preferably 200 or more." Since the sample size for the current study was only 38 and there were 10 independent variables, it is not surprising that the multiple regression analysis did not provide useful information about the predictive potential of the independent variables (developmental scales).

Limitations

There were several limitations to this study. First of all, the sample size was so small that statistical analyses were difficult and conclusions cannot be as strong as if the population was larger. Unfortunately, due to the complex scoring format for a few of the
predictor scales, for efficiency purposes the original population was limited to 84 (the entire South Campus Residence Hall Area). However, after resident advisors were asked to voluntarily participate, 34 resident advisors were lost from the sample. Further, due to a poor return rate of evaluation forms from floor residents (there were no forms at all returned from several floors), 12 more resident advisors were dropped from the sample. Therefore, it would be desirable to replicate this study on a larger population to determine if similar trends and results would be found.

This brings up another point of caution for interpreting the results of this study. One must wonder why those resident advisors who chose not to participate in the study made that decision. A profile of these individuals might be helpful in that they may be significantly different developmentally than those who willingly took part. If so, conclusions about the relationship between developmental levels and performance could be very different from the current study. As the study stands, the small range of scores on most predictor variables indicates that the population was somewhat homogeneous. This would lead to weak conclusions about correlations between predictor and criterion variables because of the highly similar independent variable scores. When there is little variability in the independent variable scores, and a significant correlation is found between the independent and dependent variables, it is difficult to determine whether the correlation is a result of a real relationship between the independent and dependent variables or if it is a matter of a specific, narrow range of independent
variable scores being significantly related to the dependent variable.

Another explanation for the homogeneity of the population may be that cognitive and psychosocial development occurs slowly and in consistently predictable ways during the years of age 18 to 25 (Chickering, 1969; Perry, 1969). Therefore, since the age range of the resident advisors was small (19 to 24 years old) and the span of years they represent (juniors, seniors, and graduates) was small, the resident advisor sample may have in fact been very homogeneous. A suggestion for future study would be to utilize a more heterogeneous population.

Interpreting differences in the results between student ratings and director ratings may also be misleading in that student ratings represent a composite of several scores, whereas the director rating represents only a single score. This may account for the large variability found in director evaluation scores. However, since only one director had adequate knowledge of each resident advisor, in order to evaluate his/her performance, this difference was necessary. It is hoped that since the five directors in the study are professionals and have had common training, their scoring would be comparable.

Another possible factor that could have affected the effectiveness scores of the resident advisors was the method of distribution of the Goodman-Rodgers Rating Scale. Due to the large number of students that had to be solicited for participation, evaluation instruments were sent to every resident with written instructions directing students to fill out the form without discussing it with anyone. However, there was no way to control how and with
whom the instruments were actually completed. It would have been preferable to have all residents complete the form in a common location at a common time to control for the possible confounding influences of conferring with other students about the evaluations.

Another difficulty with any study of this kind is in actually defining and measuring the independent and dependent variables. For instance, the ten assessment scales may not measure aspects of human development which are pertinent to the work responsibilities of a resident advisor or they may measure aspects which are not relevant. Also, since the IRI, DPI, and EIS are relatively new instruments, there has been only limited experimentation and validation of them and, therefore, their subscale reliabilities are questionable. In other words, the issue of whether these scales actually measure the constructs they propose to is still being examined.

Defining effectiveness as the criteria is also a difficult task. Students and administrators may hold different perceptions of what effective resident advisor performance is, just as directors may differ amongst themselves and students may differ amongst themselves in defining effectiveness. Since the Goodman-Rodgers Rating Scale was developed at The Ohio State University, based on Ohio State student opinions, grounded in the Ohio State resident advisor job description and has some evidence to support its validity and ability to discriminate, this instrument should help mediate the problem. However, there is some doubt about exactly what this scale measures as the effectiveness criterion, actual behavior as perceived by directors and students or personal satisfaction perceptions of
directors and students. Thus, it is suggested that for further use, specific behavioral measures should be added to the Goodman-Rodgers Scale data.

A factor that may influence predictor variable measurement and therefore affect any conclusions drawn from the results of this study is the fact that paper and pencil assessments were used. This study is attempting to draw conclusions about the interrelationships of resident advisor performance (behavior) and their cognitive and psychosocial developmental levels. However, by basing conclusions about "reality" on self report, paper and pencil instruments, the relationship between reality and conclusions is weakened. It is hoped that by assessing development in a variety of ways (several different instruments) that the findings will be strengthened.

Finally, generalizations from this study should be made with caution. The results are based on a sample of resident advisors from The Ohio State University working from the job description for this institution. As German (1979) points out, although investigators have attempted to demonstrate a relationship between particular selection processes (predictors) and subsequent job performance, all general selection procedures yield inconsistent results across institutions. Thus, it appears that certain procedures are best suited for particular campuses.

Implications

The implications of this study for the selection of resident advisors are tentative. Specifically, any statistical result must
be interpreted carefully because the sample size was so small and homogeneous. Therefore, a follow-up study to cross-validate the findings of this study, utilizing a larger and more diverse population, would be appropriate.

In order to draw conclusions and plan a course of action based on the results of this study, decisions must first be made as to what group of resident advisors (coed, female, male) and what criterion variables (student versus director evaluations) to utilize. To illustrate, significant differences were found between the way female and male resident advisors scored developmentally on the assessment scales and how they were rated for effectiveness. Also, different instrument scales were significantly correlated with coed versus female versus male groups of resident advisors. Therefore, in designing a method of selection or evaluation, one must consider whether an approach for coed, all women, or all men is most appropriate.

A similar dilemma occurs when having to plan a course of action based on performance evaluation results. Director and student evaluations were highly correlated but consistently different, they were also significantly related to different predictor variables. Therefore, a decision must be made about what criterion variables one deems most important for their purposes.

Based on this study, conclusions about the usefulness or prediction potential of resident advisor performance by level of cognitive and psychosocial development are inconclusive. Since low correlations were found between predictor scales and criterion
variables, one must beware of using developmental assessments for predictive, evaluative and selective purposes. As German (1979, p. 446) phrases it: "The goal of a selection procedure should be to gain sufficient information about a candidate to make for an accurate evaluation of this person." Based on this objective and due to the fact that few significant correlations were found between director and student evaluations and scores on cognitive and psychosocial developmental assessment instruments and that a multiple regression analysis could not be successfully conducted on the small population to determine the predictive potential of the independent variables, caution should be exercised in drawing definite conclusions from this study. Generally, without further cross-validation studies to lend support or non-support to the results of this study, the assumption to be made is that developmental assessment instruments should not be used to make conclusive evaluations or selections of individuals.

The current study stimulates thinking about future research in a variety of related areas. For example, a design with the same purpose but including resident advisor self-assessment as another criterion variable could be conducted. Presumably this information should indicate if resident advisor self-evaluations are significantly different from student or director evaluations and if developmental levels are related to self-perceived effectiveness.

Comparisons between old and new resident advisors, resident advisors working in different living environments (large versus small halls, special living environments, coed versus single sex halls,
different areas on the same campus) or resident advisors from several
different campuses could be made. Each of the variables (experience,
living environment influence and institutional differences) may significantly
affect both the developmental level of resident advisors as well as
how performance effectiveness is evaluated by students and
administrators.

A comparison between developmental level of residents and resident
advisors could be made, and then investigate the relationship between
evaluation ratings and stage differences between resident advisors
and residents. According to Chickering (1969), this may in fact be
an important aspect.

It is possible that the relationship between resident advisors
and their residents may influence the evaluation they receive. Perhaps
then, determining the degree and types of interactions residents
have had with the resident advisor would be helpful when comparing
student evaluations of resident advisors. For instance, a resident
who has interacted with his/her resident advisor in a working capacity
would probably rate the resident advisor differently in certain areas
of effectiveness than a resident who has never used the resident
advisor's services.

A test-retest design for assessing resident advisors might
also provide important information about the director and student
evaluation—resident advisor developmental level relationship. The
current study tested resident advisors in August and obtained
evaluation scores in March. Although most theories (Perry, 1968;
Chickering, 1969; Kohlberg, 1971) predict that changes in stages
occurs slowly, it is possible that changes in the developmental level of the resident advisors may have occurred in that time.

Finally, possible application of developmental theories for training purposes may be worth investigating. Assessing an individual's developmental level and tailoring training for that person based on this eliminates the problems of having a third party involved (residents or directors) who increase bias and introduce a great ambiguity in defining criterion variables. The value laden implications and concerns of using developmental theories for evaluation or selection purposes are also eliminated in a training situation.
1. **Job Title:** Resident Advisor (R.A.)

2. **Job Summary:** A resident advisor is a student living in a residence hall floor for the purpose of communicating information to residents, promoting a harmonious floor environment, assisting in the academic and personal growth of residents, ensuring the personal safety of residents during emergencies, enforcing rules and regulations, developing programs and activities, supporting and advising the hall government, and reporting maintenance problems.

3. **Duties of Resident Advisor:**
   - Communicates information to residents on floor. Makes announcements, schedules floor meetings, posts signs, and distributes flyers and pamphlets for the purpose of informing residents of rules, regulations, procedures, policies, activities, upcoming events, campus and city facilities, services, and resources. Answers residents’ questions, referring to other sources of information if necessary.
   - Performs duties which promote a harmonious and friendly floor environment. Visits floors throughout the year to get acquainted with residents. From suggestions provided by Residence Hall Director, selects group exercises (games) and activities which allow residents to become better acquainted with one another, explain and leads activity. Helps socialize roommates and build good roommate relationships. Talks to residents with roommates problems to offer advice, possibly complaining with Hall Director and Student Personal Assistant, or it make arrangements for residents to transfer to other rooms. To transfer residents, talks with residents involved to determine mutually acceptable roommate re-assignments. To authorize transfer, completes Room Change Request Form if resident is re-assigned to room within the residence hall, or same Room Transfer application if re-assignment is to another hall.
   - Assists in the academic and personal growth of residents. Counsels and motivates students to achieve in academic areas and in college environment, provides information about academic advising, and refers them to other resources for information about alternatives. To help solve residents’ personal problems, answers questions, offers advice (perhaps after consulting Hall Director or Student Personal Assistant), or refers them to better qualified person.
   - Helps ensure the personal safety of residents during emergencies. Verbally instructs residents on proper usage and location of fire-fighting equipment and informs them of evacuation procedures for the purpose of maximizing their safety during an emergency. During a fire drill or actual emergency, checks alarm to floor to see if pulled; if so, calls hall office to report pulled alarm. Enters all rooms to make sure residents
have evacuated, locks doors. Goes to office to report all residents on the floor have cleared the building and to find out if another floor needs checking (in the event of another resident advisor’s absence). Checks additional floors if necessary. Goes outside, instructs students to step back farther from building if necessary to protect them from flying glass, fire, and smoke and to allow for passage of fire-fighting equipment. During a tornado warning, escorts students to basement or other appropriate location, providing them with the best shelter possible. In the event of illness or injury, accompanies resident to hospital to provide support and assistance.

5) Enforces rules and regulations. Checks identification cards at parties to prevent consumption of alcohol by minors. Unless otherwise specified by Alcohol Permit, orders residents out of hallways and other public places to restrict consumption of alcohol to private rooms only. Verbally administers warning to resident smoking marijuana; after two warnings, refers resident to Hall Director for disciplinary action. To comply with university regulations, asks solicitors to leave floor. Reports suspicious characters to security guard to institute investigation. To maintain a good study environment, verbally administers warning to violators of quiet hours; after several warnings, refers to Hall Director or Judicial Council for appropriate action. Completes standard Incident Report Form to report all transgressions. Submits to hall office to notify Hall Director.

6) Assists in developing educational, social, athletic, and cultural programs/activities for floor, dorm, or college. Takes phone calls and/or meets with individuals to obtain information about program/activity. If necessary, needs material to obtain additional information. Talks with those involved with program/activity to determine location, date, and time, takes and posts signs to publicize events. Makes appropriate office to reserve room, specifying date, time, and place. Phones or visits suppliers of program materials, food, drink, music and decorations to place orders and arrange for delivery or pick-up. Meets with dining halls manager to arrange for storage of food and drink. Delegates duties to others to obtain assistance. To satisfy university requirement, signs Alcohol Permit and delivers to Hall Director and Area Director (if alcohol is to be served). Meets with athletic committee chairman to discuss game schedules, team recruitment, and publicity. Talks with floor and dorm officers to suggest program/activities and to supply information regarding planning and implementation of activities. Completes Campus Center for all program/activities and submits to hall office, area office, and the student development office to notify directors of all events.

7) Provides assistance and support to residence hall government. Attends floor meetings, house council meetings and meetings of committees and floor officers to make announcements, answer questions, and offer suggestions. Is advisor for a particular committee or council, meets with members to provide information by answering questions and suggesting proper course of action. Explains the duties of the various floor officers to facilitate residents with floor government. Talks with potential candidates to encourage them to run and to explain details in more detail.
Schedules date and time to elect officers. Posts signs to publicize election. Introduces candidates at floor meeting to familiarize residents with those running for office.

8) Responds and reports maintenance problems and condition of rooms and floor. Completes Maintenance Request form to describe service or need for repair in room or on floor. Places form in basket in hall office to notify maintenance personnel of need for repair. If housekeeping personnel is not cleaning room as specified, talks to custodians to determine reason and to re-establish service. If housekeeping personnel still fails to perform duties, contacts the director of area Housekeeping or the head of Housekeeping to voice complaint. At beginning of year, visually inspects and rates condition of room as specified on standard Room Inventory Form. Records ratings on form to provide a record of room condition. At end of year, visually inspects room condition and compares to recorded ratings to determine damages incurred during the year. At end of each quarter, visually inspects room to determine if floors are cleared, trash is emptied, and area around radiator is cleared to facilitate cleaning of room between quarters. Signs Check-Out Authorization slip to indicate these conditions are met.

9) Performs miscellaneous routine duties each week. Completes and submits weekly report to hall director to notify of significant events, such as programs, activities, problems, and disturbances. Attends weekly staff meeting to discuss business issues, exchange ideas with other H.R.S., and to report on state of floor (progress, problems, etc.) Talks with Hall Director and Student Personnel Assistant several times a week to exchange information. Attends periodic staff dinners to get better acquainted with other H.R.S. and to maintain friendly and open communication. Attends emergency meeting held as needed for miscellaneous reasons to become informed about various issues and problems. Stays in room (assisted by director) number of times per week to insure availability of self to residents. Checks bulletin board in hall office every day for messages related to job. Assumes on-call responsibilities on a scheduled rotation basis by Hall Director or provides residents with the availability of an H.R.S. at all times. Posts name and phone of H.R.S. on call to let residents know who to contact in the absence of their own. Assumes number on In-Out board to indicate whereabouts when not in room. Enters information on floor activity calendar to keep residents informed of significant dates and events. Receives signs or posters which are not in designated areas, which are too large, or which are not appropriate for public display according to hall regulations. Uses master key to allow locked-out residents into room. Signs sick tray form to authorize sick tray for ill or injured resident. Distributes light bulbs, trash bags, toilet paper, dots, brooms and rags as needed for residents' use.

10) Completes specially assigned tasks as directed by the Assistant Vice President of Student Services or the Residence Hall Director.
APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS
Dear Resident Advisor:

During the Autumn and Winter quarters, we will be involved in important research concerning resident advisors. The study will involve correlations between selected personal traits and performance. The study is an initial step in trying to improve resident advisor selection procedures. This project will be conducted under the direction of Dr. Robert F. Rodgers and will be implemented by the residence hall staff.

We will need approximately three to four hours of your time in order to take five paper and pencil instruments. The testing will be in September, prior to the opening of the residence halls. The results will be used to compute group description statistics only, at no time will individuals be identified.

Participation is voluntary. There will be no consequences, pro or con, regardless of how you decide.

We need your help and hope that you will decide to participate in this study. We are using a sample from South campus residence halls only; hence, it is important to have as many of you participate as possible.

If you choose to participate, you will help us improve the system of selecting resident advisors. In return if you desire, we will be happy to interpret your scores on the instrument with you in a session held after the study is completed.

Please sign the enclosed permission form if you decide to participate and return it to your director with your completed instruments. Also, please not that you
can withdraw from the project at any time with written notice to the project director, Dr. Rodgers. We sincerely hope that you will decide to help us.

Thank you.

Dr. Robert Rodgers, Project Director

John Keidze, South Area Director

E.J. Skarakis, Research Assistant
INSTRUCTIONS

Please answer every question on each instrument to the best of your ability. Please do not confer with anyone while filling out the instruments. Keep this sheet attached.

Please read the questions carefully and answer them honestly. After you have completed the instruments, return them to your director who will keep them in a sealed envelope.

Name of Residence Hall ____________________________
Floor ____________________________
Corridor (of appropriate) ____________________________
Age ____________________________
Sex ____________________________
New or Returning R.T. ____________________________

THANK YOU
DIRECTIONS FOR IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION

Leave blank all areas except the one labelled "SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER"

Fill in the first SEVEN columns ONLY as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Fill in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Building)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cansfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siebert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paterson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stradley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>(Floor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Sex)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Status)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>(Age)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXAMPLE (see right side of page)

Cansfield resident who lives on floor 3, female, sophomore, 19 years old.

This person would fill in: 1 03 01 19

If you have any questions about this questionnaire or how to fill it out,
feel free to contact Jamie Sbake at the following numbers:

Afternoons: 422-9301 (Office of Student Services)
Evenings: 299-3204 (Home)

Thank you for your help and cooperation.
I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) a study entitled "THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GENDER, STRUCTURAL ANXIETY, DEVELOPMENTAL AND RESIDENT ADVISOR EFFECTIVENESS." M. J. Sharanis has explained the purpose of the study and procedures to be followed. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I (or my child) have the right to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (or my child). The information obtained from me (or my child) will remain confidential and anonymous unless I specifically agree otherwise.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I have signed it freely and voluntarily and understand a copy is available upon request.

Date: ___________________________ Signed: ___________________________

[Signature]

[Signature]

(Investigator/Project Director or his/her authorized representative)

(Participant)

[Signature]

(Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - If Required)

7A-027 (2/79) -- To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research for which an OUI Human Subject Review Committee has determined that the research poses no risk to participants.
APPENDIX C

EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS
The instrument that follows has to do with how you as an individual think about various educational issues and identity concerns. There are no right and wrong responses to any of the items. What is important is the way you think about the items that are presented. Please be as complete and comprehensive as possible in your answers.

NAME ____________________________________________

INSTRUCTIONS:

On the next several pages are short "Sentence Start". Please respond to these items by writing down what comes to your mind. Write at least three sentences. Please write in ink.

1. My main concern . . .

2. When I think about my future . . .
3. Choices...

4. For me to say "I believe"...

5. Choosing a career...
We would like you to write two essays in response to the questions posed on the next two pages. It will help greatly if you can be as specific and complete in your answers as possible.

ESSAY A. Describe the best class you’ve taken since you’ve been in college. What made it positive for you? Be as specific as possible. Feel free to go into as much detail as you think will give us a clear idea of the class; for example, you might want to discuss areas such as what the teacher was like, the subject matter, the particular content (readings, films, etc.), the atmosphere of the class, grading procedures, etc. We want your thoughts and comments—a complete description of your experience and how you felt about it.
ESSAY B. One of the major issues in many individual's lives is the question of career choice and vocational decision making. Individuals approach this task very differently. Please discuss in detail all the things that you consider when approaching this question. It will be helpful if you can discuss the aspects of your answer with as much detail and as many examples as possible.
This questionnaire is aimed at understanding how people think about social problems. Different people often have different opinions about questions of right and wrong. There are no "right" answers in the way that there are right answers to math problems. We would like you to tell us what you think about several problem stories. The papers will be fed to a computer to find the average for the whole group, and no one will see your individual answers. Later, if you wish, there may be an opportunity to discuss some of these social problems.

Please give us the following information:

Name ______________________ Female ______ Male ______
Age ______ Class Standing ______ College ____________________
Campus or Columbus Address ________________________

In this questionnaire you will be asked to give your opinions about several stories. Here is a story as an example:

"Frank Jones has been thinking about buying a car. He is married, has two small children and earns an average income. The car he buys will be his family's only car. It will be used mostly to get to work and drive around town, but sometimes for vacation trips also. In trying to decide what car to buy, Frank Jones realized that there were a lot of questions to consider. On the next page there is a list of some of these questions. If you were Frank Jones, how important would each of these questions be in deciding what car to buy?"

Read the sample questions and responses for this example which appear on the next page. On the pages which follow the sample are six "problem stories", read each one and complete your responses to the questions that follow each story.
Part A. (SIMPLE)

On the left hand side of the page check one of the spaces by each question that could be considered.

Great Much Some Little No importance importance importance importance

1. Whether the car dealer was in the same block as where Frank lives.

2. Would a used car be more economical in the long run than a new car.

3. Whether the color was green, Frank’s favorite color.

4. Whether the cubic inch displacement was at least 200.

5. Would a large, roosevelt car be better than a compact car.

6. Whether the front suspensions were differential.

PART B. (SIMPLE)

From the list of questions above, select the most important one of the whole group.
Put the number of the most important question in the top line below. Do likewise for your 2nd, 3rd, and 4th most important choices.

Most important ______
Second most important ______
Third most important ______
Fourth most important ______
Fred, a senior in high school, wanted to publish a mimeographed newspaper for students so that he could express many of his opinions. He wanted to speak out against the war in Viet Nam and to speak out against some of the school’s rules, like the rule forbidding boys to wear long hair.

When Fred started his newspaper, he asked his principal for permission. The principal said it would be all right if before every publication Fred would turn in all his articles for the principal’s approval. Fred agreed and turned in several articles for approval. The principal approved all of them and Fred published two issues of the paper in the next two weeks.

But the principal had not expected that Fred’s newspaper would receive so much attention. Students were so excited by the paper that they began to organize protests against the hair regulation and other school rules. Angry parents objected to Fred’s opinions. They phoned the principal telling him that the newspaper was unpatriotic and should not be published. As a result of the rising excitement, the principal ordered Fred to stop publishing. He gave as a reason that Fred’s activities were disruptive to the operation of the school.

Should the principal stop the newspaper? (Check one)

[ ] Should stop it
[ ] Can’t decide
[ ] Should not stop it
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>1. Is the principal more responsible to students or to parents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2. Did the principal give his word that the newspaper could be published for a long time, or did he just promise to approve the newspaper once later as a time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>3. Would the students start protesting even more if the principal stopped the newspaper?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>4. When the welfare of the school is threatened, does the principal have the right to give orders to students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5. Does the principal have the freedom of speech to say &quot;no&quot; in this case?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. If the principal stopped the newspaper would he be preventing full discussion of important problems?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Whether the principal’s order would make Fred lose faith in the principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Whether Fred was really loyal to his school and patriotic to his country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. What effect would stopping the paper have on the student’s education in critical thinking and judgment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Whether Fred was in any way violating the rights of others in publishing his own opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Whether the principal should be influenced by some angry parents when it is the principal that knows best what is going on in the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Whether Fred was using the newspaper to stir up hatred and discontent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the list of questions above, select the four most important:

- Most important
- Second most important
- Third most important
- Fourth most important
ESCAPED PRISONER

A man had been sentenced to prison for 10 years. After one year, however, he escaped from prison, moved to a new area of the country, and took on the name of Thompson. For 8 years he worked hard, and gradually he saved enough money to buy his own business. He was fair to his customers, gave his employees top wages, and gave most of his own profits to charity. Then one day Mrs. Jones, an old neighbor, recognized him as the man who had escaped from prison 8 years before and whom the police had been looking for.

Should Mrs. Jones report Mr. Thompson to the police and have him sent back to prison? (check one)

___ Should report him
___ Can't decide
___ Should not report him
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>GREAT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the list of questions above, select the four most important:

- Most important
- Second most important
- Third most important
- Fourth most important
A lady was dying of cancer which could not be cured and she had only about six months to live. She was in terrible pain, but she was so weak that a good dose of pain-killer like morphine would make her die sooner. She was delirious and almost crazy with pain, and in her calm periods, she would ask the doctors to give her enough morphine to kill her. She said she couldn't stand the pain and that she was going to die in a few months anyway.

What should the doctor do? (Check one)

___ She should give the lady an overdose that will make her die
___ Can't decide
___ Should not give the overdose
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GREAT</th>
<th>MUCH</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the list of questions above, select the four most important:

- Most important
- Second most important
- Third most important
- Fourth most important
STUDENT TAKE-OVER

At Harvard University a group of students, called the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) believe that the University should not have an army ROTC program. SDS students are against the war in Viet Nam, and the army training program helps send men to fight in Viet Nam. The SDS students demanded that Harvard end the army ROTC training program as a university course. This would mean that Harvard students could not get army training as part of their regular course work and not get credits for it towards their degrees.

Agreeing with the SDS students, the Harvard professors voted to end the ROTC program as a university course. But the President of the University stated that he wanted to keep the army program on campus as a course. The SDS students felt that the President was not going to pay attention to the faculty vote or to their demands.

So, one day last April, two hundred SDS students walked into the University’s administration building, and told everyone else to get out. They said they were doing this to force Harvard to get rid of the army training program as a course.

Should the students have taken over the administration building?

(Check one)

[ ] Yes, they should take it over
[ ] Can’t decide
[ ] No, they should not take it over
### STUDENT TAKE-OVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREAT IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>MUCH IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>SOME IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>LITTLE IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>NO IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are the students doing this to really help other people or are they doing it just for kicks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do the students have any right to take over property that doesn't belong to them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do the students realize that they might be arrested and fined and even expelled from school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Would taking over the building in the long run benefit more people to a greater extent?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Whether the president stayed within the limits of his authority in ignoring the faculty vote?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Will the takeover anger the public and give all students a bad name?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is taking over a building consistent with principles of justice?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Would allowing one student take-over encourage any other student take-overs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did the president having this misunderstanding standing on himself by being so unreasonable and uncooperative?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Whether running the university ought to be in the hands of a few administrators or in the hands of all the people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Are the students following principles which they believe are above the law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Whether or not university decisions ought to be respected by students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the list of questions above, select the four most important:

- Most important
- Second most important
- Third most important
- Fourth most important
Mr. Webster was the owner and manager of a gas station. He wanted to hire another mechanic to help him, but good mechanics were hard to find. The only person he found who seemed to be a good mechanic was Mr. Lee, but he was Chinese. While Mr. Webster himself didn't have anything against orientals, he was afraid to hire Mr. Lee because many of his customers didn't like orientals. His customers might take their business elsewhere if Mr. Lee was working in the gas station.

When Mr. Lee asked Mr. Webster if he could have the job, Mr. Webster said that he had already hired somebody else. But Mr. Webster really had not hired anybody, because he could not find anybody who was a good mechanic besides Mr. Lee.

What should Mr. Webster have done? (Check one)

__________ Should have hired Mr. Lee

__________ Can't decide

__________ Should not have hired him
WIESEN

GRAD | HIGH | MIDDLE | LOW | NO
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---

1. Does the owner of a business have the right or make his own business decisions on cost?
2. Whether there is a law that forbids racial discrimination in hiring for jobs.
3. Whether Mr. Webster is prejudiced against orientals himself or whether he makes nothing personal in refusing the job.
4. Whether hiring a good mechanic or paying attention to his customers' welfare would be best for his business.
5. What individual differences ought to be relevant in deciding how society's rules are filled?
6. Whether the greedy and competitive capitalist's system ought to be completely abandoned.
7. In a majority of people in Mr. Webster's society feel like his customers or are a majority against prejudice?
8. Whether hiring capable men like Mr. Lee would use talents that would otherwise be lost to society.
9. Would refusing the job to Mr. Lee be consistent with Mr. Webster's own moral beliefs?
10. Could Mr. Webster be so heartless as to refuse the job, knowing how much it means to Mr. Lee?
11. Whether the Christian commitment to love your fellow man applies to this case.
12. If someone's in need, shouldn't he be helped regardless of what you get back from him?

From the list of questions above, select the four most important:

[ ] Most important
[ ] Second most important
[ ] Third most important
[ ] Fourth most important
HEINZ AND THE DRUG

In Europe a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that the doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging ten times what the drug cost to make. He paid $200 for the radium and charged $2000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Hein, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about $1000, which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying, and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it." So Hein got desperate and began to think about breaking into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife.

Should Hein steal the drug? (Check one)

____ Should steal it
____ Can't decide
____ Should not steal it
On the left hand side of the page check one of the spaces by each question to indicate its importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREAT</th>
<th>MUCH</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Whether a community's laws are going to be upheld.
2. Isn't it only natural for a loving husband to care so much for his wife that he'd steal?
3. Is Helen willing to risk getting shot as a burglar or going to jail for the chance that stealing the drug might help?
4. Whether Helen is a professional wrestler, or has considerable influence with professional wrestlers.
5. Whether Helen is stealing for herself or doing this policy to help someone else.
6. Whether the drug's right to his invention have to be respected.
7. Whether the essence of living is more frustrating than the termination of dying, socially and intellectually.
8. What values are going to be the basis for governing how people act towards each other.
9. Whether the drug's is going to be allowed to hide behind a worthless law which only protects the rich against.
10. Whether the law in this case is getting in the way of the most basic claim of any member of society.
11. Whether the drug's deserves to be raised for being so greedy and cruel.
12. Would stealing in such a case bring about moral total good for the whole society.

From the list of questions above, select the four most important:

Most important      
Second most important
Third most important
Fourth most important
READ INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY

The following are a series of statements about social and interpersonal behavior and attitudes of college students. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. There are no right or wrong answers. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself strongly agreeing with some of the statements and strongly disagreeing with others. Whether your agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many other people feel the same as you do.

If you have not experienced a situation described by a statement, imagine it on the basis of any similar circumstances or experiences you have had or how you imagine you would answer if the situation would come up. For example, if the statement is about "roommates" and you live at home or are married, answer it in relation to the people you do live with. A second example concerns statements about "faculty". If you are a transfer student or have not attended college, answer on the basis of the teachers at the last school you attended.

In the space provided, please mark each statement according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one. Use the numbers 1, 2, 3, or 4 depending on how you feel in each case:
1. strongly agree
2. agree
3. disagree
4. strongly disagree

Mines-Jensen INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

1. I accept my friends as they are.
2. I would feel uncomfortable criticizing, to their face, someone I had dated a long time.
3. In my classes, I have met two kinds of people: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.
4. The instructors here do not treat the students like they are adults.
5. As I have talked with faculty and adults about their different philosophies, there is probably only one which is correct.
6. I relate to most students as an equal.
7. It would not matter to me if someone I was going to marry had sexual relations with another person before I met them.
6. I can enjoy myself without needing to have someone with me.

9. When I talk to my friends about my religious beliefs, I am very careful not to compromise with those who believe differently than I do.

10. I have to go out on a date every weekend.

11. My roommate has some habits that bother and annoy me very much.

12. I get nervous when an instructor criticizes my work.

13. Most adults need to change their values and attitudes.

14. Sometimes I feel I have to make unnecessary apologies for my appearance or conduct to the person (s) I live with.

15. Students who live together before they are married definitely should be made to realize what they are doing is wrong.

16. I can tell my friends just about anything that is on my mind and know they will accept me.

17. I would discontinue my friendship with a person (s) I am close to if I found out my friend(s) was homosexual or bisexual.

18. My social life is satisfying to me.

19. One of the problems with my fellow students is they were not dealt with firmly when they were younger.

20. I relate with my parents on an adult-to-adult basis.

21. I do not disapprove of faculty or other adults getting drunk or high at parties.

22. My relationship with my roommate(s) is stagnating my own growth and potential.

23. I would not discontinue a love relationship if my partner did something I disapproved of.

24. I feel comfortable about telling a friend of the same sex "I love you," without worrying they might get the wrong idea.

25. Most instructors teach as if there is just one right way to obtain a solution to a problem.

26. My relationships with members of the opposite sex have allowed me to explore some behaviors that I had not felt comfortable with before.
27. I personally find it sickening to be around my friends when they do not act in a mature manner.

28. My parents do not try to run my life.

29. Freedom of speech can be carried too far in terms of the ideal because some students and their organizations should have their freedom of speech restricted.

30. My friends view me as an independent, outgoing person in my relationship with them.

31. I’m glad to see most of my friends are not dressing like “bums” anymore.

32. I always hold back when I am at a party which consists of a diverse group of people.

33. I do not get irritated when parents cannot accept their children’s friends or values.

34. I encourage friends to drop informally.

35. I only date people who are of the same religious background as me.

36. My roommate(s) and I feel free to come and go as we please.

37. I think the person I’m dating or “going with” should have friends outside of “our crowd”.

38. I have gotten to know some instructors as people — not just as faculty members.

39. I think students that get “high” and are caught should be treated like the lawbreakers they are.

40. I worry about not dating enough.

41. I can just be with my friends without having to be doing anything in particular.

42. I do not view myself as an independent, outgoing person with my friends.
DEVELOPING PURPOSES INVENTORY-2

Please mark each statement in the space provided according to how true each statement is about you. Use the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 depending on how you honestly feel:

1 always true
2 often true
3 sometimes true
4 rarely true
5 never true

1. I attend special lectures and programs that are about my recreational interests.

2. I find time in my academic schedule, even when I am busy to do social types of things whenever I am asked.

3. I find that I perceive people of the opposite sex as "people" more often than as social partners.

4. I think about how marriage (or divorce) might change my life style.

5. I think about what it would be like to be married to some of the people I see socially.

6. I do not try new things when given the opportunity.

7. I do not go to cultural events (art shows, concerts, speakers etc.) that seem of interest to me.

8. I try to regularly engage in a recreational activity which I like (swimming, chess, ping-pong, tennis etc.).

9. I feel that there is too little time to participate in all of the activities in which I might be interested.

10. I take courses because the description sounded good to me.

11. My social life is oriented around other people with the same recreational interests as myself.
12. I attend special lectures and programs in areas of my academic interest.

13. I imagine myself in a full-time work or career setting that I would like.

14. Because I like to, I read articles and books that deal with some aspect of my academic interest.

15. I spend a lot of time with people who have the same academic interests as myself.

16. I think about the occupation which I want to enter.

17. I do the best that I can when completing a project for a class.

18. I don't put a lot of effort into assigned schoolwork.

19. I read all of the assigned material for class.

20. I take courses, or plan to, because they are necessary for my career plans.

21. I go to someone more experienced for general help and advice about what I should study and how I might plan my career.

22. I do not feel confident of my own abilities to make decisions and to have opinions in my major field.

23. I think of ways to gain practical experience in my major field while still in school.

24. In classwork my own point of view and opinions seem unimportant to me.

25. I expect my teachers to provide the correct answers and to say which theory is correct.

26. I do not take the coursework in my major, or area of interest, very seriously.

27. I read the materials that have been suggested or recommended by an instructor for a class but are not required.

28. I do not get very involved in the topic when I write a paper for a class.

29. My primary desire for doing assigned work is to just complete it.

30. Before making choices and decisions about how I will get to where I want to be in life, I refer to my general plan of how I want my life to go.
31. I think about what getting married (or divorced) would mean for my career plans.

32. I am not positive that I will achieve my educational goals.

33. I feel confident that I know where I am going in my life.

34. I have fantasies about how I will be living in 5 years.

35. I feel that the career for which I am preparing will allow me to live the way that I want to.

36. I am aware of the extent to which material things contribute to my happiness (car, house, clothes, etc.).

37. I think about how my personal values relate to my career plan.

38. When I think about myself in a work or job situation, I think about the morality of the work.

39. I am not aware of what types of work activities and situations give me satisfaction.

40. I try to do things that will help my community (college, town or organization) to be a better place.

41. I have a clear plan for getting the type of job that I want after I finish college.

42. I imagine myself in the life style that I would like to lead in the future.

43. I have a good idea of what I will be doing the year after I finish college.

44. I know specifically where I want to be with my career in ten years.

45. I do not consider myself as a member of the field in my major (or in what I intend to study).
ENKIN IDENTITY SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS

THE FOLLOWING SERIES OF STATEMENTS DESCRIBES HOW PEOPLE SOMETIMES FEEL ABOUT THEMSELVES AND OTHER PEOPLE. PLEASE READ EACH STATEMENT AND RECORD AS ACCURATELY AS POSSIBLE HOW TRUE OR FALSE EACH STATEMENT IS. THE FIRST THING THAT COMES TO YOUR MIND IS PROBABLY THE BEST RESPONSE. THERE MAY BE ONE OR TWO STATEMENTS THAT DO NOT DIRECTLY APPLY TO YOU. HOWEVER, TRY TO ANSWER THEM AS THEY MIGHT APPLY TO YOU IN A HYPOTHETICAL SITUATION. REMEMBER, THERE ARE NO RIGHT ANSWERS SO DO NOT SPEND TOO MUCH TIME DECIDING ON A CORRECT ANSWER. RESPOND TO THE STATEMENTS IN ORDER AND DO NOT LEAVE OUT ANY RESPONSES.

FOR EACH STATEMENT ASK YOURSELF:

How true is this of me?

AFTER EACH STATEMENT WRITE A NUMBER FROM 1 TO 5 ON THE SEPARATE RED ANSWER SHEET DESCRIBING HOW TRUE THE STATEMENT IS OF YOU:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY TRUE</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>NOT SURE</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>NOT AT ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF ME</td>
<td>OF ME</td>
<td>OR NEUTRAL</td>
<td>OF ME</td>
<td>TRUE OF ME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BE SURE THE NUMBER ON THE RED ANSWER SHEET CORRESPONDS TO THE NUMBER OF THE STATEMENT TO WHICH YOU ARE RESPONDING. THERE IS NO TIME LIMIT BUT WORK AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE.
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1. To satisfy my sexual needs I have to be aggressive or clever.
2. I feel some guilt when I realize how strong my sexual feelings are.
3. I am as sure of myself as most other people seem to be sure of themselves.
4. I have found one of the easiest ways to make friends with others is to be the kind of person they would like me to be.
5. It seems like when I trust someone to whom I am sexually attracted I get hurt.
6. I do not have as strong control over my sexual feelings as I would like.
7. It does not bother me that I am not as attractive as other people.
8. Often my feelings toward a person and my affectational behavior toward that person do not match.
9. When I look in the mirror at myself,... I am satisfied with the physical image I see.
10. I immediately do not have the assurance that what I am doing is the next thing.
11. I believe that people should follow an established dress code in order to be accepted in a work environment.
12. I sometimes regret my sexual behavior in informal social situations (e.g. parties).
13. My sexual feelings often interfere with my interactions with other people.
14. It usually takes so much effort to make decisions I wish somebody else would make decisions for me.
15. I have many doubts about what I am doing with my life.
16. I feel uncomfortable when I am seen with someone who dresses out of style.
17. If I really let go of my sexual feelings, I probably would not do anything that I would later regret.
18. When I compare myself to others whom I think are extremely good looking, I feel inferior.
19. In most situations, I would not hesitate to express my beliefs to those with opposing beliefs.
20. Most of the time I am comfortable with my sexual feelings.
21. I believe there is only one right person for me with whom I could establish a close love relationship.
22. I make a conscious effort to wear the style of dress that most other people are wearing.
23. I envy those people who know where they are going in life.
24. If I did not wear the basis style of dress that other people wear, I would feel left out and excluded.
25. If I shared my true feelings with a close friend (male or female), she would probably think less of me.
26. No matter how sad I feel, I usually think things will get better.
27. Each day presents new challenges that I cannot wait to confront.
28. I feel confident that I have chosen or will choose the best occupational field for me.
29. I am capable of understanding most ideas I read about.
30. When I am hurt by someone I care for, I find it hard to trust others for quite a long time.
31. I often feel inferior when I compare myself to other people.
32. I often have uneasy thoughts about the way I appear to other people.
33. I believe there are only a few people (if any) in the world I could be happy with in a close love relationship.
34. I do not mind appearing different in dress from other people because that is me.
35. No matter how hard I try, I do not feel prepared to enter the working world.
36. I believe that I understand the sexual functioning of men and women.
37. Even though it may be contrary to my normal wishes, I usually dress to fit the situation or wishes of others.
38. My confidence is really shaken when I see so many capable people with abilities as good or better than mine.
39. I feel self-conscious at a swimming pool because my body is not particularly attractive.
40. If I seem to be not dressed appropriately for a particular situation, I usually become very anxious and feel out of place.
41. When I am a stranger in a group, I often introduce myself to others.
42. When other people discuss how important it is to be handsome and pretty, I feel badly and wish I were more attractive.
43. I would not change my style of clothes just because my boss indicated that I should dress more like him or her.
44. I only wear clothes that are in style.
45. My height makes me feel uncomfortable when I am in a crowd.
46. It is uncomfortable for me to speak out in groups for fear my statement may be incorrect.
47. I realize my sexual feelings and desires are natural and normal.
48. I am unusually optimistic in expecting that my love relationships will become permanent.
49. There are certain sexual feelings I have that I do not understand.
50. My sexual needs often overwhelm me when I try to establish close friendships.
51. I rarely admit to myself I have sexual fantasies.
52. I would not pattern my appearance after the dress style expected by my peer group.
53. If a boss or teacher criticizes my work, it is usually because they do not understand me.
54. I frequently have doubts that I can have a successful and happy close love relationship.
55. I usually do not smile because I am uncomfortable with the way my smile looks.
56. When I fall in love, I am reasonably sure of my feelings.
57. I often wonder if my sexual feelings are too strong.
58. I still have difficulty making decisions for myself.
59. I realize there are types when I must say, "I cannot do this."
60. I believe I can accomplish anything.
RESIDENT ADVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUCTIONS

Please do not confide with anyone while filling out the questionnaire. It should take about 10 minutes to complete. Please answer on the basis of your experience with your present Resident Advisor. Base your answers STRICTLY on your own experience.

The questionnaire is a series of statements pertaining to Resident Advisor performance. The answer sheet provides spaces for several responses or opinions persons may have regarding the statements on the questionnaire. Read each one carefully and make a decision as to your degree of agreement or disagreement. For each statement, completely darken in the square on the Answer Sheet as follows:

1 if you strongly disagree
2 if you disagree
3 if you are neutral or don’t know
4 if you agree
5 if you strongly agree

EXAMPLE

Q. My R.A. answers his/her residence hall.

If you disagree fill in number 2.

COMpletely LACKED THE SQUARE FOR THE ONE RESPONSE THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR OPINION WITH A #2 PENCIL. IF YOU CHANGE AN ANSWER, ERASE THOROUGHLY. MAKE NO EXTRA MARKS ON THE ANSWER SHEET. DO NOT FOLD OR FILL THE ANSWER SHEET.

Please return the answer sheet and the consent form, in the large envelope provided, to your floor Council Representative by January 30, 1985.

RESIDENT ADVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

MY RESIDENT ADVISOR:

1. Is generally good at handling people.
2. Is normally honest with floor residents.
3. Tends to act like a dictator.
4. Is generally very helpful.
5. Tends to take advantage of his/her position.
6. Is willing to admit mistakes.
7. Is not usually a source of encouragement for residents to achieve higher grades.
8. Is a fine representative of the university.
10. I would not go to my resident advisor even if I did have a problem.
11. Is usually very responsible.
12. Does not really help the freshmen adjust to their surroundings.
13. Tends to become conceited.
15. Generally has the ability to put himself-herself in another’s place.
16. Is not very friendly.
17. Usually provides worthwhile assistance to residents with academic problems.
18. Is too bossy.
19. Is usually a good leader.
20. Is deeply concerned about the problems of floor residents.
21. All things considered, my resident advisor normally does a good job.
22. Rarely understands the problems of the students on the floor.
23. Does not normally try to be patient.
24. Is usually not willing to listen to criticism of himself-herself.
APPENDIX D

CHARTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfield</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mack</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stradley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIT</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>IRI 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIT</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRI 1</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRI 2</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI 1</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI 2</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI 3</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 1</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 2</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS 3</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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