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CHAPTER I

Introduction to the Study

Introduction

This study began as an examination into one component of the interpersonal relationships between resident assistants (RAs) and students. During the course of the study another issue and question emerged to take control of the study. Although related to the initial question, the second question—the question of how trust is developed—became the focus of the study. This chapter will provide a frame for the initially proposed question. As well, this chapter will display the second question and some initial conceptions of trust.

Condition of Present Knowledge to Study

Within the area of student personnel work in higher education a significant amount of time, energy and money goes into the training, selection, and supervision of the students who fill the position of the resident assistant. The people who work in these positions in the residence halls are the representatives of the institution who work the closest with students in their day-to-day lives. Because they are in the front line of the university with the students, they are, according to Hoelting (1980), a great
resource for educating the student to the context and the meaning of the institution.

**Literature Review I**

Historically, the roles of the resident assistant that have been reported in the literature have focused upon the status of the institution and the role that it saw itself playing in the education and development of the student. Schneider's (1977) review of the literature reported several of the roles that the resident assistant has held from the view of the institution in the past. Hardee (Schneider, 1977) described the role of the resident assistant as being that of a 'mom' or a 'big brother' to the students who live on the floor. Another role was identified by Beder and Richard (Schneider, 1977), who saw the role as mainly that of an administrator. Kenniston (Schneider, 1977) thought that the resident assistant should have the expected role of the intellectual leader of the students with whom she/he comes into contact. Referring to the growing importance of student development theory in the administration of the residence halls, the role of the teacher has been developed (Stark, in Schneider, 1977; Schneider, 1977). William & Reilly (1974) and Schneider (1977) reported that the role of the resident assistant was to be a buddy and a friend, and yet still be the authoritarian or disciplinarian when the need arose. Schneider (1977) has also defined the role as that of a counselor.
In discussing the objectives of the resident assistant, Greenleaf (1974) outlined four major roles of the resident assistant. The resident assistant was to: (1) provide an environment that would enhance the student's ability to meet the academic purposes of the institution, (2) provide for the personal growth and development of the individual student, (3) provide for the student's self-responsibility, and (4) provide additional learning experiences through programming developed if not presented by the resident assistant. The shift in the definition of the role of the resident assistant is a reflection of the change in the field to a student development model.

The student development model is based upon the theories of Erik Erickson, William Perry, Lawrence Kohlberg, Arthur Chickering, and Douglas Heath to name a few. The work of these authors became the knowledge base upon which student personnel professionals established their claim of expertise. This work focuses upon the development of an identity and the cognitive structure that assist in the development of the student. With this shift in the foundation of the role of the resident assistant, the literature about the position shifted as well. Banning (1980) stated that due to 'in loco parentis' and the 'helping' profession model that existed before the theories of student development, the roles that are necessary to facilitate the growth necessary for the student to adjust to the experience of college will also have to shift.

DeCoster and Mable (1974) stated that with the shift to student development theory the process of learning became more important
than the product of learning. They went on to say that development means that residence education can no longer be considered a socialization process. They detailed how the resident assistant role should be that of teacher, researcher, catalyst, consultant and resource. Brown (1974) argued for the role to be defined in terms of the social engineer who would manage and manipulate the environment for specific and perhaps predictable purposes. Riker (1974) also defined the roles in terms of the objectives of the position related to student development theory. He detailed six roles: (1) recognizing student needs, (2) perceiving changing conditions, (3) helping to integrate experiences, (4) contributing to growth and development, (5) assisting to provide meaningful human relationships, and (6) collaborating with other agencies and departments. The role as the facilitator for the growth and experiences of students for their personal growth was outlined by Hoelting (1980). Another grouping of four basic roles were identified by Blimbling and Miltenberger (1981). They were: (1) role model of appropriate behavior, (2) counselor, (3) teacher, and (4) student.

When the research is examined regarding the roles of the resident assistant, the studies have a common thematic. Gifford (1974) examined three different role types of resident assistant administration to examine the impact they might have on damage reports, student grade point averages, and drop-out rates. Pierce (1977) focused upon the development of values and found that the role of a resident assistant was very important for this process.
In a quasi-experimental design study, Pascarelli and Terenzini (1980) found that the agents of socialization, faculty and peers, were most significant for student intellectual and personal growth. Zirkle & Hudson (1985) examined grade point averages of students to determine what difference the resident assistant's maturity made to the students' intellectual growth. The common thematic of these studies is that the roles of the resident assistant are assumed to be the ones identified in the literature or by the administration of the particular institution of study.

**Statement of the Problem**

The work of G. H. Mead established the importance of jointly-produced social order between members of an interaction (Miller, 1973). Erving Goffman's (1967) work further supports the idea that both or all parties involved in an interaction, as well as the context, are contributing to the construction of the meaning of the situation and the roles. Cicourel (1972) notes the work of Sarbin in outlining his interest in role and status negotiation, who covered the research literature on role-making. He quotes: "A role is a patterned sequence of learned actions performed by a person in an interaction situation." Role-making requires that the actors articulate in some manner the emergent, constructed action scenes that are negotiated to find the meaning of the role. Husserl referred to this process as constitution (Stewart & Mickunas, 1974). Things appear to actors in the way they experience them, and the way they experience them is the way that
they appear. This is more than perception. This requires several phases of consciousness, including perception, retention, expectation, memory, imagination, reflection, et cetera.

The questions that arise out of a phenomenological and interactionist perspective are: what is the role of the resident assistant created by the actors in the interaction particularly from the standpoint of the student? What do the voices of the students say about their own experiences of their relationships with the RA?

The student personnel professional values the student as an individual (Brown, 1972). With an orientation that values the student, the constructions by the student and the inherent meanings should be of importance to the field. The contributions of the student and the resident assistant over time to the construction of meaning of their shared interaction and, as a result, the typification of the resident assistant and the roles, should be an area for research. A typification is defined as the meaning structure or category that is not empirical, but based upon the empirical or experiential. Without the creation of typifications the understanding of experience is impossible for actors (Stewart & Mickunas, 1974).

The questions that are a part of this construction of the typification of the role of the resident assistant are several. What is the context in which the interaction occurs? What is the training process that the resident assistant goes through that affects his/her perception of the role? What role was negotiated
and remembered by the resident assistant regarding his/her resident assistant? What past biographical events does the student bring to the interaction that are used in the construction of meaning? How is meaning made of the interaction(s) so that the typification is created? What is the interpretive process or rationality of the situation that is used by the student in the constitution of the role of the resident assistant? The interest is in what Collins (1981) described as the procedural detail. This is the previous experiences of social interactions, negotiations, efforts, and cognitions that are compressed into a label for understanding. Mackay (1975) treats this as cultural assimilation. Cicourel (1975) identifies this process as preliminary mapping. Zimmerman & Pollner (1980) identify ethnomethodology as a way to understand this construction of the everyday life world.

**Significance of the Study**

This study of the creation of the typification of the resident assistant role is to gain understanding of what roles are negotiated and identified by students in the course of their day-to-day interactions with resident assistants at the opening of the school year. This has significance in several areas.

In the theoretical literature discussing student development theory, the role of the resident assistant is identified by the student personnel professional and based on the developmental literature. When the student is discussed, it is from the stance that the student needs the role of the resident assistant to grow
and develop to achieve the fullest potential possible along the developmental schema. The student development literature identifies the structure of the world for the student in a particular stage, but it does not address the issue of how meaning is made. However, it is important that developmentally-oriented professionals discover whether the roles that the resident assistant is instructed to play are the ones identified by the students as a part of their everyday life world. The meaning that one gives to the people that interact with the students has significance in how effective and important that relationship becomes.

In the research literature on residence hall staff and their interactions with students, the question of what roles the resident assistants perform has been broken into quantifiable outcomes/variables that do not ask the question directly of the students. To obtain a better understanding of the interaction that goes on in the resident halls, it is important that the data be collected from the culture and its participants from their perspective.

In the area of selection and training of resident assistants the study would be significant because of the potential to identify roles that may be different than what is assumed students identify. The qualities that have been established as necessary for the resident assistant could prove to be either of more or less significance. Some areas that are stressed in the training of the staff through in-service and classes, as well, could prove to be of
similar or of changed importance regarding what happens in the first two weeks of school as the students and staff negotiate the interactions and the role.

Understanding the interpersonal interaction provides understanding of interpretation—understanding in all forms (Deetz, 1982). The understanding of the processoral nature of interaction regardless of the setting is significant for human communication and interaction. To bring this into focus for examination, that which was present in the interaction but was glossed through the assumptions of the actors assists in the understanding of that and other similar interactions. The meaning is not the sole possession of one or the other party to the interaction, nor is it the possession of the researcher. But each of the actors will give different significance and meaning to the interaction. It is the groupings and the movement toward the creation of the typification that are important.

Conceptual Framework

Ethnomethodology, a micro-sociology, considers as its problematic the everyday life world and the practical forms of reasoning that members use to make order of the social world by looking at interaction in a social setting (Knorr-Cetina, 1981; Pollner, 1975). It assumes that social actions are meaningful and should be studied for the meaning they have for the actor (Douglas, 1970). As well, ethnomethodology assumes that all interaction is based upon underlying interpretive competence (Mackay, 1975). This
has been developed from Goffman's work, which was based upon the principle that any face-to-face situation is of importance in itself in determining the meaning of what goes on in the situation (Douglas, 1970).

Conceptually and problematically, ethnomethodology is indebted to Alfred Schutz, a phenomenologist, who was interested in the applications of Husserl's phenomenology. Schutz's two-stage model of sociological methodology included: (1) actions are first described and understood in terms of the actors' meanings, and (2) they are then explained by concepts meaningful to the analyst and the audience (Knorr-Cetina, 1981). The attitude of the daily life, or the natural attitude, was developed by Schutz as the basic presupposition whereby events were assigned by an agent/actor the constituent meanings for him/her of the events' feature(s) "known in common with others." He developed eleven features that define the commonsense character of an event for a bona fide member of an ethno (Garfinkel, 1963). Schutz referred to the social world as the commonsense world and identified three phenomena as a part of commonsense knowledge. They are: the stock of knowledge at hand, the natural attitude of everyday life, and the practices of commonsense reasoning (Leiter, 1980).

The stock of knowledge at hand consists of several groupings, one of which is recipes, rules of thumb, social types, maxims, and definitions (Leiter, 1980). These include general ways of doing things and the manner in which they get done. An example is that of the local grocery stores that will not accept a check without
two pieces of photo identification. Before going to this particular store, one knows to take the appropriate materials for cashing a check. Another grouping consists of social types or idealizations of people, objects, and events that serve as points of reference and action (Leiter, 1980). Social types are developed for occupations and each will have a definition. Sports are an example of this. When thinking of a long distance runner the typification is tall and thin and basketball players are typified as being tall; hockey players are typified as being white, short and tough.

As outlined by Schutz, the stock of knowledge at hand possesses several properties. These properties have significance for examining an ethno and the negotiation of meaning for the members, particularly as the structure is developed. (1) The stock of knowledge is socially derived. The knowledge of the ethno is constructed by the ethno. (2) The stock of knowledge is socially distributed. The knowledge is not located in any particular area or place but is found throughout the ethno. (3) The social distribution of the stock of knowledge is itself a part of the stock of knowledge at hand. The fact that the knowledge is distributed throughout the ethno and that experts are found from within the group is a part of the knowledge. (4) The stock of knowledge is built upon and expressed in everyday language. This is a reference to the indexicality and reflexivity of talk, as well as the importance of talk as an account or a display of the knowledge of the ethno. (5) The maxims, typifications, rules of
thumb, and definitions of the stock of knowledge all have an "open horizon of meaning." That is to say that they are potentially lending themselves to multiple meaning. (6) The stock of knowledge is heterogeneous. The contents of the stock of knowledge vary in degree of clarity and specificity because the specific sense of its element is context dependent (Schutz, 1967; Leiter, 1980). This notion of context playing a significant role in the determination of meaning for human events was developed by Schutz and later became an important assumption for Garfinkel and all other ethnomethodologists (Douglas, 1970).

Another gloss in the term "commonsense knowledge" is that the knowledge and experience of the social world is seen as a factual environment. The constitutive phenomena of the world of everyday life was described by Schutz as the world known in common and taken-for-granted (Garfinkel, 1967). There are several properties associated with this characterization. (1) The social world is experienced by people as having been historically organized prior to their arrival on the scene and it will continue to exist after they have left (Zimmerman & Pollner, 1970). (2) People reciprocally assume that the social world is not just their private world but is "out there" for all members of the society to see; it is an intersubjective world due to its shared skills and/or procedures (Zimmerman, 1978). (3) The world, as a fact, is taken-for-granted and accepted by people as they are given through experience. (4) People are interested only in those features of
the world that are relevant to the project of the moment (Leiter, 1980).

The practice of commonsense reasoning is the third phenomenon glossed in the commonsense knowledge. It is through the use of commonsense reasoning that people create and sustain the sense of social reality as a factual environment. The practices of commonsense reasoning are a set of methods for turning the experience of a member/actor into an experience of an objective reality. In addition, the practices of commonsense reasoning are used to decide when and which parts and pieces of the stock of knowledge at hand to use (Leiter, 1980). The outcomes of these practices is the structuring and/or restructuring of the world/interaction in retrospect. Several properties are developed from this that have been elaborated by Garfinkel and Cicourel that are important assumptions to be made with regard to interaction: the congruency of relevances, the interchangeability of standpoints, and the 'et cetera' principle.

The congruency of relevances consists of the following: the person expects, expects that the other person does the same, and expects that as he expects it of the other the other expects it of him that the differences in their perspectives that originate in their particular individual biographies are irrelevant for the purposes at hand (Garfinkel, 1963). The interchangeability of standpoints presumes that a person assumes and takes for granted and assumes that the other person takes for granted and assumes
that if they were to trade places the social world would be seen in
the same typicality by each (Garfinkel, 1967).

The 'et cetera' principle notes the importance of
interpretation in social interaction. Cicourel uses the Schutz
notion of the "open horizon" to detail that in interaction the
speaker assumes that (1) the hearer can fill in the unstated but
intended meanings of the speaker, and (2) the hearer assumes that
the speaker will say something at a later point in the interaction
that will clarify the ambiguous expressions. This rule permits the
actor to make narrative sense of the immediate settings. Another
interpretive property from Schutz associated with the 'et cetera'
principle by Cicourel is the normal form typification where the
participants of interaction will attempt to normalize the action
scene if discrepancies appear (Cicourel, 1972). Garfinkel (1963)
also assumes that differences between expected events and
activities are 'normalized' through comparisons to past events or
interactions, and then adjusted for the chance of occurrence and
context to achieve stability or routinized again through
interpretation.

The overriding concern of ethnomethodology is with the
organization of the everyday, taken-for-granted meaning into
routine patterns of interaction (Denzin, 1969). This concern for
the everyday practical reasoning becomes a study in how members
employ interpretive procedures to recognize the relevance of
surface rules (Cicourel, 1970). The reasoning used by the members
is the rationality of use in the negotiation of meaning (Cicourel,
A member is defined as an individual who has mastered the natural language, or the practices that allow members/agents in an interaction to display and produce commonsense knowledge and/or practical actions (Zimmerman, 1978). Ethnomethodology brackets the ordinary pragmatic assumptions in order to examine their foundations (Collins, 1981). Practical reasoning is a topic of its own for study.

The methods of reasoning that are used and which are accepted by the members of a group, or ethno, is different for each of the different ethnos to which a person belongs. Each group, or culture, structures a different form of reasoning (Manning, 1970). Interaction must be analyzed with respect to the methods and procedure by which members make their daily activities recognizable and accountable to themselves and others, thereby acquiring and conveying a sense of orderliness and structure (Knorr-Cetina, 1981). The topic is the manner in which members of a culture assemble particular scenes so as to provide evidence for one another of a social order-as-ordinarily conceived; looking to observe how members create the typifications that they use and acknowledge (Zimmerman & Pollner, 1970).

The form of the order or structure is consensual and not static. The ethnomethodologist treats meanings as indexical rather than transitationally stable (Zimmerman, 1978). It is through talk that members make accounts that unavoidably recognize and make recognizable to others the orderliness and coherence of daily life (Zimmerman & Weider, 1978). As one would expect, social structures
are assumed to be temporal in nature in that they are free to change meaning and structure as the ethno develops. The fact that the structures are created through a succession or collection of here and now situations can be seen to be epiphenomenal (Garfinkel, 1972).

Among other questions of ethnomethodology is how the actual world of the indexical and the particular get related to the general and the universal. Related to this question is how the typical gets made out of the indexical, and how this happens when a member is unfamiliar or new to the ethno.

The ethnomethodology makes several assumptions regarding the world in the search for the practices through which persons see, describe and act as if social interaction were stable (Knorr-Cetina, 1981). Social order is constantly being created/constructed/negotiated through the interactions of the actors/members. The order, demonstrated through the interaction, becomes the appropriate way of doing things or the commonsense reasoning for the members of the group. The ethnomethodologist assumes that the practical forms of reasoning that are used by an ethno or a particular group are differentiated from the forms used by other groups. Each group will accomplish its social order in a different way. While the social order is shared among members, it is not a consensus model. Talk, which always has a context, is a significant way to demonstrate the practical reasoning.

The ethnomethodologist has chosen to study communication and interaction that is demonstrated in public and is therefore
observable and empirical (Zimmerman, 1978; Weider, 1970). In doing so, they do not ask causal questions. The cognitive, or linguistic, turn has as its interest the language use of agents and the processes that interpret the world and its interactions (Knorr-Cetina, 1981). The focus of the study is not the subject, but the events, items, behaviors, and interactions that are in the common/public domain.

Trust is another key concept. The seriousness of interactions is seen as a trust and, as such, is taken as a moral matter by the members of the interaction. This trust is inherent and essential to all interaction (Garfinkel, 1963). One trusts that during interaction, behavior and communication will follow the properties or constitutive rules that are of the common/shared domain. The moral order consists of the rule-governed activities of everyday life. The moral order is known through the perceived normal courses of action (Garfinkel, 1972). Trust is also involved in verbal interaction in that one trusts, among other things, that understanding is accomplished.

Definitions of interaction and experience are constructed relationally, through reflection and reference to other imputed, projected or reconstructed accounts or situations (Knorr-Cetina, 1981). Interpretive rules allow the actor to adjust the changing sense of social structure to assign meaning and/or relevance to the environment ( Cicourel, 1972). Douglas (1970) makes note of two important kinds of context used in the interpretive process: linguistic context—where meaning is determined by linguistic items
(i.e., indexicals), and practical use context—where meaning is determined through the use of non-linguistic aspects of the situation. The properties of reasoning, which include the processes of interpretation, point to the indexical and reflexive nature of talk and interaction in the accomplishment of fact in the social world.

Bar-Hillel first discussed the idea that indexical expressions are essential for communication. Indexicality indicates the accomplished nature of meaning in interaction (Leiter, 1980). Indexicals are derived from the linguistic particularistic references in any statement made. It necessitates a context that is understood by the actors involved. The contextual particulars are themselves indexical (Leiter, 1980). Pronouns are typically indexical in the way that they reference meaning.

Reflexivity, similar to indexicality, makes social facts the product of interpretation. It is a necessary part of members' "rational accounting" of their activities (Douglas, 1970). Potentially it can demonstrate infinite regress of self-regarding viewpoints (Collins, 1981). A reflexive property of accounts is that they can make features of the setting observable. Those features and the accounts are made meaningful by the setting. The account explicates the setting by making some of its features observable; the setting, in turn, explicates the account. The reflexive property is visible within the account itself. Reflexivity is the result of the indexical property of objects,
events and particular talk. Reflexivity is produced through the unending chain of indexicality (Leiter, 1980).

Another property of the interpretive procedures that takes place during interaction is the documentary method. It was first elaborated by Mannheim (1952) and later transformed by Garfinkel (1967). In this method of making sense within the everyday life world, the documentary method requires distance from the phenomena. The actor or member has as the goal the reconstruction of the configurations of a thematic of the everyday life world. Any part that demonstrates the configuration is appropriate for use. One does not need to have any certain number of cases or even a completed event/interaction that matches the configuration. Members negotiate the totality out of the initial thematic. For Garfinkel the patterns are drawn from actual appearances, and the appearances are used to the interpret the patterns as the patterns are also used to interpret the appearances (Weider, 1975). The documentary method of interpretation is not for use by the ethnomethodologist, but it is the method that members use to discover and portray orderly and connected events (Zimmerman & Weider, 1970).

The Second Question - Trust

During the evidence-gathering portion of the study, the issue of trust began to submerge the initial question of typifications and the RA role. While the typifications were evident in the creation of the understanding of the RA role, the typifications
also were evidence for the development of trust. The focus of the study shifted to a second question: what is trust and how is it accomplished? Ethnomethodology remained the conceptual frame for understanding the development of trust among residents.

**Literature Review II**

A second review of the literature of student affairs and residence halls was begun with a focus on trust. The literature of student affairs is dominated by psychological and social-psychological literature. This literature review addressed trust from the foundation of these orientations. In the only work discovered in the literature that focused on the staff of the residence halls, Powell et al. identified trust as a necessary need for the PA or resident assistant to fulfill in relations with students (1969:55). In their book-length monograph on the personnel assistant, the need for trust was solely placed with the responsibility of the RA.

Trust was associated with the ability to maintain a confidence regarding a personal or private matter. Empathy was identified by the authors as related to trust but not a foundational condition for the development of trust (1969:57). They elaborated further that an RA did not have to trust students to understand them.

Relatively, Erickson's developmental framework, upon which much of the student development literature is based, has as a fundamental issue the interplay between trust and mistrust (1963:247+). The interplay between these two issues formed the
basis for later crisis. The fundamental experience of therapy was to resolve and re-resolve issues regarding trust. Trust, from this developmental and psychoanalytic frame, is in a very broad sense phenomenological because of its relation to experience. But trust is categorized as a need located in the ego impacting individuals within the life situation.

The social-psychological literature draws broadly from work similar to Erickson's and incorporates perspectives that attempt to develop an interactionist approach. There are a number of authors who have undertaken a dialogue with Luhmann, Parsons, and symbolic interactionism as they explore conceptualizations of trust. All of the writers claim trust as a fundamental and/or critical component of social interaction.

Identifying themselves with a systems formulation, Holzner & Robertson in a journal publication write of trust as an essential quality of social bounds and . . . society (1980:9). Maintaining a connection with social psychology, they identify trust as a critical component of identity construction. Shapiro, in an article titled "The Social Control of Impersonal Trust," also considers trust as a kind of bond for social organization that is located along with issues of the self (1987). Shapiro also begins to outline the relationship between trust as a social bond and its role within organizations. Barber elaborates this conception in his book The Logic and Limits of Trust further by claiming that trust is a form of social control related to actors' expectations
(1983:20). For this reason, it should be given special consideration by organizations.

In "Social and Interpersonal Trust," Loomis & Loomis ground their discussion of social and interpersonal trust in the work of Parsons (1973). From Parsons they nurture the social qualities of trust. They conceptualize trust as one of two systems relative to needs. Loomis & Loomis also establish a connection to G. H. Mead and his ideas of the symbolic nature of language to discuss the communication of trust. They modify Mead to develop the symbolic nature of language impacting the development of trust through attitudes and emotions (1973:320). One system that Loomis & Loomis identify is the personality productive system, and the second system is that of organizations (1973:321). Although the authors initially locate trust as a cognitive process, trust eventually is related to rewards and fears to enhance the two systems of culture. This moves trust for Loomis & Loomis into the affective domain.

In a more clearly symbolic interactionist frame that draws from social-psychology, McCall & Simmons identified trust as being "tactfully considerate" to others within the bound of a social relationship (1966:195). In their work *Identities and Interactions*, they describe trust as having particular limits and bounds for actors within a relationship, but that all limits are reciprocally expected (1966:195). This is understood by actors through needs and language interactions.

Griffin & Patton identify trust as a construct to explain relationships between behavioral events (1971:375). It is a
construct because trust is an attitude and not observable or identifiable. For actors to be able to establish trust, the authors identify three necessary components. There must be 1) risk; 2) goals to be attained; 3) a degree of anxiety regarding the interplay of risk and goals (1971:377). They also identify a series of variables regarding each of the components. In an article authored independently, titled "Interaction Variables of Interpersonal Trust," Griffin further details how trust cannot be seen but only inferred from behaviors because it is a feeling or an attitude (1973:297-298). Images of self-concept and esteem are tied to feelings of trust and willingness to risk the self-image within relationships. This view is also supported by Morgan, who in an article developed similar notions suggesting that trust is a matter of faith in the other who is presented through symbolic acts (1973:239).

In separate writings, both Weigert (Sociology of Everyday Life, 1981) and Henslin ("What Makes For Trust," 1981) maintain that trust is a part of the everyday life world. For Weigert, trust goes further than knowledge to communicate the self to the other throughout the duration of a specific situation. Henslin states that trust is a socialized mode based on behavioral cues to trust. Trust is an offering, or a gift, to the other. It is a presentation of the self that is accepted by the other (1981:91-92). Both authors identify trust as an attitude relative to the image of the self and expressed and accepted through social relations.
For Holzner, trust is the "cement of social life" (1973:333). In his article "Sociological Reflections on Trust," he relates trust with risk in social relations. Holzner connects via Heidegger trust and faith as necessary parts to the same whole. Trust is maintained through patterns of trust embedded in the fabric of social relations both interpersonally and interorganizationally. The cues for trust occur through and across contexts. Trust depends upon the identity and conscious activities of the actors involved (1973:344).

Gratton's article "Some Aspects of the Lived Experience of Interpersonal Trust" attempts to conceptualize the experience of evolution or development that altered individuals' conscious experience to trusting another (1973:275). Borrowing from Schutz, she identifies shifts in trust as the result of changes in interpersonal relatedness. Trust is related to vulnerability and risk as the focus of the changes in interpersonal relatedness. For Gratton trust is rooted in the present and future rather than the past. Trust is a matter of choosing to risk within the context of interpersonal relations (1973:296).

Discussion

This initial review of the literature relative to trust did not yield conceptualizations that were commensurable with the experiences that were identified by the actor or with the behaviors that were observed by the researcher. Gratton's writing came the closest to identifying trust as a practice that is a component of
the everyday life experience. Yet she maintains a connection to the affect through her conception of risk and its relation to trust.

The literature of a social-psychological frame to trust could not produce understanding of the phenomenon as a lived experience that is a natural event in the life world. Trust was identified as emotion or affect, and as such it was identified as a need. Within these notions one could not understand the production of trust or its maintenance outside of a psychological condition.

The psychological and social-psychological literature will not be used as frames for understanding trust. The focus of this study is on the meanings and the meaning structures of actors. The paradigm of psychology and social-psychology present limitations to the accomplishment of understanding meaning and meaning structures of actors (Polkinghorne, 1983). (Any theoretical or methodological decisions will limit the understanding that is able to be constructed due to the limits of the selected paradigm.)

Deetz (1982) outlines problems with the dominant paradigms. The paradigms of psychology and social-psychology attempt to establish explanations through correlations with psychological states, attitudes, roles, or conditions. The resultant law-like predictions that are produced are typically independent of space and time. Events are seen to occur in a never-ending present. Interactions between actors focus upon one actor's response and then the second actor's response. Interaction, or what is happening between actors, is not identified. The complexity of
interaction and its socially distributed knowledge is lost. The results of research within these paradigms are deterministic and limit the ability of the actors to be creative of their life world.

The literature reviews of this chapter locate trust within the psychological or social-psychological frame. Trust, for these paradigms, is associated with affect and/or emotion. To conceptualize trust in this manner indicates that trust is already a given and not constructed, sustained, or adapted by human actors and only a matter of perception. From the beginning this researcher did not identify trust as already given or a social or psychological state or condition; rather, trust was identified with social practices of creative actors and located within the frame of socially distributed and socially acquired knowledge.

The evolution of the methodology and issues of the emergence of the study of trust is detailed more completely in the research chapter. A second review of literature can be found in the interpretation and discovery chapter. This second review examines the theoretical, sociological literature related to trust and places it in juxtaposition with the interpretations of evidence and experiences gathered from the everyday life world for the study.
CHAPTER II

Research Methodology

Any inquiry into or study of members' practices is itself an organized activity. Its purpose is to make evident, or reveal, or demonstrate the rational properties of members' practices and accounts.

(Garfinkel, 1967:32-34)

Introduction

Ethnomethodology is not a methodology but a theoretical lens for studying the social world. There are four features that are necessary for the accomplishment of an ethnomethodological study. As a foundation for its agenda, ethnomethodology relies on the work of Alfred Schutz and, in particular, his construction of the natural attitude. Schutz's notion of second order constructs is significant for the doing of a phenomenological-styled study. Closely related to the second order construct is the documentary method; methodologically, ethnomethodology implements the documentary method as a procedure to identify and explicate thematics for study.

Ethnomethodology

Ethnomethodology directs its attentions toward members and the social groups to which they belong. The ethnomethodologist studies
actual situations to discover how people in them see, report and order the interactions and structures that are assumed to be orderly. The procedures of sense-making for members of a social group become a topic for study rather than remaining a resource of the study. With this orientation, one is addressing the interpretive process of the members and the social group. Pollner (1974) points out that the ethnomethodologist attempts to see the processes, that is the accounts, the practices, the activities, by which members continually create, sustain, reproduce, and make visible the features of the social order that appear to be already objective. The researcher cannot assume a common understanding, and that is why accounts of the members are generated, recorded and selected for study.

Ethnomethodology has as its charge the study of the practical reasoning demonstrated by an ethno, or group. These practical forms of reasoning are seen to have their own form of rationality that is a part of the members' everyday life world. Ethnomethodologists use the term 'member' rather than Schutz's terms 'actor' or 'agent.' 'Member' indicates that the actor is a part of a particular social group. An actor is a member of several distinct social groups at any one time. A member cannot be seen in the limited perspective as only an individual. Rather, a member is a person who is a competent participant in the language and meaning systems of that particular social group (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970: 342).
A competent participant is a member of a social group who is accomplished in the use of the language and the meaning system of a given social group. Garfinkel & Sacks (1970) make a further distinction that language in this context does not refer to a specific language of words and symbols with a syntax and such, but to the system of practices of the sociality. The competent participant will know the rules, codes, and typically routine behaviors, and the meanings they hold within the context of a particular social group. The mastery of the natural language allows members to display their commonsense knowledge that will produce and exhibit the features of the environment that are seen as objective and real.

The Natural Attitude

The attitude of the daily life, or the natural attitude, was developed by Schutz as the basic presupposition whereby events are assigned by an agent constitutive meanings that are based on the features of the event that are known in common (Schutz, 1962:208). The natural attitude is an outgrowth of the routines of daily life and becomes the foundation for understanding the experiences one has in the world. From the natural attitude, the world is seen as factual and typical; it is not doubted or questioned while the actor is pragmatically involved in his or her interests. The orderliness of the social structure is linked to the routines of the everyday life and is redone each day through social interaction. The meanings are seen as established prior to the
involvement of the member and agreed upon by known and unknown predecessors. The world is seen as meaningful and established prior to the actors' entrance.

The social world is already intersubjective and therefore not a private domain. It is available for all to interpret via similar recipes or maxims in the objective and real manner that it is presented. Through the actions and assumptions expressed and observed by the actors in the natural attitude, the everyday life world is accomplished and maintained (Leiter, 1980). Actions by the actors either reaffirm or add to the commonsense knowledge. The knowledge of the everyday life world is socially acquired and socially distributed. The experiences and the interpretations of the everyday life world are based upon the accumulated social knowledge that is available to all participants of the everyday life world.

**Second Order Constructs**

Ethnomethodology seeks to bracket or suspend the belief in the objective features of the everyday life world, that is, the natural attitude. Schutz developed a two-stage model of the methodology of phenomenological sociology. (1) In the initial stage, the actions of actors are first described and understood in terms of the meanings they hold for the actors. This stage is a description of the meanings of the natural attitude. (2) In the second stage, the actions of the actors are explained by concepts meaningful to the social scientist and the scientific audience (Schutz, 1962:59).
The concepts of the second stage are second order constructs. They remain closely associated with the meanings of the actors and should be described and explained in language accessible to the actors and their community.

The second order constructs of the social scientist are seen within an objective context of meaning in that they are understood apart from the perspective of the members of the study (Schutz, 1962:241). While the phenomenologist brackets to identify the foundational features of experience that develop the meaningfulness, the ethnomethodologist brackets the natural attitude to consider as phenomena only those practices of members which are produced. The ethnomethodological perspective makes understandable, from the members' perspective, the objective features of the setting that give the setting the reasonable or routine qualities that the members maintain (Psathas, 1977:80).

Analysis for the ethnomethodologist takes the form of examining the experiences and the themes from the data or evidence. For the ethnomethodologist the focus is on the processes, members' practical methods, for making accountable the setting's properties (Psathas, 1977). The researcher examines the evidence and formulates the second order constructs, which create ideal types for use as exemplars (Schutz, 1962:39-40). The ideal type is not a universal or generalizable construct but is a type used for discussion and comparison. The interpretation, the ideal type, is a constitution and, as such, its scope is limited to the understanding of a theme or phenomena within a particular context.
The Documentary Method

The documentary method will be used in this study as a means to thematize topics for examination. It is an interpretive method for making sense of the life world. The documentary method has its origin in the work of Dilthey (1921) and Mannheim (1936), and was later transformed by Garfinkel (1967:95). It requires a reflective distance from the phenomena. A reflective distance indicates a movement out of the natural attitude toward a scientific frame.

The researcher has as a goal the reconstruction of the configurations of a particular thematic of the everyday life world. As such, the documentary method is an interpretive procedure based in empirical evidence. The documentary method is a reconstruction of historical knowledge. The social world is a world that is already interpreted for the researcher and the members of the social group of study. The meanings for events and phenomena are already incorporated in the language and meaning systems that we learn through our interactions with others.

Procedurally, the documentary method must first produce an actual occurrence that will point toward or be an instance of a supposed underlying pattern. This occurrence is a produced facticity available for interpretation within a social context. The occurrence is used to elaborate the patterns of interaction and vice versa. The first interpretation, which is in the objective mode, is the natural attitude of the everyday life world of the members. This is an immediate reaction and is always primary and prior to any reflection. It is objective not in the positivist
mode of subjective/objective dichotomy, but objective in that it is a social fact or facticity constructed out of the history and expectancies of the everyday life world. One can have questions and reflections in the objective mode, yet they remain interpretations. Second order constructs of Schutz's method are developed out of this initial interpretation of the natural attitude.

Any part of an account, behavior or text that demonstrates the configuration or pattern of the whole is appropriate for use as an instance available for interpretation for a second order construct. One does not need to have a certain number of cases or even a completed event that matches the configuration. Rather than trying to grasp the phenomena in its totality, a few of its features are identified and the situated meanings expressed. Researchers and members can interpret and identify the larger themes of the totality out of the initial thematic.

If the researcher constructs a natural history of a phenomenon, it is the documentary method that is utilized to decide the appropriate structure and order that will illuminate the present through relevant events of the past (Garfinkel, 1967:95). For Garfinkel, the particular instances are drawn from actual appearances and the appearances are used to then interpret the general theme, as the themes are also used to interpret the appearances (Weider, 1975). The documentary method of interpretation is not only for use by the ethnomethodologist, but it is the method that members use to discover and portray orderly
and connected events within the everyday life world (Zimmerman & Weider, 1970).

The examples selected for this study are developed from transcribed taped interviews and observations that are available from recorded field notes. The examples become instances of the thematic, or question. In this way they are affirmational or supportive of the whole from which they were selected. What is non-affirmational is not selected for inclusion within a particular thematic. As well, perceptually they may not be as attended to due to their non-affirmational character. The researcher does the affirmation or denial of the coherence of the particular instance through the reading of the field notes and the transcribed interviews. (Both the field notes and the transcribed interviews are identified texts available for interpretation. However, the interpretation must remain bounded within the context of the social group and the physical environment for the interpretation to be objective.) But other forms of manipulation of the created texts will also assist the researcher in the creation of instances to reflect onto the thematic. For example, the transcription of the taped interviews was done by the researcher.

To obtain knowledge of the social group, the researcher cannot describe phenomena with his or her own a priori categories. One must use the terminology, language and perspective of the members. To do so, the researcher must be a participating observer, trying to get the most genuine, native descriptions and meanings that are shared by the members. The goal of the researcher is to identify
and elaborate the internal perspective of the members rather than the external perspective that she/he brings to the social group. In this manner the researcher is able to use the interpretive frame of the members to understand phenomena. The researcher is the one who generates the thematic or question for study.

There is not a minimum or maximum number of cases that are necessary for the documentary method to be appropriate. It is in the selection of the fragment for use as an instance that the documentary method becomes significant. Each part reflects back to the whole of the phenomena of which it is a part. The talk of the interviews and the observations from field notes are particulars. One fragment which reflects the whole, in the manner of a holographic picture, is what is necessary. The fragment can become the particular and the element of analysis that points toward the pattern or the thematic. The questions that are used in the interview are generated from the observed behavior of the members' interaction and from the texts of the initial interviews.

During the interview members make reasonable accounts that are constructed out of a question by the researcher. The accounts made by the members of the social group are demonstrations of the common culture that is intersubjectively shared. The accounts are a text to be read regarding the members' rational methods for assembling the factual nature of the everyday life world.

In-depth, semi-structured interviews are one method of creating an account of members' rational practices. The semi-structured interview is an account in the same manner that field notes of
observations are also accounts. Accounts are methods used by members to produce social order or objects that reveal features of the event and setting. The interview, similar to other forms of accounts such as stories, explanations, letters, reports, and rationalizations, is seen by Garfinkel as a reflective practice that asks members to make an account to the researcher about the practical reasoning that facilitates the activities and the types of interactions the members are managing (Garfinkel, 1967:4). Accounts are based in the interpretive practices of the members.

Significantly, the transcripts of the interview, and for that matter the researcher's accounts based on observations, are forms of transformation. Each instance that occurs is a transformation of the actuality of the events. Because language does not have a direct one-to-one relationship with the objective and phenomena of the social world, its use already incorporates a transformation or gloss of meaning. The approach develops a foundation of evidence based on actual practices of members.

The research method used for this study follows some of the strategies of phenomenological research regarding interviewing combined with the agenda of ethnomethodology. The methodology is micro, as it directs focus on the elements of a social group with limited membership. The second order constructs will produce formulations of membership activities that appear rule-like. The rules are descriptions of features necessary to produce the appearance of recognition of an event for members, rather than being a structured and prescriptive rule (Psathas, 1977:93). The
foundations of the rules are similar to the identification of constitutive properties. The rules can be applied only to the unique setting in which they are situated. While the activities are 'out there' to be seen and studied, it is a matter of common sense for the members and in this way out of awareness for them. This methodology seeks to make explicit the implicitness of the everyday life world. The present study is an 'account of accounts' through an ethnomethodological lens.

Evidence Collection

Evidence for this study was collected primarily during the 1986-87 school year and also during the fall of 1987. The study began as exploratory. Employing concepts from ethnomethodology, I began to look at residence hall staff and student interactions.

Entering the Site. To undertake this work I gained the informed cooperation of the residence life area of a major land-grant university. The associate director, an area coordinator, and a residence hall director assisted in identifying a specific locale for a prospective setting for the research.

The process entailed the submission of a research proposal to the office of residence life, followed by a subsequent meeting with the chief administrator for the residence life system. We agreed at this time to include the area coordinator from one of the three areas with which I had some familiarity because of workshops I had done with a hall staff different than the building eventually chosen for study. After this meeting a particular building was
selected for study and a follow-up meeting was initiated with the area coordinator and the hall director of the building selected for study to discuss the identification of a particular resident assistant (RA) for the study.

The residence life office also permitted me to have access to the resident assistant selection and training process. During this period, Spring 1986, a structured interview was conducted with four future resident assistants, and I had the opportunity to review training materials so that I might obtain a better understanding of some of the intentional socialization practices and the expectancies of a future resident assistant from the organization.

The residence hall professional staff were open and helpful in allowing me to select a site. They included discussions about the physical characteristics of the building selected, the traditional reputation of the facility, and the composition of each of the floors in terms of the number of students, ranking, male/female ratios, and number of students returning to the residence hall system. This information helped to confirm the selection of the building because of its general make-up of students.

Other criteria that were involved in the initial development of the site of the study were discussed and accepted during this preliminary stage. These criteria included the following considerations. I wanted to do the study in a large, coed residence hall. The composition of the floor that was deemed most desirable by me was one that would be predominantly, if not totally, freshmen. It was hoped that the freshmen would be
reasonably distributed between females and males on the particular floor of study. As well, students who had not lived in college residence halls previous to the time of the study was another criterion among the population of residents, although the control over this was limited to the randomness of the computer placement of the resident students.

At the meeting of the area coordinator and the hall director and myself, they suggested a residence hall advisor (RA) who might be appropriate for the study. My criterion was a first-year staff member who had no previous experience as an RA and who had lived in the university's residence hall system for at least one previous year, and I wanted a person who had participated in the system's selection and training process. One suggestion made to me at this time by the professional staff of residence life was that I select a male staff member to work with rather than a female because of the amount of time that I would spend in this person's room and with him or her in the performance of the person's professional duties. A tentative selection was made of an RA at this time pending his approval.

A general statement regarding the goals and methods of the proposed study was explained in writing to the RA. This introductory letter, sent to the RA at his summer home address, explained who the researcher was, the goal of the research, and a solicitation for further discussions and assistance from the RA. The original correspondence led to a telephone conversation and finally an interview. During the course of this interview, we
established an initial set of ground rules for the work which were
designed to protect the RA's ability to perform his duties as
assigned. A second goal of the ground rules was to allow the RA
enough of an opportunity to do his school work unimpeded by the
researcher's presence. The ground rules had a third goal, which
was to allow the RA time to function as an individual apart from
his job and his school work. The dialogue regarding the ground
rules was an empowerment of the RA, allowing him to have control
over his commitment to and the boundaries of the study. As well,
the ground rules were set up to guarantee the anonymity of the site
and the individuals connected with it.

Ground Rules. The ground rules that were discussed and agreed
upon by the RA and myself covered the aspect of the evidence
collection. The RA's involvement hinged upon my ability to come to
understand the context and not impede the RA in the doing of his
job. Because the context of any environment is constituted by what
the members are doing and when they are doing it (Erickson &
Shultz, 1981:148), it was necessary to spend a considerable amount
of time among the staff and students in the building. The most
significant in terms of potential impact was that the RA or his
supervisor could terminate the study at any time and for any
reason. A second rule was that I would be notified and permitted
to attend any floor function including parties, sports events,
meetings; there would be no limit on my participation in these
public events. When the RA was on-call, I would be permitted to
observe him and follow him throughout his duty. If the RA was
going to be in his room hanging out or studying, I could ask for
his permission to observe possible student interactions. Before I
started to do interviews with the students, another agreed-upon
rule was that the RA asked that I be on the floor only when the RA
was there. Later, the RA rescinded this ground rule, and the
second-year RA never asked for this rule when I offered it to him.
In the course of doing observations, if a situation arose at any
time—in a student room, in the RA's room, or if we were on rounds
—that the RA felt he wanted to deal with alone, then he could ask
me to withdraw from the situation.

Confidentiality. Confidentiality was a separate issue in and
of itself because of the varying allegiances that differing people
had. Each of the vested participants had a particular issue with
confidentiality, both the maintenance and the violation of it.
This included the professional hall staff, the RA, and the students
who were being observed and interviewed.

The professional residence hall staff expected me to confront
inappropriate student behavior in a manner similar to being an
adult presence in the residence hall. It was never detailed in our
discussions what inappropriate behavior might entail. I suppose
that our shared history of residence hall work allowed the
professional staff members, from whom I had to obtain approval to
get into the site, to assume that I knew and shared their
perspective of what this type of behavior might look like.
Fortunately, no occasions arose where a dilemma confronted the
researcher regarding my involvement in confronting student behavior.

The RA expected me, as a part of our ground rules, to keep confidences regarding several general issues. When he revealed student confidences to me based on his discussions with students, or if I was with him when a student revealed a confidence, the RA expected me to keep these to myself. Contrary to this, the RA and the hall director expected me to reveal to them confidences told to me by students if the confidences might negatively impact the welfare of the students or the facility. On a different front, unstated yet still felt by myself, the RA also expected me not to detail to the hall director or the area coordinator the instances when he chose not to follow the appropriate rules and policies of residence life or the institution in terms of confronting students regarding their behavior.

The students also had an issue with confidence in regard to their interaction with me. Some students with whom I developed relationships would reveal information about themselves and/or their relationships that they expected me not to pass along to the residence hall staff regardless of the potential outcome. For some students, an issue of confidence involved their violation of rules and whether or not I would reveal their violations to the hall staff. However, for most student this was not an issue because they did not violate policies or they accepted my role as it was explained to them at the first floor meeting.
The first-year RA, "Cliff" as he will be called, agreed to be a participant. Because of the manner in which the evidence was collected, Cliff, and later John, the second-year RA, had to be a full participant at all times for the study to begin or continue. As the study proceeded, Cliff and John were always fully apprised of the nature of the work at hand. Particular research questions and shifts in methods of observation and data collection were only begun after the RA had approved them. In this manner they both became full partners in the research efforts, always confirming analyses and helping in the definition of the direction of the study.

**Pre-service Training.** After gaining the approval of the RA, I participated in the part of their in-service training that occurs the week before students arrive. I had four goals that I hoped to achieve through this involvement. First, I wanted to familiarize myself with the physical layout of the building and the rooms of the students and the staff. Second, I wanted to make myself familiar to the other RAs in the building. I did not want to create an incident should they see me in the building at some time and not know who I was. As well, the RA with whom I was working would have duty with the other staff people throughout the course of the year, and I did not want to meet them for the first time when I was taking notes. Third, I wanted to have some knowledge of the direction and training that the staff had as a part of the developing context for understanding the RA's actions. Fourth, I wanted to come to know the RA of the study in a more personal
manner before the students arrived. Lincoln and Guba (1985), Douglas (1976), and Johnson (1976) identify this initial aspect of a study as gaining the trust of the participants in the study.

Developing trust is distinct from gaining approval for the study. Each is significant in its own way. Without access one could not do the study. Without the trust of the RA the access could be limited and the confidence in the data would not be strong.

First Floor Meeting. The procedures that are described below are the same for both the first and the second year of the study. At the first floor meeting I introduced myself as a graduate student involved in dissertation research into the nature of the RA and student interactions. I stated further that I would be around the building and the floor with Cliff, and later, John, taking notes, and that at a later date I might ask them to do an interview with me that would be taped. I explained that I was not a residence life staff person and that there would be no pressure for them to cooperate with me. I indicated my willingness to respond to any question at that time or at any other time convenient to them. In both years, no one asked me any questions about myself or the study during the first floor meeting.

Meeting the Students. I initially met the students at the first floor meeting, but this was in terms of a group. To meet them as individuals I employed four strategies. First, I would meet them as the RA would do rounds. This could occur in the hall, on the stairs, in the elevator, or in their rooms if he stopped to
chat. I made a concerted effort to have the RA introduce me as Jeffrey, a friend who is doing research about residence halls. Second, I would meet the students as they came to the RA's room to chat, ask him questions, or if he called to them as they passed by the room. Along with the introduction, I tried to engage the students in a personal discussion so I could have a basis for another conversation in the future should the opportunity present itself. A third means for meeting the students was to sit with them during floor meetings and talk to them and to participate in floor activities such as volleyball. On these occasions I attempted to act as an equal and fit within the group. Fourth, I used the roommate contract as another method that also allowed me access to the student rooms. Each room had to do a roommate contract under the supervision of the RA and these took place in the student rooms. By getting in to the student rooms, I could meet the students as individuals and they could see me as a minimally-obtrusive observer. This also allowed me to distinguish patterns of connection and interaction outside of the room that were inclusive or exclusive of the roommates.

Field Notes. The collection of data regarding the interactions between the RA and the students began with the first floor meeting that is held before classes start in the fall quarter. The residence halls open six days before classes start, and students begin to move in as soon as they know the buildings are open. To avoid the confusion that initially occurs as students move into their new environment, I was asked by the RAs in both
years of the study to not come onto the floor until the first floor meeting.

From this point until the conclusion of the study, I spent time with the staff person as he performed his duties. To maintain continuity and capture the context of interactions, I maintained a schedule where I would typically enter the building around dinner time and stay until the RA decided to go to bed, usually around 12:30 a.m. I would sometimes go to dinner with the RA, but most of the time I would meet him after he returned to his room. If there was an event or meeting that was to occur with his floor, I would participate with him. If the RA was on duty I would accompany him on his rounds through the building.

At first I carried a small notebook with me, but the first-year RA expressed concern that the students might perceive himself individually or us together as police people making a record of names and activities of the students. To avoid this presentation to students, I kept my notebook in the room of the RA and would take any notes when we returned to the room or after a student left the room. (I continued this practice throughout the duration of the study.) By all indications, this was not problematic for the students; they seldom expressed interest in myself or the research except when it came time for individual interviews.

Taped Interview Sessions. The research interview is a jointly-constructed event where the researcher has to be aware that she/he, along with the interviewee, are creating an event with its own context for the purpose of generating evidence for study
(Mishler, 1986). After becoming familiar with students, I would ask them to do a taped interview. This sense of familiarity was usually based upon having observed an interaction that they had with the RA that could then become the basis for discussion. Kvale (1983) has identified several aspects to the qualitative research interview.

Writing from a phenomenological frame, Kvale's outline is helpful in guiding the researcher in understanding the context and the data of the interview. Kvale indicates that the qualitative research interview should capture descriptions of the everyday life world of the interviewee. In detailing the technical aspects of the interview, he suggests that the interview be "semi-structured," indicating a form that is located between a free conversation and a highly-structured questionnaire (1983:174).

The power of a semi-structured interview is that it allows the researcher to push the interviewee to further describe and detail the experiences that are disclosed in the interview. The semi-structured interview permits the researcher and the respondent to come to an agreement regarding the particular meaning a word, phrase, or thought may have from the vantage point of the respondent that might be unclear to the researcher. The gestures that accompany the responses are also available for explication by the respondent in the semi-structured interview. It also allows the researcher to probe a particular avenue that comes from the descriptions of the interviewee that are not a part of the interview questions brought to the format. Kvale states that the
interviews should be taped and then transcribed exactly as they are heard on the tape. The tape and the transcription are the texts to be used for the interpretation.

Kvale identifies several aspects to the interview situation that are appropriate to this study (1983:174-176). His procedural remarks have a similarity to Schutz's conception of the development of second order constructs. There are five parts of Kvale's work that are singled out for emphasis in the methodology of this study. First, the interview is focused upon the everyday life world of the interviewee. A second aspect is that the interview is an attempt by the researcher to understand in a manner similar to the frame of the interviewee the meanings of phenomena of the life world. Third, the researcher attempts to have the interviewee describe as concretely and exactly the experiences that she/he has had and the meanings that the experiences hold for the interviewee using the language and meanings of the everyday life world. Fourth, the researcher seeks to have the interviewee talk about particular events and people rather than to talk in general terms about indirect experiences. Finally, the content of the interview should focus upon specific themes available to the interviewee in the everyday life world. The interviewer guides the discussion toward the themes. The interviewee supplies the specific examples, the meanings of the examples, and any values or opinions that may be identified with the phenomena of the times.

Prior to the interview, the researcher used as a part of the interview protocol an introductory statement. These remarks
included a request to do the interview. An introduction of the researcher, including his status as a graduate student at Ohio State University, was made at this time to those students who might not know the researcher very well. A brief explanation was made of the problem that the researcher was investigating. This also incorporated a disclaimer that the researcher was not interested in evaluating the job performance of the RA. The researcher outlined to the prospective respondent the nature and depth of confidentiality of any remarks made by the respondent. The researcher explained that the use of a tape recorder permitted a more accurate transcription to be made of the interview.

The researcher also proposed that at a later time he would return to the student to verify the transcription and to permit the respondent to suggest inaccuracies or incompleteness in the transcriptions. This discussion could include the request to define words or expressions or experiences that may be unclear to the researcher. The researcher outlined that at a later date another discussion would be requested to discuss interpretations and hypotheses that might be emerging. Once these procedural concerns were agreed upon, the interview could begin.

The particular questions that were used as the basis for the semi-structured interview follow below. The questions were always asked in the order presented here. 1. Based upon your own experience at this college, what does an RA do? Please give specific examples. 2. Before you came to this college, what did you know about RAs and from whom/where did you obtain this
knowledge? 3. What is the typical RA? 4. What qualities or characteristics would you give to the ideal RA? 5. Please describe a relationship with a person whom you knew before you came to college that is similar to the relationship that you have with your RA. 6. Have you ever talked or thought about these issues that we have just talked about before, and if so, with whom? Depending upon the detail and depth of the response, further questions could be asked to obtain a clearer description of the phenomena from the life world of the interviewee.

The cooperating RAs also participated in the taped interviews. The interview format detailed above was also done with the two cooperating RAs as well as the students. As interactions were observed, the RAs were also interviewed regarding the substance of the events and the situated meanings.

The Second Year

For the second year of the study, additional approval was necessary. At the end of the first year of the study the chief administrator for residence life, the area coordinator, and the hall director for the facility I was in all changed personnel. Another proposal was submitted and another round of meetings was held. My criteria remained the same and I added the request to use the same floor to eliminate any differences that might have occurred in the study due to physical differences in facilities. As in the first year, the professional staff was helpful in allowing entrance to the site. They were also able to draw upon
the comments from the first year of the study that indicated my presence was not a hindrance to the operation of the staff member on the floor in the fulfillment of his duties.

For the second year of the study the RA for this floor changed. To gain the approval of "John," as he will be called, I had to go through the same procedure that I did with Cliff. Again, as with the discussions with the professional staff in the second year, I benefited from the positive relationship and experience that I had with Cliff. I encouraged John to speak to Cliff about what he might expect from me and my presence on the floor. John and I agreed to the same conditions of the study as Cliff and I had, which have been detailed above.

**Analytic Procedures**

As in other forms of analysis, manipulations of the evidence are necessary to reach meaningful understandings. The first form of manipulation involves the reviewing of field notes. A second form of manipulation involves the process of creating transcriptions from the taped interviews. The transcriptions were done by the researcher. After the transcription was created, it was reviewed against the tape to check for accuracy.

Transcriptions were supplied to the respondents to permit them to review them for completeness and coherence of their comments as recorded. Changes were made after discussion with the respondents. After this time, notes made during the interviews regarding the location and the conditions of the interview were added. As well,
notes about gestures, interruptions, and changes in the tone of the interview were added to the transcription.

The transcription process afforded the researcher the opportunity to become familiar with the evidence. Examples of instances of the thematic appeared "obvious" and available for the development of the interpretations. Yet analysis of the evidence begins with the observation process. Each observation, interview, transcription and reflection becomes a moment of attending to a particular. Time away from the evidence was also spent in contemplation of the study, whether intentional or unintentional. Patterns that emerge from connections that arise through reflection add to the development of understanding. A series of notes were maintained that outline this constructive process begun during reflection.

At this juncture, the whole of the evidence could be read and analyzed and the documentary method detailed above utilized.
CHAPTER III
Evidence

Introduction

This chapter will begin with a presentation of the physical setting for this study. Included within the description of the context is a linguistic account of the physical layout of a student's room, the RA room and the hallway. The questions of the student interview and the responses and typifications from the first and second year of the study are detailed. A breakdown of the responses according to gender is graphed. The movement to a second research question embedded within the evidence and experience of this study that became the central focus for the study is outlined through a documentation of exemplars.

The Physical Setting

The residence halls were opened the weekend before the Wednesday beginning of classes. The researcher entered the site on the Sunday night before school started. Most of the students had moved in by this time. On this evening, the RA had his first floor meeting and introduced the researcher to the residents. The researcher could respond to any initial student concerns or questions at this time.
From this point until the sixth week of school, the researcher would arrive in the building at 5:30 p.m. and stay until at least 12:30 a.m. On weekends the researcher would arrive in the building at 12:00 p.m. and remain with the RA until 1 a.m. When there were special events or meetings during the times that the researcher was not normally in the building, the RAs called and informed the researcher so that he could attend. An example of this was the roommate contract process that typically occurred during the middle of the day during the week. This pattern of observation was the same for both the first and the second year of the study.

This study was conducted at a large state-supported institution in the midwest. The residence hall is the largest facility by the number of students on campus. The building consists of twelve floors designed in a T-shape. The elevators are located at the junction of the T. Stairs are located at the end point of each section of the T. The common areas, which include the TV lobby, the weight room, the laundry facilities, the large study rooms, the meeting rooms, and the piano, are located on either the first floor or in the basement. Each floor has seventy-two (72) residents and one resident assistant. The senior staff, all of whom live in the building, includes one full-time professional hall director. The two assistant hall directors are half-time, and they are also graduate students in a student personnel program.

**Student Rooms.** The rooms in the facility are similar except for the RA's room. The door to the room enters into the living area. In the living area are four desks; two of the desks are
moveable and two are permanently affixed to the wall and floor. The single telephone is also in the living area. Many students create telephone extensions to the sleeping area by rewiring the phone themselves and providing their own new unit. The rooms include a bathroom which is off the small living area. On the opposite side of the living area to the bathroom is the sleeping area; it contains two sets of bunked beds, closet space and drawer space. The rooms were originally designed for two people to be assigned to each room. At the present time, four students are assigned to each room.

While this description indicates the physical layout of the rooms, it does not detail the differences between rooms. Typically, the rooms take on an appearance that matches the interests and orientations of its residents. The match can usually be associated along gender lines.

Male rooms usually have at least one nude female poster hanging somewhere in the room. Alcohol advertisements and sculptures constructed from empty beer cans and bottles become monuments to previous experiences. Car and rock posters take a place among pictures of women and sports heroes. It is not unusual to find rooms where one cannot see any of the wall beneath the layering of posters. In the small space above the desk may be the picture of a girlfriend. The rooms of the men frequently take on a stronger odor that is not limited to the smell of dirty, sweaty socks. There is a feeling of darkness to the male room.
By contrast, the typical room of females will have more of a lighter look and feel to it. Generally, one can find a plant or two in the room. If there is an odor, it is usually of a lighter variety. This does not hold true if a female room has athletes as residents, and in this case the smell may be more in line with what is usually associated with a male room. The posters on the wall may include rock stars, scantily-clad sports figures, advertisements for campus events, and posters that include generic philosophical statements about life and getting through the day. Posters of this last variety are usually not found in the male rooms. The posters do not usually cover every inch of wall space, so one can see the paint on the walls. Typically, one does not find displays of alcohol-related events left in the room as in the sculptures in the male room. There will be a variety of pictures in the small space above the desk. There may be pictures of family members including pets, boyfriends, particular girlfriends, or pictures of the entire graduating class. As the year progresses, pictures of experiences with roommates will be added to the display.

The RA Room. The RA rooms are located just off the elevator lobby at the junction of the T. Because of this arrangement, the RA could quickly scan the floor by leaning out of his door. These rooms were physically different from the student rooms because they had a bathroom and second room which serves as an office, study area, meeting room and sleeping area. In this second room is a day bed, a set of drawers, and non-moveable desks. Both of the RAs of
this study brought an overstuffed chair, a TV, and a small stereo tape deck to provide a personal touch to their rooms. Similar to the student rooms, these rooms are not carpeted by the university, but most students, including these two RAs, brought their own carpets.

Because the RA is a returning student, there was a greater representation of books in the room. Most of the books were from previous courses, but there were also a couple of favorite fictional works. The posters on the wall were limited to two by both of the RAs in the study. Each of these men also had a few plants in the room. These rooms had the look of a typically female room in terms of light, but there was a supplemental sense of sparseness.

The Hallway. There was no common space on this particular floor except for the hallway itself. Some of the other floors in the facility have study rooms, but the floor used for this study did not have one. This meant that upon entering the floor from one of the three stairwell doors, especially during the first two or three weeks of school, one would look down a long, narrow, and relatively dark carpeted hall. The walls were painted an institutionally-colored light blue.

A visitor would see most of the doors to the student rooms standing open. Some students are typically standing, sitting, or leaning in the hallway talking. One or two students are often standing in the hallway speaking on their telephones, having moved into the hallway to have greater privacy. Other students are
frequently moving back and forth between rooms. The design of the hall is such that the doors are aligned so that persons in rooms on opposite sides of the hallway could view each other, talk and move back and forth without obstruction. On this particular floor, the rooms are arranged so each female room looks across the hall to a male room. Occasionally one would have to dodge—or be invited to participate in—games of soccer, frisbee, or football that would be taking place in the hall.

As one first enters the hall, there is often a cacophony of sound from the variety of music being played on the different stereos, and the televisions become more distinct and separable by room as one moves down the hallway. Each room has at least one stereo, and many of the male rooms have one for each of the four residents. At times stereo wars break out as students attempt to demonstrate the power of their particular systems.

Televisions are visible in each room. Typically the TVs are located directly opposite the door, next to the window to maximize reception quality. These televisions would also add to the sound that becomes, for most students, "white noise" that typically is not heard after the first week of school. Many rooms also have a second TV in the sleeping area. Occasionally one could see, and also hear, one or several individuals practicing their electric guitars.

Initially students meet each other, make connections and interact through contacts made as they walk the halls and as they share the elevator on the way to and from the floor. Students
seldom use the stairs except for movement between the floor
directly above and/or below.

The cafeteria was shared with other residence halls and was
located outside the building. The connective and interactive
processes were practiced as new acquaintances were invited to eat
with roommates or already-established relationships. No one wanted
to go to the dining commons alone; but even more so, no one wanted
to be seen eating alone in the commons.

The Interviews

In total, forty-seven taped interviews were completed over the
course of this two-year study. Interviews ranged in length from
twenty minutes to fifty minutes of recorded audio tape. I
conducted the interviews in the student rooms, although one
interview was done outside of the building in a courtyard due to
an outbreak of stereo wars. Of these interviews, three from each
year were with the RA to check and seek some form of verification
of the researcher's interpretations. A second goal of these
interviews with the RA in each year was to gain further
descriptions of the interactions observed and detailed in
interviews completed with the students.

Twenty-four interviews were conducted the first year. Of
these, three interviews were with the RA as noted above. The RA
interviews were semi-structured, and they began around a particular
question and explored the answers given by the RA to reveal
accurately the meanings he attempted to communicate.
There were twenty-one interviews conducted with the resident students. These semi-structured interviews consisted of at least the following ten questions. The same ten questions were used for the student interviews in each year of the study.

1. I would like to ask you about your interactions with your current RA. Will you agree to be interviewed?

2. Based upon your own experiences at this college, what does an RA do? Please give specific examples.

3. Before you came to this college, what did you know about RAs and from where/whom did you obtain this knowledge?

4. What is the typical RA? Give specific examples.

5. What qualities or characteristics would you give to the ideal RA?

6. Please describe a relationship with a person whom you knew before you came to college that is similar to the relationship that you have with your RA. Give specific examples of experiences that are similar.

7. Before this interview, have you ever thought or talked about your relationship with your RA, particularly in comparison to --------?

Other questions were asked to clarify particular words, phrases, or thoughts of the respondent when the researcher was unsure of the intended meaning.
The Responses

Nine of the interviewed were male and twelve were females. Of this group, all were freshmen except one male, who was a junior college transfer and had not previously lived in a college residence. Two of the women were sophomores who had recently transferred to the institution and had lived in a college residence previously, but not at the institution of this study.

For the initial question that began as the focus of this study, at least two interview questions were of the most direct importance in obtaining the student's typification. In the first year of the study no one responded to question number ten in an affirmative manner, indicating that no one had reflected upon or thought about their relationship with the RA.

Yet the sharing of interactions and observations regarding the RA occurred on a daily basis for many of the students in both years of the study. The telling of narrative-styled stories that recount the day's incidents is a common occurrence of the everyday life world. However, a distinction was made by the students between reflected and unreflected comments about their interactions and relationships with the RA. Daily sharing was thought to be unreflected material and, as such, was constructed as being similar to reporting facts. The questions used during the interviews were seen by the student respondents as requiring responses that necessitated reflection. This type of material was thought to be closer to an opinion and moved the response of the student to another level distinct from observations and reporting statements.
Certainly the context of doing an interview may be entirely or partly responsible for this distinction made by the students.

**Evidence**

The **First Year**. For question number nine, the break-down of responses about typification is as follows: males - the response of teacher received two citations, all of the rest received one response, including mother, older brother, friend's older brother, band director, junior college coach, girlfriend, and a combination brother/mother; females - friends (female) received five responses, counselor received two responses, and the rest received one citation, including parent, brother, nurse, teacher, and older friend.

**First Year of the Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Brother</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend's Older Brother</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band Director</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College Coach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother/Brother</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend (female)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Friend</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Second Year. In the second year of the study, twenty-three interviews were completed. As in the first year, three interviews were recorded with the RA. Nine interviews were recorded with males and eleven interviews were conducted with female residents. The ten questions used in the first year as the basis for the semi-structured interview were utilized again in the second year. All of the students interviewed in this year were first-quarter freshman students who had not attended any other institution, nor had they lived in a college residence previously.

With regard to the initial question of the study, in the second year the responses to the tenth question were all negative except one. In this case, a woman lived across the hall from her boyfriend and he had had a negative interaction with the RA. She and her boyfriend had discussed their feelings and relationship with the RA as a result of the negative interaction. The female student in particular felt that the conversations that she had had with her boyfriend regarding his interaction with the RA had moved beyond a narrative retelling of the incident. She identified their discussions as "examining his (the RA's) motives" and this process required reflection.

The breakdown in the second year with regard to relationship typification is as follows: males - work supervisor received two responses and the rest all had one response each, mother, brother, history teacher, camp counselor, high school counselor, and uncle; female - friend (female) received four citations, parent received
two citations and the rest received one response, cousin (male),
camp counselor, referee, baby sitter, choir director.

Second Year of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Counselor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Counselor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend (female)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousin (male)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Counselor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby sitter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choir Director</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

These typifications or categories, identified by the students
through their descriptions of the experiences, are approximations
of the complexity of the RA-student relationship. They de-
camouflage the typically understood/assumed roles of mother,
father, sister, brother and friend. These categories are the
respondents' recollections and interpretations of a relationship
that may change over time. Their responses, which were produced
during the interviews, remain both temporal and historical despite
being solidified by the tape recorder and the subsequent
transcripts. The categories reflect one point in time for a particular group of students.

Early in the evidence collection phase of the first year of the study, the researcher was engaged in reflections about student-staff interactions and a second issue of the practice of doing interviews. A second problem emerged. Embedded within the evidence and the day-to-day practices of doing the research design was a potentially more original and significant question related to the accomplishment of trust. Still adhering to the original research design, the researcher shifted attention to the second question without methodological variations being necessary.

The initial reflection and subsequent insight involved a request to do an interview with a male student with whom I felt a positive rapport. 'Ed' was someone with whom I had spoken on several occasions in a variety of locations both on the floor and outside of the residence hall.

However, when I asked to do an interview with him he found it necessary to ask me several questions before he agreed to do the interview. Among the questions that he asked that are recorded in field notes are: what is a dissertation?; what do I get out of it?; what is the interview going to be used for?; why are you doing this and why have you asked me?; why do you want to record this?; who is going to hear this recording?; will my name be used? Despite what I felt to be more than a typical observer-respondent relationship, he needed to have these questions answered before he agreed to do the interview.
In contrast to this experience, I had a different interaction with one of the first women I interviewed. As I was walking down the floor on my way to the RA's room, I passed a student room that was occupied by two women. I glanced in the room as I went by and I saw two women who were eating Oreos and drinking milk. While I had observed them around the floor interacting with the RA, we had not previously met nor had I been in their room. I glanced in the opened door as I walked by and they said "hi." I returned the greeting and kept on moving. On an impulse I turned around, went back to their room, introduced myself and asked them if we could do an interview. They both immediately agreed and offered me cookies and milk as I settled into the room and begin to dig my tape recorder out of my bookbag.

Neither of the women asked me any questions about the whys or wherefore of my request to interview them. Both seemingly had no hesitation about inviting me, a relative stranger, into their room.

In contrasting these two experiences that became typical as the study progressed over the two-year period, I began to ask questions about the location of the differences that are evident. As exemplars of the social practice of doing interviews, they can also provide insight into a richer understanding of social interaction. As in the everyday life world of social interaction, the social practice of interviewing is itself in the process of being structured as it is being constructed.

The evidence already collected and the evidence that was yet to be collected were examined in light of the emerging hypothesis.
The questions posed shifted from a focus on typification to a focus upon trust as a social practice.
CHAPTER IV

Interpretation and Discovery

A quotation is itself an interpretation.

T. Adorno
The Authoritarian Personality

Introduction

This chapter will juxtapose evidence as it displays interpretations of the evidence. As discussed in Chapter II, it is not possible to separate interpretations and evidence. To frame the interpretations, a review of the sociological literature on trust will include an examination of Durkheim, Simmel, Parsons, Luhmann, Lewis & Weigert, Schutz and Garfinkel. Interpretations based on this literature will point toward trust as a social practice. The definition of intersubjective trust as a social practice will be formulated before discussing the practice of the development of intersubjective trust.

Evidence I

It is the fourth day of classes, which means most students have been living on the floor for about ten days. Cliff and I are sitting and talking in his room. Sal comes to the door. He stops
at the door but does not come into the room for a bit, makes small
talk and then asks Cliff if he is busy. Cliff responds, "no," and
invites Sal in and asks, "what's up, buddy?" (Cliff called all men
"buddy.") Sal responds by saying nothing, but comes into the room
and continues small talk. After about fifteen minutes of talk bout
dinner and music, he tells Cliff that he is thinking about going
home. Cliff asks Sal if it is "ok" that I stay; Sal agrees, but
asks that Cliff shut the door. Sal then begins his story which
includes his relationship with his girlfriend who is still at home,
his folks, his roommates, the size of the institution, to name just
a few. This conversation lasts for two hours.

Evidence II

The first day of classes, Cliff does rounds because he is
scheduled for duty. We leave his room and proceed to the elevator
to go to the top floor. As we pass a room with the door ajar, a
woman from within asks, "Excuse me, are you the RA?" Cliff
confirms her question and introduces himself and me to her because
we have not met this particular student previously. She says that
she has to talk with him and asks if this would be a good time.
Cliff responds that it is fine and he asks if it is "ok" that I
come into the room with him. The resident agrees. Cliff and I
enter the room and take seats. Carla begins a story about
roommates and roommate problems that is seemingly on the verge of
violence.
In both of these exemplars, the residents are looking to the RA, Cliff, for help, assistance, and counsel. When I interviewed Sal, he expressed that he saw Cliff in the same role as a big brother. In my interview with Carla, she saw a similarity between the relationship that she and Cliff developed and a relationship that she had had with a high school teacher.

My interviews stimulated the students to make accounts about their relationships with the RA. The collected accounts expose the students' typifications. As Brent-Madison points out, the importance of typifications is in the discerning of relationships through cognitive processes to develop understanding (1980:31).

The typifications incorporate trust as a part of the interpersonal relationship. Where the typification comes from is not a question of induction; it is a question of meaning. The question of interest remains as to how trust is produced.

Literature Review III

The phenomenon of trust has not been a central focus in social science despite its presence in the everyday life world. Trust as the underpinning to sociological writings has been neglected as a topic of study. Recently in the sociology literature, Lewis & Weigert have made an effort to conceptualize trust (1985). Their social analysis focuses on the phenomenon on both the micro and the macro levels, i.e. they refer to both interpersonal, face-to-face relations as well as broader societal phenomena associated with modernity. According to Lewis & Weigert (1985), the phenomenon of
trust plays an important part in the theories of Durkheim, Simmel, Parsons, and Luhmann. Also significant for understanding the social practice of trust is the work of Schutz and Garfinkel.

Parsons built upon the work of Durkheim and Simmel in his analysis and development of conceptions of trust. Luhmann's writings draw significantly on Parsons in conjunction with Simmel's work. Luhmann attempts to forge a trust that combines macro and micro aspects of social relations. Garfinkel began his ethnomethodological writings by dialoguing with the work of Parsons. Garfinkel uses Schutz's conceptions of the everyday life world to move the conception of trust into the realm of practices shared and understood by members of social groups.

**Emile Durkheim.** For Durkheim, trust is embedded in the non-contractual aspects of social contracts and is usually overlooked when social contracts are understood as relations between two or more individuals. The legitimation of contracts as forms of negotiation rests more deeply in the social solidarity of the social group and is related to the conscious collective. It is linked to the very fundamental basis of social life, which is altruism (Durkheim, 1933:227-228). As a recent interpreter of these issues of social contract, Collins extrapolates these contractual notions in a psychological direction by suggesting that "distrust" between two contracting parties leads to difficulties which can be attenuated by various devices, such as written contracts (1982:12).
Georg Simmel. In contrast to Durkheim's rather broad, societal notion of trust, Simmel provides a more micro-analytic position and views trust as an aspect to relationships which can be established, cultivated, and also destroyed. Simmel argues that the formal properties of trust include what he calls "faithfulness" which increases with interactions which are supportive of trust—i.e., trust could therefore vary in intensity or degree. It can also develop in situations of opposition or conflict as between a captor and his/her hostage (Simmel, 1964:381). It is for Simmel a basic human feeling which is uniquely social, since it can exist only in the presence of a plurality of persons. As such, it is relational and can be found in specific relations such as those of husband and wife, or it can be diffuse as for the whole of humanity.

Simmel identifies a diffuse level of trust that is so general that he calls it a metaphysical-type trust which, significantly, may exist beyond the actor's conscious awareness (Simmel, 1964:318n). Existential types of trust are characterized by relations to particular others who are viewed as possessing positive qualities. At this concrete level, trust may be conscious, rational and changeable, and related to an object, person, or collectivity which can or cannot be entirely known. If actors had the ability to completely and totally know other actors and objects, there would not be the necessity to trust.

Simmel also entertains the possibility of trust violations in the form of betrayal. It is through the observation of the
betrayal of trust that the tensions of trust can be identified (Simmel, 1964:333-334). He sees both trust and betrayal as responsive to more general social force and pressures such as power. Those who hold trust, he argues, also hold power, be that power in the form of money, property, or political office. Ultimately then, for Simmel, trust is a feeling which is linked to insecurity and fear.

Talcott Parsons. More recent theoretical examples of the formulation of the concept of trust can be found in the writings of Parsons. Parsons approaches the topic via the construct of 'generalized media of social interaction,' and specifically such symbolic media as commitment, influence, money and power (1967:264-382; 1968). He argues that social order is universally dependent on the predictability of individual action which occurs through social roles which, in turn, require different types of sanctions. Besides social control through the use of force, persons respond to situational and intentional sanctions.

Breakdown in trust is possible and may occur in various degrees, and indeed may threaten an entire social system. Therefore public trust in the generalized symbolic media is crucial for the survival of the social group or society, and it must be protected. Parsons takes a social holistic position that trust is an irreducible foundation of human association based on the initial premise that human action and interaction must be predictable. However, he focuses on the social-functional reasons for trust as he sees them rather than on the actual accomplishment
of trust in interactive situations in the actual world. Parsons does not conceptualize the nature of trust itself.

Nicklas Luhmann. Luhmann has also recently addressed the issue of trust from a system's perspective. He argues "trust occurs within a framework of interaction which is influenced by both personality and social system, and cannot be exclusively associated with either" (1979:6). Like Parsons, he bases the functioning of the social system on predictability of action and the need to rely on the stable expectations of action and interaction.

Since knowledge is always only partial and fragmentary and thus, at best, only probable, it can never be fully responsible for predictability and assured expectations. Trust, Luhmann maintains, comes into play at the point at which knowledge leaves off. Indeed, trust allows for going beyond the available knowledge or information base (1979:32-38). This going beyond is conceptualized by Luhmann as an "over-drawing," a leap and risk, so he pairs the concepts of "trust" and "risk." He eventually identifies two forms of trust, one which he calls "interpersonal trust" and the other a "systems trust" (1979:22).

Interpersonal trust, he argues, relies on individual emotional bonds and the suffering that would occur for both parties if the trust were betrayed. Systems trust, on the other hand, lacks emotional involvement and relies on a fundamental appearance of normalcy.
Ultimately, systems trust relies on a "trust in trust" which is broad, diffuse and indeed similar to Simmel’s metaphysical trust (1979:66-70). One's trust in the objects of the system rests ultimately on an individual's trust that others will entrust these objects with trust just as the individual does. Lastly, Luhmann suggests that there is a correlation between interpersonal and systems trust. As public confidence—i.e., systems trust—weakens, interpersonal trust is said to be at greater risk and, indeed, systems trust will invade or colonize the domain of interpersonal trust.

David Lewis and Andrew Weigert. Lewis and Weigert see trust as an elusive, primary form of experience which they choose to discuss analytically in cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions (1985:464). They see the cognitive dimensions in terms of knowledge which is based on conscious, rational grounds; they see the affective as mutual involvement of actors which results in guilt, anger, and other emotions when trust is violated; and they see behavioral in terms of the voluntary rendering of trust to others. They therefore offer an operational definition of trust in terms of the contextual observability of members of a system who "act according to and are secure in the expected futures constituted by the presence of each other or their symbolic representations" (1985:465). While their discussion is certainly suggestive, it does leave unspecified and problematic how the relationship between the actuality of trust in everyday life and
the analytic position they recommend is to be established, constituted, and validated.

Alfred Schutz. Schutz identifies trust, but his conception is related to the natural attitude or natural stance of social actors which is foundational to Schutz's understanding of the life world. The natural attitude is placed within the social reality of actors. Actors trust in the everyday life world as it is experienced in the natural attitude (1962:228).

In On Phenomenology & Social Relations, the natural attitude is defined as "the mental stance a person takes in the spontaneous and routine pursuit of his daily affairs and the basis of his interpretation of the life world as a whole and in its various aspects. The life world is the world of the natural attitude and in it things are taken-for-granted" (1970:320). The actor of the everyday life world accepts the world as it appears and assumes other do in the same manner that she/he does. The world is from the outset viewed as typical. In Schutz's formulation of the natural attitude, there are five components that are interwoven to develop the particular perspective of experience that is the natural attitude in which actors have trust.

1. Within the natural attitude, an actor intersubjectively shares experiences and meanings with others. The social world is an intersubjective world. It is not just one person's world, but is already shared because of the nature of communication through language. The natural attitude is the intersubjectively constructed world of the mundane (1962:218). Mundane indicates
that the typical flow of events and interactions that actors do in
the accomplishment of their daily projects have a routine, matter-
of-fact quality to them. The world in the natural attitude is an
intersubjective world from the beginning; as such, the knowledge of
it is socially acquired and distributed.

2. The actor is pragmatically oriented as she/he pursues
everyday life world interests. The interests of the actor are
directed toward the doing of the next project. The actor in the
natural attitude is oriented toward practical or useful activities
that accomplish the task(s) at hand, as opposed to a theoretical
interest.

3. The events and phenomena in the natural attitude are
historically organized prior to the actor's involvement in the
social world. In the past, present and future that is the social
world, the actor discovers that it has been organized and
understood prior to the actor's arrival (1962:7). The organization
of the social world is of an orderly manner pointing toward
reasonableness for the actors of the everyday life world, rather
than a logically organized world. As an actor becomes involved in
the everyday life world, the experiences and the meanings of the
experiences have been constructed, shared, and understood by actors
who have proceeded the self. The experiences of the everyday life
world form a stock of knowledge that is shared with others.

4. The events and phenomena of the everyday life world are
taken as factual and objective (1970:72). One's knowledge of the
social objects and phenomena is understood as real. One's relation
with the social order is predicated on the assumption that, despite individual or biographical differences, the same objects are experienced in essentially the same manner by other actors.

5. Because the everyday life world is seen as factual, it is taken-for-granted. The actor accepts the everyday life world by way of experience and the experience is undoubted. The everyday life world is taken-for-granted as plausible based upon the stock of previous knowledge and experience that is socially constructed and available for use by all actors of a social order as a scheme of reference.

The natural attitude is not a totality of one but a component-like perspective of the social group, subject to individual differences that for most purposes are not significant for the practical matters of the life world. In the movement toward typicality, the actor must use the stock of knowledge of his or her own distinctive natural attitude and frame the phenomena within the rubric of typicality of the shared natural attitude. An actor must trust in one's own ability to create an understanding from one's own distinctive natural attitude and be able to make those meanings typical within the framework of the sociality.

Schutz writes of the *epoché* of the natural attitude where the actors of the everyday life world put into brackets or suspend the doubt that the world and its objects might be otherwise than they appear. The existence of the world is not doubted (1962:123, 229). The natural attitude is believed through the phenomena of trust. An actor trusts in the experiences and the interpretations of the
experiences; there is a naive acceptance of the world as it is
presented through experience.

Harold Garfinkel. In an early article, Garfinkel identifies
trust as an essential feature of the social order and outlines the
features of trust, thereby making it a central feature of
interaction available for study by social science. In "A
Conception of, and Experiences With, 'Trust' as a Condition of
Stable Concerted Actions" (1963), Garfinkel draws upon the works of
Schutz to address the constitutive features of the everyday life
world. Through an analogy with the basic rules of games, Garfinkel
examines the constitutive features of normal interaction and the
position of trust in the accomplishment of daily life. The
developed notion of trust is associated with a perceived manner in
which members construct through interpretation the normality of
events.

Although not explicitly stated as a goal of the article,
Garfinkel demonstrates that the natural attitude conceptualized by
Schutz (1962:8-9) incorporated "trust" as a foundational feature.
The natural attitude is how members of a social order of the
everyday life world come to organize their experiences. In the
natural attitude the members of the social world take for granted
or trust their experiences until demonstrated otherwise (Schutz,
1962:228).

Garfinkel thematizes trust by logically inverting Schutz's
background expectancy of doubt. Garfinkel notes that the 'rules of
doubt (distrust)' are a feature of the common expectancies within
the natural attitude and that through breaching experiments one can make manifest the characteristics of trust (1967:50n). Garfinkel shows how trust is an essential, foundational, and common component of the natural attitude in the everyday life world.

In Garfinkel's conception, trust is a normative order in the manner that it binds members to assumptions and/or attitudes regarding the behavior of the other. Trust is associated with commonsense knowledge and its taken-for-granted character. The assumptions are reciprocal and entail not only expectations of the other about social behavior, but also the knowledge of the other about the knowledge and behavior of the self. These presuppositions are the interpretive frame used to comprehend the actions of the other and the meanings associated with actions.

Garfinkel's article on trust includes experiments conducted to demonstrate normative rules by breaching the play of chess and tic-tac-toe. As Cicourel notes, Garfinkel's interest is not with the norms themselves, but with how the norms are used as criteria for the events and interactions that are seen to be normal (1964:206). To this end Garfinkel disrupts the play of a game and illustrates the assumptions supposedly held-in-common and the features about the game. Garfinkel demonstrates that a player's trust in the other's knowledge of the game's rules and the willingness to abide by the rules each time the game is played is assumed. In a similar manner, a member trusts in the world that each day's interactions are going to happen in the same way if repeated. The game and its rules are used to illuminate social interaction.
Garfinkel details three properties or norms in interactions that he identifies as constitutive expectancies at work in interactions of the everyday life world (1963:190). They are: 1) from the range of choices, the actors of a social group will choose the appropriate rule. This acts as a boundary condition upon the type of interaction that is to occur; 2) each member assumes that the choices are limits on the self. The norm of reciprocity is assumed by each member; 3) the self assumes that as she/he expects of the other, the other expects of the self. The expectations of each of the members are assumed to be perceived and interpreted similarly by the self and the other(s). These principles of reciprocal and interchangeable positions are shared, experienced, and demonstrated by the members of the community but typically unspoken unless breached. This points toward trust as a feature of interaction that is typically not a topic of discussion between participants of an interaction prior to or during the interaction. Trust is certainly available as a topic, but as a part of the natural attitude trust is out of awareness until necessarily brought forward.

The constitutive expectancies are at work for particular types of interactions that are organized through social knowledge. As in the rules of a game, the constitutive expectancies are rules within the common social domain and, in this way, are intersubjective. Garfinkel comments that the rules of trust provide for the constitutive accent for each related event (1963:191). The constitutive expectancies act as typifications, suggesting that the
socially-distributed knowledge regarding rules and expectations is assumed to be socially approved and used to assist the actor in interpreting and understanding the events of the everyday life world (Schutz, 1962:7-8).

In this conception rules are not the location for internalized behaviors and attitudes of non-reflective actors. Rules are not driving a logic and sequence of social structure separate from members. For Garfinkel, rules are interpretive devices utilized by members to account for and understand practices of the everyday life world (1963:195). The rules guide situations of interaction as members apply the appropriate rule formula. When engaged in reflective activity members use rules to account for the meaningfulness of events and interactions.

Trust, for Garfinkel, is not an action. It is not a passive state but an attitude that overwhelms the individual member in the doing of the everyday life world. Overwhelming the member, trust allows the member to interact with the everyday life world without stopping each event/interaction to question each object, act, and word. The conception of trust as an interpretive frame that Garfinkel discusses is the salient point to his discussion.

But Garfinkel also suggests a second nuance to trust that is of equal if not greater significance to the member of the everyday life world. This second conception of trust is that each actor in an interaction trusts that the other will respect the constitutive rules identified above. Trust in this manner, in fact, may be the
meta-typification that carries actors throughout the everyday life world.

This second aspect of trust, labeled the "et cetera" agreement, is also highlighted by Garfinkel's breaching experiments. In a short paragraph Garfinkel identifies "the unstated terms of contract" that members will act in accordance with the assumptions and expectations of interaction (1963:199). This second aspect that Garfinkel seems to gloss is 'collaborative trust,' and it points to the socially-produced and subjectively-provided objective nature of "trust." Trust of this nature pushes the concept of trust further than the knowledge and interpretations of the actions and behaviors of trust. The "et cetera" agreement identifies the expectation that there will not be any violation of the constitutive expectancies identified by Garfinkel. A member trusts that the other members will not intentionally breach or disrupt the interaction and that all parties to the interaction are motivated by trust and are therefore sincere and genuine in word and action. This concept of "trust" supersedes all other rules of interaction and is naturally assumed and out of awareness before events occur.

Discussion

More generally, the above notions of trust by Durkheim, Simmel, Parsons, Luhmann, Lewis & Weigert, Schutz, and Garfinkel universalize trust to apply to young and old, male and female, and all members of all cultures in egalitarian fashion. Despite an attempt to incorporate a more contextually-determined mode of
trust, Lewis & Weigert remain universal. The approaches of Durkheim, Simmel, Parsons, Luhmann, and Lewis & Weigert remain grounded in the individualistic psychological level. Actors are seen as giving or withholding trust. Actors are conscious and rational in their actions, or are unconscious of it and thus are using trust to alleviate their own insecurity, fear of dread of the future and the unknown. Thus, trust can be seen by all these theorists as fundamental to human relationships and as basic to the social solidarity which marks human societies.

It is the intention in the following pages to suggest another view of trust, one which locates trust not in the actors and their psychological dispositions, but in the social practices and social relations which two or more members share. The works of Schutz and, in particular, Garfinkel are very suggestive of this alternative conception. Trust becomes a constitutive feature of the social practices. From this perspective, 'trust' is a feature of the rules which are constitutive of the social practice of establishing interpersonal relations.

Evidence III

After an interview that I was having with a man, James, during the second year of the study, I turned off the recorder and continued in conversation. James had told me already that the RA, John, had established a relationship and interactions with James similar to that of his high school guidance counselor. James indicated that both are able to keep the peace when dealing with
larger groups, and each is able to "send you in the right direction when you need help with a situation." It is this second feature that is most important for James.

Based on my observations, he has only used the RA for informational-type concerns. For example, he has asked John about the location of shopping malls, how to get to a particular building, and how to drop and add a class. Yet, I have also noted that James is harassed by his roommates. He has not asked John for help or counsel with how to take away some of the tension that is evident. It appears that James is being harassed because he is a serious student who is not interested in drinking and doing drugs in the patterns of his roommates. His three roommates knew each other before they came to the institution and seem to be more interested in partying than studying.

James has not participated in any floor activities, nor has he made any close associations, let alone friends, mostly because he is studying outside of his room and usually off the floor. With the tape recorder off, I ask James about the situation and why he has not spoken to the RA. His first response is that it is "no big deal." I knew he was sleeping elsewhere on occasion and going home on weekends because he was uncomfortable in his room. He later admitted that he does not know John, the RA, well enough to talk about this situation with him. James said he would want to be sure about the response he would get from the RA.

Examining this exemplar and the other instances that have been displayed to this point, one must ask about the location of the
differences that are evident. As exemplars of social practices, these instances provide insight into a fuller understanding of social interaction and the production of trust. As a social practice trust is being structured as it is being produced.

The Contractual Perspective

Let us examine the first instance as an exemplar of the contractual perspective. It suggests the use of distance as a common component of an overall theme of interaction and trust. The student, James, had an ongoing relationship with the RA that was more than casual and deeper than surface. On several occasions James had come to John's room and asked him question about how to do different things regarding classes and school. However, when he was invited to do so, he had not stayed in the room and joined others who were eating pizza. James had demonstrated through his actions an orientation to keep the relationship at a distance. James had not participated in floor volleyball, football, or softball games; nor had James participated in the floor picnic.

James had a serious problem that needed attention and the RA should have been a prime resource to help resolve the situation. James did not feel comfortable going to John because James perceived distance. This was a distance maintained by James and is in contrast to those students who had developed a 'closer' relationship with the RA through participation in a variety of activities. These studies did reveal problems and concerns to the RA that were of a more personal nature.
Contracts. The juxtaposition of some of the conceptions associated with contracts with the social practice of trust provides insight into the accomplishment of trust from a particular perspective. There are several generally recognized issues related to the actualization of a contract. These are: the proposal for an agreement, the acceptance or mutuality; the limits to the agreement, and, finally, a breach or violation of the contract.

1. Proposal. For there to be a contract between parties, there must be a proposal for a contract. Interaction between members must be initiated by one or more of the participants. From the standpoint of the RA, she/he is in the position of proposing relationships and interactions with all the members of the floor. Certainly not all students are interested in accepting the proposal. Some students may go the entire year without talking to the RA.

From this perspective, the contract for the relationship and the trust that will be developed is accepted and acknowledged through the doing of some activity. Typically during the first week this takes the form of a volleyball game, a football game, or some other physical activity that is shared. Football as a social activity becomes a practice leading to the construction of trust. Other activities, such as going to a student's room to listen to music or sharing pizza, can also have the same function.

Students who came to develop relationships with the RA—in this perspective, who were able to disclose and discuss personal issues
--all shared the same feature of having physically shared in the
doing of some activity with the RA. A second aspect to this
relationship was that the shared event was viewed as positive by
the students.

The particular types of interactions that were shared take on
the character of tests or qualifications. This will occur out of
awareness. The students are checking the credibility,
authenticity, and/or sincerity of the RA. The interactions also
have a second reflexive sense. The interactions have the ability
to communicate information regarding the other, in this case the
RA, but there is also the notion that the interaction reveals the
self.

The student who keeps the RA-student relation at a distance
chooses not to reveal or communicate the self to the other. The
student who, at the most, uses the RA for informational activities
maintains control over the knowledge of the self that the RA can
gather through interactions. As a result, the development of trust
is also controlled.

It must be acknowledged that, due to the open horizons of
language and to the lack of shared interactions prior to the
residence hall experience, alternative meanings that are not
entirely intended consciously by the student may be constructed by
the RA. The student may choose to control the knowledge of his/her
identity gained by the RA through shared activities, but that does
not mean that the RA is somehow able to close off the activities of
the life world and his interpretations of it.
An instance of this is reflected in the following incident. Cliff wanted to get to know some men on his floor who were loud and had had several disruptive parties during one particular week. He went down to the room with a favorite tape of new age music. He did not even get the chance to finish listening to his tape. The men of the room typically listened to heavy metal. They laughed at Cliff and his music and continued to avoid him after he made this attempt to bridge the gap. The men were no closer to Cliff and they kept him out of their circle of activities. While the bridge was not built, Cliff still made a judgement about what type of students these men were and how they would get along for the rest of the year.

The acceptance or rejection of the proposal establishes reciprocal obligations for the next interactional event. The goal of each succeeding interaction is to develop a framework within which the expectations of each participant can be identified. The playing of football, while of no great significance itself, becomes a forum for students to identify whether they will want to move into another region of interaction with the RA.

2. Mutuality. The relations that are identified with each interaction are tied to a formal expectation of what the self can expect of the other and what the other can expect of the self. The norms of the interaction are made public through the interaction. The self, the student, confirms the rights and obligations of the other, the RA, through the interaction. Certainly the truthfulness
of the intention, the sincerity, and trust can only be determined against future behaviors.

It is in the area of future actions that the practices of trust become evident. The student must decide, unconsciously using typifications, about whether to engage in the next interaction. There is an element of risk involved in the decision. The region of trust for the student in the contractual perspective involves the development of a confidence regarding the expectancies of the RA. Under positive conditions the student expects that the next interaction will fit into a pattern known through typifications. There is a focus on reciprocal rights and obligations within each area of a relationship.

Mutuality is a necessary component of the contractual perspective. Simply, mutuality indicates that all participants to an interaction have agreed to abide by the rules and practices of the relationship. This can lead to confusion because it assumes that all participants understand the rules and practices in the same way. It also assumes that each participant understands in a reciprocal manner the region or type of relationship that is being accomplished.

Changes in the relationship indicate changes in social practices and this is reflected by the difference in locus. A friendship will have one locus while a romantic relationship, for example, will necessitate a different locus. Previous to the football game including the RA and the students there was one set of boundaries regarding types of talk and regions of trust
appropriate to the relationship. However, with further interactions and practices new sets of boundaries are established to reflect the practices appropriate to the talk and trust of the new relationship. Each interaction becomes a transition to the next interaction and the inherent practices of trust.

3. Limits. Contracts typically have time limitations. The limitations are expressed either explicitly in the contract and are related to the boundaries established or they are expressed implicitly, represented by already-established convention or rule. In the case of this study, limitations are not related to time but to spatial orientations.

One instance of a spatial orientation as limits involves location. Those students for this perspective who lived in proximity to the RA room developed relationships exhibiting greater regions of trust. Because they lived closer to the RA, they had more opportunities to interact with the RA. The students and the RA accumulated a series of practices that built trust. As they passed by the RA's room, Cliff or John would invite them into the room just to say "hi" or to share a pizza. On other occasions, as the RA came back onto the floor the students in immediate proximity would invite him into their rooms. As the relationships developed, the time and the types of activities that were shared broadened.

One must acknowledge that spending time and doing things with the RA is not the 'coolest,' 'brightest,' or most understood activity, because he represents authority and the university.
4. Violation. The final component of a contract that can give insight into the practice of trust is the violation and subsequent repair of trust. A violation of trust is a violation of the conditions of expectancies and is a serious matter. It entails a future action by the other that does not conform to the unstated but assumed reciprocal understanding of the boundaries of action. From the student's perspective, to violate an expectancy invites corrective actions. Examples of this were frequent and took a typical form. A student would come to the RA with a concern about his roommate or friend. After expressing his concern, he was surprised to learn later that the RA had approached the other student. Even when the RA did not reveal the source of his information, the student who initially expressed the concern was angry that an expectancy was violated.

The violation was a violation of the expectancy of confidence. The student believed that the RA understood that the student could tell the RA information and not have the information repeated to the involved party. Even if no names were used the student expected that the social practices established by prior interactions clarified that the information should not be passed along. Specifically, Paul came to Cliff expressing his belief that one of the female residents was vomiting her food after each meal. Although Paul did not state that he did not want this knowledge to get back to the student, the RA was in the position of having to confront the female student about this potentially dangerous behavior. Paul later returned to Cliff and stated that
he thought it understood that Cliff was not to talk to the student about the information that Paul had revealed.

When I talked with Paul about this incident, he stated that although there was never a conversation about the expected actions of the RA, he felt certain that Cliff understood that he was not to confront the female student. Paul stated that he could not trust Cliff anymore because of this particular violation. On the other side of the relationship, Cliff stated he believed that Paul expected him to speak to the female student about this alleged behavior. At the least, Cliff said that Paul knew that Cliff, in his role as the RA, would have to do something about the information that Paul had revealed. As long as Cliff did not reveal the source of the information, Cliff believed that he had fulfilled Paul’s expectancies.

5. Repair. To repair trust based upon a contractual orientation suggests an interaction that seeks to use skills of negotiation and context determination. Perhaps the violation is the result of one of the participants misreading the context. The breach could also be the result of a breakdown in the establishment of expectancies. In instances of repair, the contractual perspective lends itself to repair because of the practices that constructed the relationship.

Returning to the exemplar of Paul and Cliff reveals an instance of repair. For a couple of days after this incident occurred, Paul avoided Cliff. There was a previously planned event with another floor which Paul attended, but he did not speak to Cliff. Two days
after this event, Cliff had a pizza in his room at one a.m., and when Paul walked by and smelled the pizza he came in to eat, talk, and watch a movie on TV. Eventually Paul reached a point where he revealed private matters about himself to Cliff, suggesting that trust had been re-established through the practices of newly-shared experiences.

While Paul chose initially not to participate in activities with Cliff, he eventually resumed interaction. Paul and Cliff never discussed the incident of the violation, nor did they make a concerted effort to repair the relationship. By redoing, beginning again with their interactions, they were able to construct trust again by re-establishing expectancies that were assumed to be reciprocally shared.

6. **Identity Issues.** Within this examination of trust and relationship in this posture are issues relating to identity. The issues of identity involve knowledge about the student and are related to the maintenance of this knowledge of the self by the student. This is a distinct form of knowledge about a person that can only be collected from the person through discourse. Identity knowledge cannot be collected through observation, intuition, or perception. Identity knowledge is knowledge that provides insight into the other's values, morals, dreams, closely-held opinions, and attitudes. This information is only obtained by direct dialogue with the student about these items and issues related to them. A sense of risk is involved in the disclosing of this type of knowledge because of the sensitive and personal nature of the
knowledge. This is the psychological risk identified by several authors writing from the psychological and social-psychological frames.

For the individual who understands trust through the practices of the contractual perspective, the maintenance of the image of the self and assurances that all parties to an interaction share expectancies are of utmost importance before a person in sharing this particular contractual tendency begins the disclosure of identity knowledge. Once the knowledge is stated and heard by another person—in this case, the RA—it becomes part of the public domain and available for interpretation and criticism. Once knowledge regarding the self is public, there is potential for negative repercussions.

Summary

Before a summary discussion can progress, a limitation on the word "perspective" is necessary. In this study perspective is associated with "bias" and "posture." "Bias" indicates a mental or cognitive learning. The contractual perspective suggests a cognitive learning with regard to the practices of trust. "Posture" refers to a frame of mind, an attitude or cognitive condition relative to particular circumstances. In the circumstances of constructing trust, members utilizing this frame apply contractual rules of trust.

In this manner, "perspective" indicates that this particular interpretive frame, as suggested in Garfinkel's conception of rules
and collection of practices, are out of awareness until violated or breached (1963). "Perspective" is not deterministic of behaviors or attitudes of members, but as a mode it is typical for members. All members have a primary perspective relative to the practices and rules of trust. As such, they take for granted that others experience and understand the everyday life world, specifically in this context--trust--in a similar manner. "Perspective" carries this meaning throughout this study.

The contractual perspective has a two-fold orientation. In the initial instance, the orientation is toward a concern with rights, duties, respect and obligation in the doing of the interaction and, as a result, risk and trust are framed accordingly as clearly understood expectancies. They operate as a series of interpretive protocols necessary for the member to understand the accomplishment of trust. This tendency was demonstrated by males in this study. The contractually-oriented person also constructs a subject-to-subject relationship by identifying and limiting reciprocal expectations as a means of establishing regions of trust. This occurred through the social practices of each interaction.

The second aspect of this contractual perspective is its solipsism. It is a closed orientation. An individual with this bias keeps a guard or fence around the self and the knowledge that is disclosed about the self. The social practices of members utilizing this perspective are assumed to be universally and reciprocally understood by a member, but may in fact be particular and difficult for others to understand appropriately. Respondents
from a different cultural, religious, or ethnic background may suffer from this form of non-comprehension. The person utilizing the contractual tendency emphasizes a dichotomy of the self versus the other, the arrangement of the two separate subjects/members with the self striving for control of the self.

To change the practices or behaviors of interaction through a process similar to contractual negotiation will be reflective of a change in the meanings of trust and the inherent modes of interaction that are cultivated within the relationship. Differing regions, or meanings, of trust are utilized to interpret and understand action sequences depending upon the history of the relationship. Each relationships carries a particular history and subsequent meanings that become interpretive reference points to understand current interactions. This rule use, in the manner outlined by Garfinkel, is typically out of awareness as the process is so elemental to the everyday life world (1963).

Because self-revelations and disclosures of self are bounded by the category of relationship, the more intimate the relationship the broader the practices of risk and trust. Suggesting that as relationships develop a history members will construct more confidence about expectancies that are assumed understood, the more superficial the relationship the less the risk and the narrower the practices of trust. As a result, a member will allow less to be taken-for-granted in each interaction.

Schutz's discussion of contemporaries includes a distinction between concreteness and anonymity that is helpful for this
perspective (1976:48). Through language and interaction, actors break down the anonymity and move to relationships that are based upon commonly-shared experiences. The practices of interaction in the contractual orientation mirror this discussion by Schutz. As each actor shares the experiences of growing old together while accomplishing a project, the actors do more than share time and space. They develop a history of knowledge about action sequences and each other that can be utilized to understand other situations and the unique other more fully.

The knowledge or, more appropriately, the unconscious awareness of the RA gained through each interaction, allows for the construction of trust. The interactions and the social practices of each future interaction are available for reflection and judgement regarding the intent of the other. However, each practice of trust is measured and evaluated through assessments based on mutual expectations of duty, obligation, and rights within the boundaries of the relationship.

From within the contractual perspective, as a member moves into broader regions of trust, the member relinquishes control of knowledge of the self and social practices utilized in the display of self. The private experiences displayed in counseling-type interactions are situated in the context of self-revelation. However, to arrive at this point other interactions which cumulatively construct trust must occur. Revelation of the self through displays that are physically shared pushes the interaction toward new practices of trust.
Evidence IV

In the second year of the study, John and I are walking down the hall of his floor. As we get closer to the end of the hall, we first smell and later can see that a substance composed of at least fruit, vegetables, cereal, and chewing tobacco has been smeared all over the door of a particular room. The mess is not pleasant to either the nose or eyes, and there is no way to avoid it. John is just about to knock on the door of the room when it opens and a woman resident of the room asks him if he is the RA. He confirms her inquiry and she tells him that she was just coming down to see him.

Gail has not met John before. She begins a story that lasts over two hours. Gail states that she believes the mess on the door came from the guys who live across the hall from her because they perceive that she is different. I believed and, as I later discover, the RA also believed, that her difference is her physical appearance. Gail reveals that she is a lesbian and that her lover has been staying overnight in her room.

The conversation evolves into a dialogue about sexual orientation, male egos and sensitivity, values, roommates, and shared expectations, and although it does reach a termination point on this evening, the conversation continues over the course of the first quarter until Gail drops out of school.

During an interview we have at a later date, Gail stated that the RA, John, interacted with her in a manner similar to that of her cousin, who is also male.
The Contextual Perspective

In contrast to the contractual perspective, the contextual perspective suggests a different orientation to the social practices and rules of trust. ("Perspective" has the same meanings and conceptions in this section as identified above.) While the contractual perspective indicates the maintenance of interpersonal distance and the necessity of physically sharing experiences, the contextual perspective suggests a closing of distance through attention to the members within a particular time and space. The contextual perspective also demonstrates a willful openness to interactions and the ongoing and unlimited development of relationships and trust. "Contextualization" indicates this bias. It means an orientation to the directly-experienced, commonly shared interaction. The contextual perspective incorporates a reciprocal expectation with and toward the other. As in the contractual bias, this occurs out of awareness and is assumed to be similar to the tendencies of others.

Contextualization. Gail invited us into her room and began her story. The invitation was given to two relative strangers to enter into a private and personal space to reveal identity knowledge. The invitation occurred after others had violated her space by the display placed upon her door. There was no hint of a contractual process incorporating the practice of establishing reciprocal expectancies.

Gail's (Evidence IV) and Carla's (Evidence II) invitations to share in an experience suggests a participant that makes
connections rather than impedes interaction. The invitations to share in spatial and interpersonal relations is more than just a sharing. The possibility of negative consequences of the invitation and the sharing are not considered. The concern over mutual and reciprocal expectations is not foremost. This is a matter of trust. These particular women exhibit a confidence that the interaction/relationship will produce an approximation of their personal worlds through the sharing.

The revelation that occurs communicates an acceptance of the RA as an other. This initial component of acceptance is one that creates the RA, as the other, into someone distinct but not necessarily separate. Gail's discourse demonstrates an orientation that acknowledges and accepts the other as the self acknowledges and accepts the other. The emphasis is more on the idea of the RA being an instance of a particular that is a part of a developing understanding. There is a reciprocal expectancy of acceptance with a foundation of mutual understanding based upon communication within a common environment.

The sharing and revealing also communicate an understanding. This is in contrast to the contractual perspective that communicates a sense of objectification and evaluation through the creation of distance. Within the contextual perspective, the attention to the acceptance of the other and the self communicate a willingness to welcome the RA into a relationship that is assumed to be trustful. This is not a form of empathy in the psychological sense, but a trust in the sense of attempting to understand the
experiences and knowledge of the other through his/her personal story.

A second component to acceptance is communicated through openness. The student's offer to enter into an interaction is also an acceptance of the self. This is not the offer from one who is more concerned about the other or, for that matter, the self. The other is not placed before the self, but is held in relation to the self. Gail and Carla accept the self in the same manner that they accept the otherness of the RA. There is a reciprocal orientation and expectation toward acceptance and trust.

Making Connections. In an interview with Barb, she noted that she framed her understanding of John through comparisons to her high school teacher. She stated, "like the first day of school, as we were moving in with suitcases in the hall and everything. . . . he [John] knocked and came into the room, introduced himself, and made sure that we knew that he was there to help us."

I encouraged her to tell me how John communicated this, believing that I was on the verge of a revelation. "What in fact did he say and/or do that struck you so powerfully?" Barb answered, "He told us--he said 'Hi, my name is John and I'm here to help you. . .' It's like, very casual mutual respect."

John did not contribute much in the sense of disclosing identity knowledge, as might be expected from an individual utilizing the contractual perspective. Yet when the interaction was over a certain practice of trust was established between the two participants and this occurred without qualifications or
guarding behaviors by the participants. Does this indicate that 'small talk' is a guide to the development of trust? No, it is more likely that the trust is already present from the moment the interaction begins.

In the contextual perspective trust is extended from the time one enters the interaction. Perhaps "extended" is not the correct word to describe this perspective's phenomenon of trust. Another way to describe trust is to state that it is already implicitly expected to be a part of the relationship, of all social relations. The trust was extended to the RA as a particular individual, not because of the particular event of the interaction. As a result, changes in types of interactions as the relationship develops a history are less problematic from this perspective because the relationship is not focused on a series of protocols.

**Locus/Context.** The person utilizing the contextual perspective has a distinct notion of context. Members will tend to understand context as being more like locus. Locus, as borrowed from mathematics, encompasses a system of planes that have as a condition that every point along each plane will satisfy a particular condition. The particular member is the plane where the trust is achieved. The trust remains with the members no matter the type or place of the interaction, and these are the points on the plane. In the framework of this orientation, the condition that all points share is the integration and fusion of the member and trust.
A demonstration of this occurred frequently during the two years of the study. From this perspective students would talk with the RA about their primary romantic interest who was either at home or at another institution. These students spoke about the confidence, the faith, that they had in the other. The students believed that their romantic interest at home would not violate the relationship that had been achieved and understood. The strength of this belief was such that, on several occasions, questioning the commitment of trust by the one at home was to offend the student.

Integration/Fusion. Each participant to an interaction who shares the contextual perspective will seek to integrate the knowledge and experiences of the other into the experience of the relationship. Subsequently and reflexively, the knowledge and experience will also be integrated with the self. In the particular cases of Gail's and Carla's experiences, there is an invitation to bring the knowledge and experiences of the person who is the RA into their social realms. Discourse of this nature expands the experiential base of the listener. Shared discourse regarding personal experience entails the revelation of personal knowledge and experiences.

Personal knowledge is valued as being a more trustworthy form of knowledge. As such, the sharing of personal knowledge permits the development of regions of trust which become broader. The layers of meaning relative to any face-to-face interaction are located in language (Schutz, 1970:187). As a result, more can be taken-for-granted in terms of the expectancies of trust. As a
member continues to interact over time with another particular individual, the shared practices construct more trust and this permits more expectancies to be developed.

Fusion is the second aspect to this perspective's integrative orientation. The participants in an interaction are not only encouraged to share experiences through discourse, but the ongoing interaction fuses the experiences to connect them with the members' narratives. Fusion as a social practice bonds participants in the contextual perspective. The prior experiences of each member are brought together to create a new experience and narrative that incorporates all participants into the personal knowledge of the self. Discourse is a procedure to assess this knowledge and to develop trust.

Unlike the contractual perspective, the contextual perspective is not concerned with the changes of context. The contextual perspective which is based on an orientation to be open and to integrate and fuse knowledge and experience presents a different interactional base for trust. The normative order of the interaction is confirmatory and based on informal and unstructured interactions that occur naturally. The entire interactional sequence is evolutionary and is allowed to occur without concerns regarding control of the interaction or the control of the identity knowledge of the self.

Implicitly, assumptions of reciprocal honesty, caring, and genuineness are constantly at work. Trust has a similar placement within the contextual perspective. The social practice of trust is
a frame. Implicitly, it is a fundamental component of interactions or relationships until violated or until it becomes a concern for reflection.

Repair. Question - "So you start with the assumption of trust and then people have to lose your trust, your respect?"

Nancy - "Right. I usually trust everybody until they do something to hurt me or let me down, and then I have a hard time letting them, forgiving them until they do something to gain it."

The contractual and contextual repair of trust exhibit different practices and rules. The contractual perspective suggests a formula of renewed protocols and shared experiences. Trust typically did not appear as a topic of dialogue. From the contextual perspective, trust is identified as an inherent quality of social interaction. The construction of trust includes an acceptance of self, and the violation of trust is more personal and severe because it encompasses a violation of self.

Trust, from the contextual perspective, is a taken-for-granted orientation toward relationships. Once violated, trust becomes a matter of consciousness available for reflection. The repair of trust is difficult. If this perspective is grounded in the relatedness of members utilizing notions of integration and fusion and the orientation to accept and disclose one's personal experiences and meanings, the violation of trust becomes, in essence, a violation of self.

Disruption of self and the relation would continue with significant disorientation. The relational perspective is grounded
in an implicit assumption of trust, the next interaction after a violation will entail both the practice of assuming trust and, at the same time, there will be a cross-current of caution related to the violation. The genuineness and sincerity of this perspective is grounded in the unqualified orientation to trust. To attempt to hold the orientation to trust in check is to dislocate the self of the member from normative practices of interaction.

The fusion and integration of experiences and narratives into the narrative of a shared experience would be a breach of what had been up until the breach confirmatory of the self and the other. In this manner, the self will question the meanings and practices constructed with the other and implicitly and totally accepted by the self. The experience of being connected to the other and the shared experience is severed. True repair can only occur when there are no further violations and there is an ongoing, over a period of time, relationship that redemonstrates trust.

The suggestion here is that the depth of the violation is directly related to the length of time necessary to establish repair. In some cases the violation may be so significant and personal that repair is not possible. In a relationship seeking repair there would be little that could be taken-for-granted, in contrast to most interactions where much is taken-for-granted.

Summary

The contextual perspective suggests a tendency that is specific to the particular situation and yet generic toward the individual
member. Trust is an orientation that is foundational and essential for interactions and relationships. In this sense, there is a generality of relating to others and a particular individual rather than the stronger reliance upon categories and typifications that predominate the contractual perspective. Maintenance of the image of the self held by others is not an issue from the contextual perspective.

Both the contractual and the contextual perspectives are located within the we-relation or face-to-face relations as conceptualized by Schutz (1967:162+). The contractual perspective follows Schutz's conception in its linearity and issues regarding anonymity. In the face-to-face, actors experience actual simultaneity with each other as they operate along separate streams of consciousness. In the spatial and temporal immediacy of the face-to-face, a member becomes aware of self through the other but the relation remains two separate subjects taking turns focusing on the other.

The contextual perspective is located outside of this conception of Schutz. Rather than understanding based on the comprehension based on projects and motives of the actors, understanding the practices of trust in the contextual face-to-face are situated within an orientation that is relating holistically to the other and the immediate situation. The other is seen as a unique individual with his/her own biographically-determined situation and the face-to-face occurs within a unique context that limits the available meanings and understandings. The contextual
face-to-face is not seeking to identify the motives or the project of the other. The project of this relation is the relation within a context.

A member utilizing the contextual perspective reciprocally expects that the other is also utilizing a holistic interpretive scheme. Going further than Schutz's notion of the common experience of separate subjects, the contextual perspective will unify the discourse of the members and the situation of the face-to-face relation.

The presentation of the contextual perspective appears here as less complex than the contractual. The protocols identified in the contractual perspective are not evidenced in the contextual bias. Because of the nature in which trust is accomplished, the presentation is less complex. However, the practices and rules utilized to interpret and understand the action sequences provide the same function as in the contractual bias. They provide a code to identify the meaningfulness of the everyday life world. Yet, the repair of a breach or violation that occurs from within the contextual perspective entails much more complexity due to the practices of trust and the expectancies that have been breached.

Intersubjective Trust Defined

Similar to Simmel, there are two facets of trust. Type A, intersubjective trust, includes the conceptions of Garfinkel and Schutz and points to how members trust in the rules of interaction. Type B, interpersonal trust, is a particular aspect of
interpersonal relations and always incorporates Type A trust. Type B, interpersonal trust, is identified by the features of the closeness of the relationship--i.e., the confidences that are revealed to the other and the risks that are taken. Yet for Type B to occur, there must be confidence that the other in an interaction reciprocally comprehends the appropriate forms of the social practice of Type A trust. The Type B trust is the psychological form of trust. Type A, intersubjective trust, is the focus of this study.

The significance of this study is that it suggests there are differences in the practices, the interpretive rules, and the production of the intersubjective trust; the contractual perspective and the contextual perspective are two instances of distinct forms of practices, rules, and productions. In all instances, intersubjective trust is co-founded or collaboratively accomplished. There must be a circumstance of shared interactive experience for intersubjective trust to be accomplished.

The writings of Schutz, Garfinkel, and others suggest that there is a universally applied formula to the development of the expectancies that are intersubjective trust. To follow conceptions based on their lines of reasoning limits the possibility of actors constructing a particular trust for their life world and the meanings therein for themselves in distinct and creative ways (Cinnamond, 1988).

Intersubjective trust, in all its regions of manifestations, is used as a device by participants in an interaction to account for
the taken-for-granted expectancies. ("Regions" was selected as a descriptor for intersubjective trust due to some of its physical connotations.) The rules and practices are assumed to be the standard among members, and therefore the rules and practices have moved to a position of out-of-awareness until they are needed for reflective or repair work. As the conception of intersubjective trust is an interpretive account utilized to understand social relations, similarly the rules of each distinct bias are utilized by the members of the perspective to operate as typifications or social types to comprehend the everyday life world.

Zimmerman details the use of rules as interpretive devices based within a particular context (1970:227). Zimmerman suggests that rules hold the operational meaning and situated relevances for action sequences as such rules are utilized by actors to "account for or to justify action" (1970:229). As rules are used on an instance-by-instance basis to understand, redefine or modify an action sequence, rules themselves may be altered to 'fit' new or different circumstances or contexts. Interpretive rules can also be suspended entirely to modify the reasonableness of the action sequence (1970:223).

Despite being an interpretive account, intersubjective trust is an accomplished product that can be described and displayed by members as a feature of social interactions. This study evidences the constitutive order in the phenomenon of collaborative intersubjective trust. All social actions have a constitutive structure relative to the accomplishment of intersubjective trust.
Constitutive structure is what Garfinkel examines when he indicates that all social action sequences are 'serious' and therefore 'moral matters' to the participants (1963). Intersubjective trust is a routine and stable feature of the life world because of its interpretive rules and practices (Cinnamon, 1988).

The development of intersubjective trust in relationships can be likened to objects and spatial relations. Intersubjective trust can demonstrate a sense of boundaries and edges. As in the characteristics of clouds, intersubjective trust can have a boundary and a shape, but it does not have a surface. Even without a surface a cloud is identified as an object that, although hollow, also has a mass and an unobserved side (Stroll, 1988).

The notion of areas or regions also carries with it different distinctions regarding shallowness or depths and interiors and exteriors. Intersubjective trust is also similar to a shadow which has a well-defined edge yet is not solid, and shares its surfaces with other objects. While these are ideas of fixity appropriate to objects, intersubjective trust is a transitive, creative phenomenon that is identified by members only during moments of violation or repair.

Intersubjective trust acts as an interpretive frame. The members know when intersubjective trust is shared. Members know about trust in common with other members without "trust" ever being a topic of dialogue between them. Typically, intersubjective trust occurs without self-reflection. This knowledge of the practices and interpretive rules of intersubjective trust is very complex
and the members 'trust' in it totally. As Luhmann suggests, trust allows for more complexity for a system; the more trust is developed, the more complex expectancies are also developed (Luhmann, 1979:8).

Intersubjective trust is based upon knowledge gained through interactions with consociates and typifications from previous experiences. Consociates, from Schutz, is a particular type of relationship. Consociates indicates an ongoing relationship of community in a particular space and time, with face-to-face interactions being the standard type of interaction (Schutz, 1962:15-16). Knowledge about the practices and interpretive rules of intersubjective trust is also located in typifications accumulated through previous experiences. The typifications for the perspective most commonly shared by men in this study incorporated trust as a contractual relationship. In this study the perspective typically shared by women incorporated typifications of intersubjective trust that are contextual in orientation.

A participant to an interaction has faith that the relationship or role of the other will remain consistent within certain known but unstated parameters. The participant also has confidence that the other understands the role and relationship as the member does, and that the other will not breach or violate the expected and assumed understood roles within the particular relationship. Intersubjective trust is a confidence in the ambiguous or unknown character of interactions and the expectancies that the interaction
will remain consistent and reciprocal as participants understand them, either contractual or contextual.

Significantly, intersubjective trust is either reaffirmed or violated through the conditions and practices of future social action. Trust entails an out-of-awareness confidence that future actions will remain bounded within the already-established reciprocal practices of expectancies.

Discussion

Garfinkel’s work with regard to rules clarifies that members trust that interactional events incorporate an expectation that other members will respect the constitutive rules of the action sequence. They trust until further notice that each is operating under the same code of rules. In this sense, the seriousness of interactions and the intersubjective trust is a moral matter to members (1963).

This study evidences that there are interpretive rules to the development of intersubjective trust as a feature of social relations. Interpretive rules provide for the reasonableness of intersubjective trust. They are not utilized by members for issues of compliance or non-compliance with a particular circumstance (Zimmerman, 1970:233). While the interpretive rules and practices are distinct for each particular perspective, members from each perspective appear to have little difficulty in constructing intersubjective trust across perspectives. Intersubjective trust is a stable and reciprocally-expected feature collaboratively
accomplished. Intersubjective trust can be reflectively identified as such by members.

Similar to the "et cetera" principle of Garfinkel (1963:199), where one member has faith or trust in the unknown but intended actions and behaviors of the other, intersubjective trust is the confidence, based upon the known. The known is based upon typifications and personal knowledge, but it is used to account for the unknown practices of the future. This is the other side of the cloud, out of perception but not out of consciousness. Intersubjective trust is, however, not a conscious facet to interactions, except possibly from the contractual perspective.

Intersubjective trust is not typically a consideration that is made before entering into a relationship/interaction. It is typically not a topic of conversation before an interaction. There are other circumstances where, based upon prior knowledge, the region of trust is to trust in distrust. This suggests a meta-region of trust. An example is of a woman walking alone through the alleys of almost any major urban area in North America after one a.m. on a weekend night. Were she to encounter a group of males wearing gang colors, in most cases her expectancy would be to trust in conceptions of distrust. Intersubjective trust is more than a cognitive, affective, or linear mental process. Intersubjective trust includes the experiential, and in this manner has a strong emotional component that is typically out of awareness until violated.
The conception of intersubjective trust that is identified here is a component of the natural attitude, but intersubjective trust also exhibits diversity in its nature of intersubjectiveness, its situatedness and, most importantly, gender differentiation. The social practices and interpretive rules of intersubjective trust in interactions are not universal. That intersubjective trust is a part of the natural attitude points to the unity and simplicity that members seek for their everyday life world. Yet the contractual perspective, in this study associated with males, and the contextual perspective, in this study associated with females, exhibit different practices and interpretive rules for the accomplishment of intersubjective trust. Intersubjective trust remains an objective feature in social practice because it is a social fact established through ongoing interaction. Intersubjective trust is clearly a constitutive feature of interaction.

Using Schutz's terminology, regions of intersubjective trust are related to the relationships of consociates. The experience of residence hall living is oriented to the development of consociate relationships. Consociates take more for granted because they share more, in terms of quantity of knowledge, regarding the actions and meanings of the self, the other, and interactions. It is in this area of the taken-for-granted that a region of intersubjective trust is at work. The deeper and broader the Type B trust and Type A intersubjective trust, the more than can be taken-for-granted with regard to interpersonal knowledge,
interactional rules, and social practices. More importantly, this knowledge is personal knowledge (Schutz, 1962:19). Personal knowledge is acquired in such a manner that the member has more confidence in it. Confidence is demonstrated throughout the contextual perspective and through the development of the contractual perspective. This is not necessarily differentiated along gender lines.

Social proximity provides a particular stock of knowledge to draw on in particular situations. In the instance of consociates, proximity is associated with the depth and range of interactions which is separate from the time or the spatial closeness of the relationships. Clearly, intersubjective trust is a temporal phenomenon.

Intersubjective trust becomes a way to transcend the time, space, and expectancies of interactions. From the contextual perspective, intersubjective trust has infinite temporal boundaries; relationships edged with intersubjective trust have no particular closing or end points. The contractual perspective has time-bounded intersubjective trust. Intersubjective trust is exemplified through genuine and sincere statements that begin and maintain a trusting relationship. It is the course of future actions that affirms or violates the intersubjective trust. Intersubjective trust becomes the means for dealing with the temporal nature of relationships.

Intersubjective trust facilitates communication; as such, it may on occasion preclude explicit communication because the deeper
regions of intersubjective trust may incorporate implicit meanings that are embedded in the practices of the interaction. One key is what and how much is taken-for-granted. A second issue is the particular region or zone of intersubjective trust. The region or zone is the particular meaningfulness of intersubjective trust for the members which may or may not be identical. Intersubjective trust is an available resource that permits more to be taken-for-granted regarding meanings and intentions of the other. The broader and deeper the region of intersubjective trust, the more that can be taken-for-granted by the participants. The amount of intimacy in the relationship will allow for suitable topics of talk and appropriate modes of discourse. Intersubjective trust allows for more genuine and sincere modes of discourse, discourse of a form that will utilize multiple means for dialogue and communication.

In this manner one cannot attempt to understand intersubjective trust apart from a particular context. Context is not always related to a situated place, as exemplified in the case of the contextual perspective. Context can also be an indication of a particular biographically-shared event, space or the knowledge of typicality. Intersubjective trust is not fixed or stable, but is changeable and adaptable, dependent upon the fluctuations of interactions.

Intersubjective trust as a practice develops the unity of the intersubjective relationship no matter the physical constraints of the interaction. In either its presence or absence,
intersubjective trust becomes the fundamental unifying condition. Intersubjective trust unifies because it allows participants to enter into interactions in spite of a lack of knowledge of the other and, in many cases, also because of a lack of knowledge regarding context. Intersubjective trust also unifies through its ability to be redone or renegotiated after a violation. The ability to become a topic for discourse and a goal of interaction allows intersubjective trust to solidify relationships. Seventy-two freshman students new to residence hall life manage to live together despite a total lack of personal knowledge about either the particular context or the particular persons with whom they have to live.

It is in the absence of intersubjective trust that the essential nature of intersubjective trust is demonstrated and made visible to participants and observers. The absence of trust is mistrust or distrust. The displacement of the natural practices and rules of interpretations of interactions is demonstrated when there is mistrust. The taken-for-granted practices and the interpretive rules of intersubjective trust are evident once intersubjective trust has been breached. Mistrust is not what replaces intersubjective trust as an oppositional. Mistrust and distrust are but points along a series of interactional planes that may overlap depending upon the roles and situations of the participants.

The relation of intersubjective trust and mistrust is exemplified in the following. When a male student was interviewed
about his relationship with his RA. Kevin said that he would go to Cliff for information about classes or the location of a building. However, Kevin would not go to the RA if he had a "social girl aspect" problem. This points to a trusting relationship for the occasion of obtaining resource-type information from the RA, but a non-trusting relationship involving the sharing of information regarding personal or social concerns. Kevin also spoke about having had a "hate relationship" with the RA due to a confrontation over a loud party that included alcohol violations. (While Cliff, the RA, did not share the strength of feeling--hate--he did describe the relationship as being one where he did not trust the future actions of the student.)

In this aspect of their relationship, Kevin mistrusts the RA, yet in at least one other area he trusts the RA. This complexity creates an orderliness that the student assumes to be normal and reciprocally held by the RA. Intersubjective trust is illuminated by this exemplar as a part of the objective reality of social facts that for the members is an ongoing accomplishment.

The practices and interpretive rules for the repair of intersubjective trust are distinct for each perspective. The contractual perspective repairs intersubjective trust in such a manner that it fortifies the notion of two separate members. The contextual perspective demonstrates practices that join the other into the self, and for this reason the violation of intersubjective trust is more difficult to repair.
The repair practices and interpretive rules of intersubjective trust direct attention to intersubjective trust as a creative and continuous process that is made concrete through interactions. Each interaction, no matter the regions of trust, is a historical event. Typifications will be used by members to 'normalize' any region of intersubjective trust necessary to routinize the interaction. (A typification is a meaning structure or category that is not empirical or experiential. Without the use of typifications, the understanding of experience is impossible for the members [Stewart & Mickunas, 1974].)

Intersubjective trust is created through continued interaction. The sharing of experience and knowledge without violation can potentially develop broader and deeper regions of intersubjective trust. Conversely, the continued sharing of negative experiences and/or violations of intersubjective trust can develop broader and deeper regions of distrust or mistrust.

As such, intersubjective trust takes its place within an ongoing pattern and history of practices that contribute to the development of relationships. Each individual trust-building interaction is unique and idiosyncratic, but at the same time it will contain elements that are identical with other trusting relationships. In this sense, there is a normative component to intersubjective trust that reflects stable social relationships. This stability is evident in the regions of either intersubjective trust, which contributes to continuity, or distrust, which contributes to discontinuity.
Intersubjective trust develops immediately and directly, both explicitly and implicitly, through the action sequences of participants. It is constructed jointly through the interaction of the participants, yet it will be understood separately, distinctively, and out of awareness. As well, intersubjective trust can be reflected upon at a later time, or it can be the topic of discourse. On several occasions students spoke of initially not trusting their RA even though they had not had any personal contact that might contribute to the lack of intersubjective trust. In all of these cases the students were friends with other students who had had a negative confrontation with the RA. Through dialogue about the confrontation, the students had formulated a distrustful position toward the RA. The shared practices of members can be based upon empirical observations that they make, behaviors they have experienced, or discussions among themselves.

Garfinkel's work demonstrates that on some levels personal knowledge of the other is not necessary for trust to be present. Yet deeper and broader regions of intersubjective trust are determined and sustained by continuous social interaction. Each particular interaction is used as a part of the constitutive building of a trustful relationship. In this sense, every interaction is a demonstration that members do trust in the particular practice, rules and expectancies that they construct. For the development of intersubjective trust, each interaction means nothing; it only possesses the possibility of developing a trust-type relationship within a concrete context. Intersubjective
trust is related to meanings but not dependent upon them. The greater, or deeper, the degree of understanding the higher or deeper the development of intersubjective trust.
CHAPTER V
Implications and Recommendations

"Could you now, my dear young man, under such circumstances, by way of experiments, simply have confidence in me?"

H. Melville, The Confidence Man

Introduction

This chapter will begin with a review of the findings. A call for a paradigm inclusion for the area of student personnel and, in particular, residence life follows the review of the findings. A recommendation regarding the potential for phenomenological research and its power for developing intervention strategies is subsequently developed. A set of recommendations involves potential interventions for the area of residence life, and it reviews the practices of the resident assistant. The last section of this chapter contains recommendations regarding areas for further research.

Review of the Findings

The research presented here indicates that features of interactions between students and the RA are a part of the development of intersubjective trust. Intersubjective trust is
based upon social practices. This study has indicated that the social practices of trust are more complex than recent authors have conceptualized. Explicitly, this examination of social relations of the everyday life world suggests there are at least two particular modes of intersubjective trust demonstrated in social practice.

The contractual perspective maintains a sense of indexicality. Indexicality, in this case, suggests that events and interactions occur within the context of a particular series of interactions. The subsequent meanings of intersubjective trust will be determined by participants relative to the shared and understood context. The contractual perspective moves through a protocol of interactions before intersubjective trust is established. The contextual perspective begins with the expectation of reciprocal interpersonal trust. "Begins" is not quite the accurate word for this perspective. From within this bias, a member moves towards an orientation of the social practices of interaction with and toward the other that will include intersubjective trust.

The significance of the practices of trust discovered in this research is not in a deterministic formulation of intersubjective trust by the participants to interactions. The significance is in the identification of the practices as interpretive devices utilized by members to understand action sequences of themselves and other members. The practices are rules in the sense identified by Garfinkel (1963). He identified rules as having the qualities of being amended, changed, or maintained, but the rules maintain a
function as interpretive devices for the understanding of the behaviors of the self and others (1963:190-194). The rules are not indicative of internalized norms, values, or behaviors. Rules in this conception are not determinative of behavior.

This study does not want to create 'judgmental dopes' whose actions reflect internalized norms and values and who are unable to change behavior based upon the contingencies of the everyday life world (Garfinkel, 1967:35-75). Previous social relations and roles are important in the construction of intersubjective trust. However, intersubjective trust is not embodied in the role, nor is it innate in social relations or roles. Although some roles will have social constructions of trust associated with them, each role or social relation can be seen as a generality. Yet in actuality members can identify each role or social relation as a particular instance of the generality in the everyday life world. As a result, members do interpretive work coordinating the meanings of each new particular occurrence, event, and social relations.

Intersubjective trust transcends the roles and permeates each interaction. The particular members utilize previous experiences and the immediate context to determine each instance of intersubjective trust. This process typically is accomplished out of awareness and not brought into a conscious mode until reflected upon. Previous experiences do not determine intersubjective trust, but experiences are attended to by members and associated with roles and behaviors that are utilized to interpret current action sequences.
The context, current and future actions, and previous experiences determine the meanings of intersubjective trust. The meanings of intersubjective trust are distinct for each member. Two members reflecting upon the same history of shared interactions can identify two distinct meanings of intersubjective trust. For the purposes of most interactions, the meanings understood by each member are neither significant nor are they called into question. Only in instances of breach, violation and repair do the meanings become important considerations to be brought into conscious awareness.

Intersubjective trust is a social knowledge achieved through interactive relations with others. As a social knowledge, it entails social rules and norms which dictate expected behaviors and obligations for the participants. As indicated above, these rules are not static, nor are the conditions upon which members behaviors are determined.

Implications of the Study

In general, two questions immediately arise as a result of this study: 1) how do these empirical and theoretical concepts of intersubjective trust relate to student affairs practices? and 2) what are the practical uses of this knowledge for student affairs and, in particular, the area of residence life?

Student Affairs Practice. The developmental orientation of residence hall staff development and training seeks programs to adapt the residence staff to types of situations and students. The
student personnel literature does not include, for the most part, a
dialogue with sociological theory. There is not an emphasis upon
the practices and the practical knowledge of accomplishing social
relations. The orientation is more toward a proceduralization of
steps necessary for accomplishing the two-fold task of student
developmental knowledge for the staff and the students and the
maintenance of order. The first does not include rules of social
practice nor steps to modify the structure of relationships. The
second task does employ rules to control behavior of the students
and the expectation that the staff member will exercise self-
control over his/her own behavior.

What is being suggested here is not a paradigm shift but a
paradigm inclusion—a movement to the incorporation of another
conception of the term "province of meaning" attempts to
characterize the temporal nature of knowledge and the difficulty in
remaining embedded within a status quo. Both intellectual
traditions and individuals must draw on new and varied knowledge to
develop richer understandings.

For student affairs and, in particular, residence life, social
factors cannot only be seen as variables. Social factors must
become the focus of understanding through the sociological study of
the everyday life world as inhabited by students. A professional
in the field should use all forms of theoretical and research
capacities to achieve understanding. The results of research
cannot be identified as objective knowledge for administratively-
oriented instrumental use. The development of social relations and intersubjective trust is not a controllable condition easily manipulated by changing or eliminating variables.

This study presents a partial theory of human interaction for a particular group of actors within the context of the college residence hall. The complexity of human involvement cannot be determined or controlled through any one theory or study. This study and its results can be useful if only to prevent narrow and procedural perspectives regarding social interactions. An infinite number of subtleties which exist in each social interaction cannot be discovered with the characteristic brevity of the positivistic paradigm. Certainly no research methodology will successfully uncover all the subtleties of interaction, but the phenomenological orientation permits flexibility and rigor for understanding the lives of actors. Social factors are more significant than additional variables in an equation.

Brown, in the T.H.E. Project (1972), stated that students are important as individuals. To seriously consider this charge, student affairs professionals must view students seriously as resources and give them a voice. To give the students a voice is to see each student as a particular and distinct instance to be heard and understood within a social and historical context. To take them out of their context leaves them as mere objects for study with no depth. To develop a design and not plan for the participation of students in the construction of the meaningfulness
of their everyday life world does not give students credit for the construction and maintenance of their experiences.

Students' thoughts and actions must be valued for the meanings held because of conceptions of students' distinctiveness, as individuals, held by the field.

One implication of this study lies within the methodological rubric. (A review of Schutz's treatment of this topic is found in Chapter II.) Phenomenological evidence is a powerful tool that can be utilized by student affairs areas to develop intervention strategies. The meanings and understanding of the roles and relationships of the resident assistant and the student are constructed by their own voice with which they can express what is significant to them and why it is significant. The researcher provides the venue of display.

Attention must be made to the shared and intersubjective nature of social phenomena. Among the areas available for research are events, contexts, situations, and interactions. Actors and social relations are situated in the practical activities of the everyday life world. The everyday life world of the students and other members cannot be understood apart from a social and historical context.

One can study the collected evidence of observations, dialogue and interviews and use them not only as a resource of the study but also make them the topics of the study. If the professional sees each student as truly distinct the professional has to develop an understanding of the meaningful patterns of the students. The
researcher and professional have to ask the questions that are important and significant for the students.

The relation of the actions of the students and the accounts that they make of them has to be a concern for a study including questions such as: how is it that students come to understand the significance and the meaningfulness of their own lives?; how do they develop relational accounts for themselves and others?; how do they attempt to understand the meaning patterns of the members from within their own perspective? Knowledge of these meanings heightens the professional's ability to intervene and support the students in a positive, proactive fashion.

The ongoing observational nature of phenomenological evidence collection allows for the development of social relations and interactions over time, which provides rich insight into the evolution and structures of the life world. Definitions of what is normal behavior and social relations take on a character that reflects more accurately the experiences and attitudes of the actors involved when developed utilizing phenomenological research. The environmental factors that impact the behavior and attitudes of the actors are readily available to the careful observer. The phenomenological study can focus on an individual student or group of students.

Phenomenological study allows the researcher to have sensitivity to the complexities of social life in the everyday life world. By the very nature of phenomenological research, the students are seen in relation to something or someone. The
relation could be to the physical environment. The relation could be another student to a staff member, to a group of students, et cetera. The relation could be to a previous historical event or social relationship. Significantly, the relation of the student to what or whomever is one that is meaningful for the student and one that the student is attempting to understand.

Phenomenological research brings into conscious awareness the complex aspects of social interaction. It focuses attention on students' patterns of behavior built up over time and has more immediacy for the participants.

Before developing intervention strategies, the researcher has a responsibility to return to the respondents and establish the adequacy and congruence of the interpretations and the resultant interventions with the understandings of the students. The emphasis is on an ability to see the students and the residence hall staff as valuable and insightful resources of their own lived experiences.

As a result, the interventions designed at the conclusion of a phenomenological study are responsive to the actualities of the situation. The interventions are created for a specific social and historical context providing for a higher level of confidence in the intervention itself. It is equally important that the researcher use terms and language of the students and the residence hall staff. It is important that the communication back to the respondents of what is for them meaningful does not become clouded by the theoretical approach or interests of the professional or the
researcher. The facilitators and the constructs of the intervention must be commonsensible to the participants to have greater relevance to the everyday life world. Schutz deals with this topic in his writings regarding second order constructs (1967).

Students and the everyday life world cannot be dissected into separate variable parts. At some time the whole must be displayed. To treat either students or the everyday life world or both as variables eliminates the ability to maintain the meaningfulness of the experiences. Students and residence hall staff are products of complex cultural and historical scripts. The scripts are written over a period of time. To truly understand the richness of individual students as participants of groups or organizations, the students cannot be abstracted from their culture. Student affairs professionals do not want to make a polarity of the student, and in this case the RA. It must be remembered by both researchers and professionals that in most cases the RA is a student as well as a member of the paraprofessional staff. Student affairs professionals should seek to identify a social constructionist approach that is as inclusive as possible. Phenomenological research is one method of accomplishing this task.

**Staff Development Interventions.** Another potential implication of this study is in the area of staff development and training for the residence hall staff. Among areas that can be considered are: what knowledge or practices are to be presented to the residence hall staff?; why have those particular practices been identified?;
how are the practices and knowledge to be disseminated? (An
acknowledgement must be made to the limitations and limits of this
or any study. The following recommendations are not meant to be
read as universally applicable or generalizable to all situations,
staff, or institutions.)

Van Manen has coined a term "co-orientational grasping"
(1975:213). He uses this term to describe the situation when an
individual is attempting to become oriented to the perspective of
another. In the training of the RA, this is an attitude that
should be good for the facilitator and for the residence hall staff
to be taught. This is a focus that is oriented toward an allowance
for and awareness of the other, no matter what the category or type
of knowledge to be presented, developed and understood. To
identify students as a valuable text would enhance Van Manen's
conception. Students as text addresses an emphasis less on
categories defined and determined outside the particular instance
of current social relations. The emphasis is upon a particular and
contextual understanding of the student and her/his behaviors
within a localized and specific setting.

The prescriptive orientation to be suggested to the residence
hall staff recognizes a grasping or a struggling to understand the
other and the other's perspective, as the other is reciprocally
permitted to accept and grasp the self of the residence hall staff
members. The attitude is a de-emphasis on a simplistic
classification of behaviors and attitudes of the students. The
recommendation attends to the interpretive features of the
everyday life world. These features are elusive and complex in the actuality of human relations in the everyday life world. Therefore, one must not deliberately focus on constructing simplistic and objectifying representations of students.

To create procedures, rules or techniques of intersubjective trust co-opts the essence of intersubjective trust and its practices. Intersubjective trust is a plurality of practices and a persistent part of interrelations. For this reason it would be difficult to proceduralize. Intersubjective trust is a co-founded social relation and, as such, is a form of caring for the other. This study suggests that the ability to construct intersubjective trust with a variety of actors is a necessary condition of the RA position. On the common sense level, students selected to be RAs should have a collection of interpretive rules and, more importantly, a variety of practices or skills that they can utilize for intersubjective trust before they are selected.

A recommended goal is to enhance communication and interpersonal understanding among all participants in the residence hall setting. Workshops should assist the residence hall staff in understanding the collaborative nature of intersubjective trust. The research presented here supports the development of skills of communication interaction. The development of intersubjective trust is related to communicative practices. A development of communicative practices should enhance the ability of an actor to construct intersubjective trust. These skills include the social
practices of introduction, dialogue, leading a meeting, confrontation, facilitation, negotiation, and mediation.

A staff person in the residence hall should develop a repertoire of competencies for interpersonal relations. Staff members should be able to have alternative practices for the variety of contexts, situations, and individuals with whom they come into contact. Certainly, it would be impossible to identify and prepare residence hall staff for all potential circumstances of contexts, situations, and individuals both in this chapter and in preparation for a workshop intervention.

However, combining potential circumstances and social practices with evidence from the personal experiences of RAs and reflection will contribute to a richer understanding of relationship development and the practices necessary to be a successful RA or student affairs professional (Cinnamond & Zimpher, in press).

Distinctive practices can be identified relative to situations identified in this study. The emphasis should be on practices. The presentation of the practical should focus on components of the everyday life world that are visible, discernible and significant to the staff for whom the intervention is planned. Among the practices that merit attention are those necessary to work with social groups, and norms, practices related to the development of individual social relations, practices related to the violation and repair of intersubjective trust.
1. **Social Groups and Relations.** The main problem of social life in residence halls from the standpoint of the professional and the researcher is not to develop theories but to assist students and staff in understanding their own capacities and their environment. Human interaction and the development of intersubjective trust is situated in practical activity and cannot be understood outside of its social and historical context.

The RA has to be able to understand the indeterminacy of social rules/norms and the emergent properties established through action sequences. The accomplishment of intersubjective trust is an ensemble activity; it cannot be achieved in isolation, but it is explicitly dependent on social relations.

Within this framework, the RA should engage in activities that will develop interpersonal skills and practices relative to working with students. The skills and practices developed should reflect a variety of interaction and leadership roles.

2. **Individual Social Relations.** Students and residence hall staff are products and creators of patterns. The practice of establishing relationships is a speculative construction within the patterns. Within the constructive practices are the potentialities of the interaction. Staff development for residence life must assist the RA in the cultivation of intersubjective trust through interventions that stress communication and social practices of understanding.

Intersubjective trust can become a part of the integrative process that expands the relationships and quality of social
relations on a floor. A thrust toward practices focusing on understanding does not mean the proceduralization of intersubjective trust or social relations. The approach suggested in this study calls for training of the residence hall staff that increases awareness of the complexity of social relations and the practices that accomplish the relations. These have to be relative to competencies in the development of social skills necessary to social relations--i.e., listening skills and speaking skills should be a component of the recommended training. Yet, social relations must be allowed to evolve naturally, with the student affairs professional prepared to assist students and residence hall staff when problems or concerns arise.

3. Violations of Interpersonal Trust. Violations are a part of the patterns of interactions that reveal isolation and the darker aspects of social relations. Intersubjective trust is fragile. When intersubjective trust is completely destroyed, nothing remains of the social relation, particularly for a person within the relational perspective. At the point of violation, a point of consciousness that students, residence hall staff, and student affairs professionals must work especially hard at are the practices of social relations. The skills and processes of communication and understanding come into heightened use during periods of violation and repair.

Intersubjective trust evolves through mutual, yet not identical, interpretive procedures. Violation is similar in that the violation may not be reciprocally shared. As well, the
potentially different meanings of intersubjective trust which are typically not shared come into sharper focus. Reciprocal intersubjective trust does not necessarily make for social cohesion. The location of the violation—i.e., student-to-student, student-to-residence hall staff, student-to-professional staff, residence hall staff-to-professional staff—will help to determine the meanings and the repair protocols necessary.

4. Repair of Intersubjective Trust. From the vantage point of the student affairs professional, to speak of the violation of intersubjective trust should also include concerns regarding the repair of intersubjective trust. The repair of intersubjective trust is also a feature of the typical patterns and practices of social relations. Repair strives for understanding and light.

If violation is darkness, repair seeks to penetrate the solitude of violation. It is a feature of repair that it has to deal with the atypical and the problematic. There can be no easy recipes for the doing of repair.

Residence hall staff development should attend to the practices and skills of communication and understanding. Certainly, the skills of active listening and restatement would be a good starting point for interventions of repair. A certain level of sensitivity to the different patterns and practices of repair suggested in this study could be helpful to a staff person.
Summary

Intersubjective trust is collaborative in nature. Communication, dialogue and interactions are collaborative. The prevalent attitudes and practices of RAs in their position as organizational beings must be toward non-adversarial approaches. Attitudes and practices that are oriented toward co-orientational grasping attempt to understand the potential constructive features of relationships inherent in the practical activities of football, pizza and casual conversation, to name a few. These practices of social relations are potentially developing intersubjective trust as a feature of the event. An orientation toward the understanding of the other moves away from the process of objectifying and classifying. Instead, co-orientational grasping moves into a emancipatory venue of integration and understanding experiences of the RA and the student.

Interventions, staff development, in-services, training and selection processes cannot develop residence hall staff with the necessary tools to become phenomenological sociologists. However, they can increase the communicative and interpersonal competence of the staff so that the staff can intentionally, purposefully and reflectively utilize themselves to establish interpersonal trust.

Why Teach Knowledge Regarding Social Practices? The history of student affairs documents the interest in the development of students as individuals and as members of social groups (COSPA, 1975). The education of students in preparation for their futures is not confined to the classroom (American Council on Education,
1937, 1949). Crookston notes that student development is the re-focusing of student affairs practice with attention to the in-class and out-of-class activities that become a part of the institutional education experience (1976:28).

Historically at least, there is a groundwork for the student affairs profession to develop student awareness of alternatives. The presentation of possibly conflicting knowledge and/or theories that allow for the reflective practitioners to grow and challenge themselves is encouraged. Professionals in the area of student affairs are also charged with the identification of a variety of practices in the form of educational opportunities and subsequent consequences of choices for the student to select. The key remains moving to an inclusive perspective (Brown, 1972).

**How Are the Practices Taught?** This section draws heavily upon the conceptions of phenomenology as a way to thematize the life world. The interventions that present the practices and knowledge regarding interaction and communication skills must be organized in such a way that a focus on everyday activities and interactions is primary. Examples of the routines and patterns of the everyday life world are combined with constructive and deliberate reflection. The implications of intersubjective trust and its differentiations must be combined in staff development and program planning in an adaptive mode that critically engages the context, situation, and participants involved.

Evidence to be incorporated into facilitation must be descriptive of the everyday life world so that it is useful and
relevant to the residence hall staff in understanding the actuality experienced. It should make visible and understandable for the residence hall staff actions, experiences, and conceptions that will richly develop the understanding of the experiences of the others as well as the self. The framework for reflective understanding should illuminate the naturalness of the everyday life world as experienced. The meaning structures and interpretive devices that immediately define the world in a non-reflective manner must be defined and presented in language available to the students.

Facilitators must attempt to make the connections between interpretive practices and rules as practiced by the residence hall staff and demonstrate the shared similar patterns. Prescriptive orientations of how to do interactions and construct intersubjective trust will not be successful. Members who are playing at a role cannot be genuine, and as a result they cannot be successful in establishing intersubjective trust.

As representatives of an organization, the residence staff will have many opportunities to integrate the practices of interpersonal relations. As the result of workshops, the staff will begin to recognize in themselves the behaviors that inhibit or prohibit positive relations with others. The focus of the interventions should be on behaviors enabling the self to grow, and subsequently the organizations of student affairs and residence life will benefit as well. An orientation of this nature increases the
sensitivity to differences in processes and dynamics of social relations.

Another focus for facilitation should be toward the development of an orientation in the residence hall staff to be receptive to behaviors, attitudes, and interactions that might normally be glossed over or dismissed as different. For this reason, no exact answer about a strategy for the development of intersubjective trust is possible. Student staff members must work within the realm of their own experiences to develop codes and evidences that define their achievements of intersubjective trust. This requires attention to the life world and meaning structures of all participants.

The facilitator must attempt to pull the RA staff into an awareness of the experience of the student and the student's grasping of the experience of college. This can be accomplished by reflectively utilizing the experiences of the RA as student.

A facilitator can pragmatically utilize the knowledge of this study to move the RA into reflective use of the practices regarding the construction and development of intersubjective trust and the differentiation according to participants. The RA must understand how the behaviors, talk, and previous experiences of the students will be utilized by them in constructing intersubjective trust. The RA must understand how the history and experiences of the other in the everyday life world assists in the construction of the meaningfulness of current social relations.
The purpose of the knowledge regarding the practices of social relations is not to gain control of the students and be able to manipulate them. The goal is to achieve reflective, insightful, and purposeful understanding regarding the practices of the self—the RA. Self-awareness of the behaviors and possible consequences of the behaviors can be powerful in emancipating the RA from destructive interactions. The intent is not to develop performance-based competencies that focus on efficient and effective modes of doing interactions, but to enhance and enrich the quality of the social relationships as experienced.

Further Research

Two rubrics can be identified to categorize issues for further research relative to this study. The first rubric is identified as "change." The second rubric is "richer."

Change. To increase understanding of the practices of intersubjective trust, a change in the situation and location of the study should be done. This could include a change in the state, the college or residence hall. In conjunction there could also be a change in the population for the study. The current study has a limitation in the small range of population included in the sample available for study. Issues identified by changing the population include whether the practices of intersubjective trust as evidence in this study are similar with others of different age, cultural ethnic and cross populations.
Another change that I feel would be significant is in the area of researcher and/or evidence collector. I have some concerns regarding how the gender of the researcher/interviewer and the RA may have impacted responses or the willingness of some respondents to participate. Would a researcher/interviewer and RA with a different gender have accomplished the study with similar findings, all other things being relatively equal? Blau’s work addresses issues of power relative to social interaction (1964). Are there power relations at work associated with gender that would generate a different body of evidence and responses?

**Richer.** Under the rubric of richer falls those areas or categories that could benefit from broader and/or deeper research. While the evidence of this study suggests different practices of intersubjective trust relative to gender, further studies are necessary to uncover other pluralities of intersubjective trust that may be evidenced in a different context or locus. A possible avenue is to examine intersubjective trust within gay communities to identify practices and interpretive rules among its members.

A second area that suggests further examination is to illuminate the particular meanings of intersubjective trust within a particular relationship. It becomes evident that participants to a shared action sequence or ongoing social relationship identify different meanings of intersubjective trust. The purpose is to identify and understand how differentiations among participants of intersubjective trust impact the social relations, if at all.
A third area focuses on the joint concerns of violation and repair. For most purposes, the meaning associated with intersubjective trust by participants is not a concern unless there is a violation. If the participants are interested in repair, the meanings and rules which had been out of awareness and assumed to be reciprocally shared become a conscious topic of dialogue and reflective thought. Any attention to this area will further expand the understanding of intersubjective trust and its significance for social relations.

The statement from Melville's work that began this chapter suggests a meta-awareness of the features of trust by the confidence man. To be successful, the confidence man must understand the interpretive frames normally utilized by actors. The confidence man must also understand how to use this knowledge and the necessary practices to mask his real intent as he plays the mark. While this study cannot develop an ongoing meta-awareness of intersubjective trust, it can within a particular spatio-temporal sequence provide some insight into the experiences of the everyday life world.
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