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Chapter 1

The Problem and Objectives of the Study

Introduction

Although residence halls provide a significant context for student development, it is only recently that systematic consideration has been given to the role of the residence hall in meeting the broad educational and social goals of American colleges. The current look at expanding the role of college residence halls contrasts with the narrow view found in the past.

Behind the current examination of residence halls lies the pressure formed by the explosive growth in student housing that followed World War II. Dormitory buildings have been associated with American colleges since the beginning of higher education on this continent. Provisions for boarding were made at the University of the Pacific as early as 1856 (Davis, 1976). But the most rapid period of growth in student housing came in the years following World War II. Replacing the slow, steady growth in housing that began around 1900 was an explosive post-war growth in both the amount of housing and the number of students demanding housing (Mueller, 1961). This growth in housing was made possible through federal funds (Butler, 1964). Such rapid growth brought with it concern for methods of maintaining quality while accommodating the increasing numbers of students. This concern was translated into a look at the roles residence halls had served in the past and a consideration of how they could now best serve the needs of the students and the
institution (Butler, 1964).

A look at the role of dormitories in colonial colleges revealed they were primarily used to regulate student behavior (Cowley, 1934). Early small Christian colleges attempted to mold the character of students through rigid control of student life (Williamson, 1958). Students lived under the surveillance of clergymen-professors who functioned as detectives, sheriffs, and prosecuting attorneys. Such activities were not always appreciated by students, and riots and revolts against these restraints were common. Cowley (1934, p. 709) quotes President Andrew Dickson White of Cornell, describing his undergraduate experiences at Hobart, as follows:

It was my privilege to behold a professor, an excellent clergymen, seeking to quell a hideous riot in a student's room, buried under a heap of carpets, mattresses, counterpanes, and blankets; to see another clerical professor forced to retire through the panel of a door under a shower of lexicons, boots, and brushes, and to see even the president himself, on one occasion, obliged to leave his lecture-room by a ladder from a window and, on another, kept at bay by a shower of beer bottles.

Such reports suggest that attempts to use residences to control behavior often met with failure. The other major historical use of the college residence hall was to improve the hygienic and safety conditions under which students lived (Williamson, 1958). Attempts to improve hygiene and safety were more successful than attempts to control behavior.

Consideration of how college housing could now best serve the
needs of the student and the institution required the answering of several questions including: (1) What objectives have been established for residence hall programs and how do such objectives relate to the goals and objectives of the college at large? (2) How can a student benefit emotionally and intellectually from residence hall life? (3) Can the individual's educational growth be influenced in a positive way by the residence hall experience? (Butler, 1969). Shoben's (1958) comments provide an answer to the first of these questions.

Shoben saw the fundamental purpose of a university as discovering, synthesizing, and transmitting knowledge and the basic objective of a university or college as providing the student the opportunity to grow intellectually, socially, morally, and vocationally. He concluded that every student personnel function or related activity by a college or university should serve these purposes and objectives.

Chickering (1967) provides an answer to Butler's last two questions. Chickering saw the residence hall as able to serve the needs of both the college and the student. It is in the college residence hall that close associations among students develop and Chickering saw these associations as providing the student the opportunity for emotional and intellectual growth. The opportunity for contact with people of different backgrounds can improve the student's ability to tolerate and learn from others. In the residence hall, the student feels the impact of the group's behavioral norms and observes the effects of his own behavior on others. Such interplay helps the student develop a personal value system that can be held with integrity.
A college's ability to foster such student development in the residence halls derives from its ability to manipulate its housing program. College housing can benefit the student intellectually and emotionally and can influence growth in a positive way because colleges can control housing arrangements and the placement of students within halls. Among the most significant factors that can affect student development in residence halls are (1) physical plant, (2) administrative structure, and (3) residence staff.

The term physical plant denotes the residence hall buildings. Riker (1956, p. 29) reports that college housing construction following World War II was primarily meant to reduce the on-campus space shortage, to improve the health and sanitary conditions under which students lived, and to replace obsolete facilities. According to Riker, college and university administrators expressed concerns that student living standards fostered good conditions of study and health. Control of the physical plant gave universities and colleges the opportunity to control sanitary and maintenance conditions. Further, through the location of housing on campus, administrators affected the student's opportunity to participate in college life. Distance from campus can make it difficult for a student to use facilities such as libraries and laboratories. Distance can limit the student's ability to be an effective member of the college community. Administrators of several institutions felt that because residential living was an important part of student college life, they were obligated to provide on-campus housing.
Various studies were done on interior and exterior architecture, and the arrangements of buildings in relation to each other. Chickering (1967) suggested that the interior of each student housing unit should be designed to foster associations among students in the unit and that units should be located such that interunit relationships are fostered. The physical plant should reflect "beauty of structure and furnishings, space, privacy, dignity, and the elements commonly described as cultural" (Riker, 1956, p. 50). Questions were raised concerning the importance of site, size, and shape of residence halls.

Questions about site concerned the location of a residence hall relative to facilities such as the library or the student recreational centers. Considerations of size and shape included questions about campus architectural values and whether new construction should blend with the old. Determination of size had both social and financial elements. Riker (1956, pp. 60-81) held that buildings holding twenty or less students were the most desirable socially but larger buildings were more easily supported financially. Riker concluded that interior design features - space, illumination, color, noise, temperature, and ventilations - all had a significant impact on student well-being. Corridor length, position of student rooms, location of shower and toilet facilities, and arrangement of common social rooms also significantly affected the student's functioning.

The resolution of concerns for physical plant has been different for each college and university and has depended on the perceived
importance of various factors. Observation of the existing college and university housing units in America suggests student personal and social development was not always considered beyond provision for adequate space and sanitation.

Administrative structure was also examined for its impact on student life. Questions have been posed about the rules and regulations employed in residence halls and about types of hall governance. Chickering (1967) suggested that housing rules and regulations should permit spontaneous, heated, and extended discussions to be held without the imposition of arbitrary time limits, or adult interruptions, intrusion, or surveillance. Chickering suggested that each residence unit or hall provide its own public statement of position on matters of conduct and behavior. Within the hall, allocation of responsibility should be real, and areas of student control as well as areas of control reserved to faculty and staff should be made clear.

Riker (1956, pp. 160-171) saw administrative structure as built of building blocks such as a "Program for Personal Responsibility (a Work Program)," a "Program for Group Responsibility (Student Government)," and a "Program for Self-Control (Student Discipline)." In further discussion Riker suggested an administrative structure with a housing officer, centrally concerned with residence halls, holding primary authority and supported by a strong head-resident who is in turn supported by a staff of dormitory counselors.

Gifford (1974) looked at various types of administrative
structures. Gifford revealed that many students doubted the need for a structure including dormitory counselors. Such students felt the residents of a hall should be given the complete responsibility for governing themselves. Essentially such students desired a residence hall administered much like an apartment complex. This self-governing unit was seen to challenge students and to encourage them to develop personal responsibility. To determine the utility of various administrative structures, Gifford compared the effect of three types of residence hall administration: (1) hall with only a head resident and permitted, not mandated, student government; (2) a hall with an assistant head resident, dormitory counselors, and permitted, though not mandated, student government; and (3) a hall with assistant head residents, dormitory counselors, and mandated student government. Gifford evaluated factors such as students' grades, student perception of their environment, damage to the hall, and student drop-out rate. He concluded that the team approach, with the administrative staff working with student government functioned best. Gifford's evaluation of administrative structure supported the need for dormitory counselors. The expense of the dormitory counselor staff was justified by its effectiveness.

Residence hall staff, in particular the dormitory counselor, has emerged as a critical element of the student personnel services in college residence halls. The role of the dormitory counselor is complex, involving both control and counseling functions (Harshman and Harshman, 1974). The present study focuses on the dormitory
The Problem

Effective methods of selecting dormitory counselors are needed. Evaluation of such a selection process calls for determining if the selection procedure employed is sorting the applicant pool effectively and if the procedure is successful in distinguishing students who will be the most successful dormitory counselors. Are those selected as dormitory counselors better than those rejected in the selection procedure?

Statement of the Problem

Does a selection procedure for dormitory counselors which utilizes individual and group interviews effectively discriminate the most successful dormitory counselors available in the applicant pool? Counselor success was to have been distinguished through the use of a profile of successful counselors developed using the California Psychological Inventory (CPI).

Significance of the Problem

Duncan (1967) and others pointed out that a consensus exists among college and university personnel that residence halls can make a significant contribution to the education of students. Among the elements which appear to affect student development in the residence hall are the physical plant, the administrative structure and the dormitory counselors. These three elements share the important characteristic of being subject to manipulation by the university or college administration.
The physical plant is the factor currently least subject to modification to meet the changing needs of students. While writers such as Chickering (1967) feel the physical plant is perhaps the major element in the students' perception of a residence hall, the rate of construction of university and college residence halls has dropped markedly in recent years. The costs of new construction or modification of existing housing are generally high and tend to limit the attractiveness of manipulation of the physical plant as a method of meeting the changing needs of students.

The administrative structure is more easily modified than the physical plant and such modification is less costly. Researchers such as Gifford (1974) have concluded that while general administrative structure was an important factor in the students' functioning in the residence hall, one of the most significant elements in the structure was the dormitory counselor.

Among the most frequently presented arguments for the importance of the dormitory counselor position is the direct and immediate contact with students it provides. For many students, particularly in large institutions, the dormitory counselor is the only direct contact with the college or university student personnel program. The flexibility available in the dormitory counselor position further adds to its attractiveness as an element to be manipulated to meet changing student needs and changing student personnel aims and objectives. Murphy and Ortenzi (1966) suggest that the usefulness of the dormitory counselor and the opportunities the position offers justify careful
selection procedures.

An approach taken by several institutions is to use a standardized test instrument. Standardized tests offer advantages over other procedures through relatively low cost and low demand on staff time. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, and the California Psychological Inventory have been evaluated for use in hiring dormitory counselors (Schroeder and Dowse, 1968; Dameron and Wolf, 1971). The results of these evaluations are conflicting. Murphy and Ortenzi (1966) concluded that a source of the conflict is lack of standardization of the role of the dormitory counselor. The potential efficiency of a standardized test instrument remains however as a goad to further exploration.

Observation of a potential dormitory counselor's reaction to typical hall situations is another approach used in selection. This approach includes having the applicant play the role of a dormitory counselor. Brady (1955) described situation models used at the University of Florida. Davis (1976) noted that role playing has been employed at the University of the Pacific since 1971. Brady (1955) concluded the use of this approach was desirable because it saved time over individual interviews and it provided some index of the applicant's problem-solving style.

The individual interview remains the most commonly employed approach to selecting dormitory counselors. Prior to 1971 the University of the Pacific relied primarily upon the individual interview (Davis, 1976). Schroeder and Dowse (1968) described the use of
individual interviews with standardized test instruments.

A clearer indication of the usefulness of standardized test instruments such as the California Psychological Inventory may assist administrators deciding whether or not to incorporate it into dormitory counselor hiring procedures. The findings of this study may also assist administrators in developing tools to evaluate their current procedures.

The Purpose of the Study

If dormitory counselors can play a key role in the implementation of a housing program, then a hiring process which selects the most skillful dormitory counselors becomes very desirable. This study attempts to investigate the effectiveness of a standardized test instrument in discriminating successful dormitory counselors and to investigate the effectiveness of a hiring procedure which utilizes group and individual interviews of applicants.

The hiring process involved in this study was one in use at the University of the Pacific. Usually, only applicants selected through this process were eventually hired by the University. Those rejected in the process did not join the dormitory staff. These constraints called for the use of an instrument that discriminated successful dormitory counselors and that could be used prior to their employment.

The objective of the initial phase of this study was to develop a profile, based on the California Psychological Inventory (CPI), of the successful dormitory counselor. Such a profile would allow an evaluation of a potential counselor without requiring actual employment
of the individual.

The objective of the second phase of the study was to evaluate the selection process for dormitory counselors for its success in selecting individuals for employment whose psychological characteristics most closely approximated those of successful dormitory counselors. This second phase was to employ the profile developed during the initial phase.

The literature regarding student personnel work and dormitory counselors covers a wide range of disciplines and areas of study. This literature, which includes specific studies of the selection, function, and assessment of dormitory counselors, and studies of the California Psychological Inventory will be discussed in a review of the literature.

Hypotheses

This study analyzes the relationship of dormitory counselors' performance on the job and their performance on the California Psychological Inventory.

The research hypothesis in phase one is:

1. One or more of the 18 regularly scored scales of the CPI significantly correlates with the measured success of dormitory counselors.

The research hypotheses in phase two are:

1. Those individuals hired are significantly different from those not hired in their performance on those scales of the CPI which were indicated in phase one to correlate with success among dormitory
counselors.

2. The directions of the differences revealed are such that those hired more closely approximate the profile of successful dormitory counselors than those not hired.

Assumptions and Limitations

The dormitory counselor population involved in phase one were part of an ongoing student personnel program which tended to limit rigid control of variables. Therefore, this study was guided by several assumptions and limitations which are as follows:

Assumptions

1. Conditions and student populations in the various residence halls of the university are similar.

2. No significant differences exist between those dormitory counselors and applicants who completed the CPI and those who chose not to complete the CPI.

3. The sample is representative of the target population.

Limitations

1. Dormitory counselors and student personnel staff participating in interviews may have different amounts of experience in interviewing and judging role-playing.

2. Dormitory counselors and student personnel staff participating in the evaluation of the on-the-job functioning of dormitory counselors may not use the same criteria in all instances.

Definition of Terms

Terminologies which apply to student personnel work, specific
concepts, and methods have been incorporated in this study. These terms are defined below to clarify their use in this context.

1. Student personnel work. The application in higher education of knowledge and principles derived from the social and behavioral sciences, particularly from psychology, educational psychology, and sociology to promote the development of the student's personality and character (Berdie, 1966).

2. Dormitory counselor. Individuals, typically relatively untrained upperclassmen or graduate students, who are given a wide range of responsibilities including control functions (such as protecting the physical plant and regulating noise) and counselor assignments (such as teaching study habits, referring students to personnel specialists and helping each resident feel accepted as an individual) (Hoyt and Davidson, 1966). Terms synonymous with dormitory counselor are "Resident Assistant" (Wyrick and Mitchell, 1971) and "Personnel Assistant" (Powell, 1969, p. 38).

3. California Psychological Inventory (CPI). A self-administering paper-and-pencil personality test intended to measure an individual's interpersonal adequacy, intra-personal structuring of values, achievement potential, and intellectual efficiency (Megargee, 1972, pp. 4-8).

4. Role-playing. A method of studying an individual's ability to function in a situation by having the individual act as if he were in that situation and/or as if he had special duties or responsibilities; having an individual pretend to be someone other than himself
Summary

College residence halls provide a significant context for student development. College and university administrators have attempted to govern and direct the residence hall experience to aid in the achievement of educational goals and objectives. Elements of the residence hall experience which are subject to administrative direction include (1) physical plant, (2) administrative structure, and (3) the residence hall staff.

Residence hall staff, in particular the dormitory counselors, have emerged as critical elements in the student personnel services of the residence halls. Dormitory counselors are the only direct contacts many students have with the student personnel program. Effective methods of selecting dormitory counselors which will meet the needs of a given student personnel program are needed.

The problem was to investigate the efficiency of a selection procedure for dormitory counselors which employed individual and group interviews. The first step in this study was to develop a profile of successful dormitory counselors using the CPI. This profile was to have been used to evaluate the selection procedure.

Four additional chapters complete this study. They are: Chapter 2: Review of the Literature Related to the Study, Chapter 3: The Design and Procedure of the Study, Chapter 4: Analysis of Results and Discussion of the Data, and Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations for Further Study.
Chapter 2
Review of the Literature Related to the Study

Several areas of research contribute to this study of selection procedures for dormitory counselors. This review of the literature is divided into three categories including: (1) Roles and Functions of the Dormitory Counselor; (2) Evaluation Procedures for Dormitory Counselors; and (3) Use of the California Psychological Inventory in Vocational and Educational Assessment.

Roles and Functions of Dormitory Counselors

Murphy (1965) reported that use of students as dormitory counselors has grown rapidly in recent years but concluded the role of the dormitory counselor remains poorly defined. Wise (1958) described three roles for residence staff: (1) the Managerial role, (2) the Psychological Services role, and (3) the Social Education role. Stark (1960) proposed another role, the Academic Teaching role. Each of these will be discussed.

The Managerial role for dormitory counselors was seen by Wise as directed toward making the students see the college, the student body, and their education in the way in which the institutional leader sees them. Aceto (1962) incorporated the Managerial concept in his view of the dormitory counselor as a liaison between the student and the central administration. Functions included within Aceto's description of the role of dormitory counselor were (a) distributing information to students about hall and college activities and regulations, and (b) helping to promote good hall government. Student
leaders interviewed by Gifford (1974) reflected the Managerial concept and described dormitory counselor's role as enforcing rules, providing counsel to hall government, and helping the head resident with items such as issuing meal tickets and unlocking doors.

The Psychological Service role described by Wise centered around counseling processes. This concept of the role of the dormitory counselor is growing in popularity (Atkinson, Williams, and Garb, 1973; Nickerson and Harrington, 1970; and Powell, Plyler, Dickson, and McClellan, 1969). Wyrick and Mitchell (1971) described this role as including individual counseling as well as developing conditions within the hall which facilitate individual growth. Wise and others described the dormitory counselor fulfilling this role as providing direct counseling services to students and as acting as an agent referring seriously disturbed students to more fully trained mental health professionals. The dormitory counselor was seen as an active component of a mental health team. Nickerson and Nickerson (1968) discussed the dormitory counselor's ability to direct students to such services as the campus counseling center.

The Social Education role as delineated by Wise included encouraging the development of student self-government and the construction of an active social program for students. The function of the Social Education role is to help students gain poise and maturity as a result of social experience and to help students develop democratic attitudes and leadership skills through self-government. Butler (1964) described the function of the residence hall staff as providing
leadership training, developing the concept of group responsibility, and developing students socially.

The Academic Education role for residence hall staff members was discussed by Stark (1960) and Olson (1964). Stark and Olson saw the residence hall as a largely neglected center for academic education. Stark called for residence teachers with consultation roles to be played by faculty and community based specialists. Wise described the current lack of educational purpose within the residence hall as an "expression of educational and economic forces peculiar to the 19th century" and saw no reason to perpetuate this during the remainder of the 20th century.

Brown and Zunker (1966) surveyed student counselor utilization in colleges and universities. They reported student counselors had served a variety of functions including instructional roles, testing, and counseling roles, as well as dormitory management roles. While one role for dormitory counselors may be stressed more than the others at a given institution, it is likely that no one role truly characterizes a given dormitory counselor. Probably all four roles find expression at most school.

Looking at the several functions served by dormitory counselors, Albright (1957) raised questions about potential role conflicts for dormitory counselors. Albright questioned the ability of dormitory staff to serve effectively both as supervisors and as counselors. He concluded that the role of a manager or supervisor who gave out rules and regulations for student conduct and who enforced such rules was
not compatible with the role of counselor. The same individual should not be called upon to perform both functions.

**Evaluation Procedures for Dormitory Counselors**

Techniques and instruments used to evaluate dormitory counselors included individual interviews (Atkinson, Williams, and Garb, 1973); group interviews (Brady, 1955); role-playing (Wyrick and Mitchell, 1971); standardized tests (Murphy and Ortenzi, 1966); and local rating scales (Harshman and Harshman, 1974). The individual interview continues to be the most common technique but Brady (1955) suggested moves have been made to augment or replace the individual interview. Brady listed several reasons for such a move including (1) a desire to reduce the amount of staff time required for effective evaluations, (2) a desire for more objective and standardized techniques, and (3) a desire to observe individual's problem solving style and skill.

The alternative to the individual interview proposed by Brady was the group interview. The group interview model proposed by Brady incorporated a variant of role-playing. Applicants for the position of dormitory counselor were asked to respond to problems, presented by the interview committee, as if they were dormitory counselors. Brady saw this approach as meeting the need for efficient use of staff time and the need to observe the applicant's style of solving problems.

Wyrick and Mitchell (1971) used both role-playing and standardized tests in their study. They evaluated the ability of dormitory counselors to counsel students in personal and social problems. They presented their 18 male and 22 female dormitory counselors with
problem situations, and used the Accurate Empathy Scale (Truax, 1961) to measure the counselor's awareness and ability in helping the client solve problems. They contrasted the dormitory counselor's score on the Accurate Empathy Scale with performance on the Duncan Residence Hall Counselor Evaluation Scale (Duncan, 1967). Wyrick and Mitchell assumed Duncan's scale was an effective measure of dormitory counselor functioning and concluded that the Accurate Empathy Scale was a successful predictor of dormitory counselor effectiveness for females though not for males.

Hoyt and Davidson (1966) used a local rating scale and a standardized test in an attempt to determine if effective and ineffective advisors differ on authoritarian attitudes. They administered a local rating scale and the California "F" Scale (Adorno et al., 1950) to 32 dormitory counselors at the University of Iowa. The local rating scale consisted of seven scales (leadership, loyalty and cooperation, order and discipline, dealing with individual students, identifying problems and taking action, progress and development, and desirability for rehiring). They assumed the local scale was a useful measure of dormitory counselor effectiveness and concluded that authoritarian attitudes, as measured by the California "F", were unrelated to counselor effectiveness.

Harshman and Harshman (1974) administered a locally developed rating scale to 48 undergraduate dormitory counselors. The scale was a 38-item questionnaire which was scored for six subscales (student contact, information, service, rule enforcement, interpersonal
relationships, and personal qualities). No reliability or validity coefficients were available for this scale. Harshman and Harshman concluded that their scale, the Resident Counselor Evaluation Scale, was effective in determining dormitory counselor effectiveness.

Duncan (1967) described his development of a rating scale for dormitory counselors at Oregon State University, Corvallis. The scale was developed from student supplied descriptive behavior statements describing residence hall counselor performance and activities. Duncan obtained ratings of these items from 1,147 students. He composed his scale of items that were judged as discriminating effective from ineffective counselors. Duncan concluded this scale was a useful and reliable measure of counselor effectiveness.

Murphy and Ortenzi (1966) attempted to determine the relationship of certain standardized tests to the criteria of success as a dormitory counselor. They administered the Strong Vocational Interest Blank and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule to 93 male dormitory counselors at Pennsylvania State University. After seven months on-the-job these counselors were evaluated by fellow students and by advisors. Murphy and Ortenzi concluded the Strong and the Edwards were ineffective in discriminating successful dormitory counselors or in predicting counselor success.

Schroeder and Dowse (1968) brought together several techniques in their attempt to evaluate dormitory counselors including the individual interview, the local rating scale, and standardized tests. Fifty-five dormitory counselors and 1,552 student raters were involved
in this study. Information on dormitory counselors was gathered from their individual interviews with the Dean of Women and from ratings of these counselors on a questionnaire. The questionnaire was adopted from one developed by Gonyea and Warman (1962) at the University of Texas. The Illinois adaptation of the Texas attitude questionnaire was divided into eight subscales (professional relations, administration, availability, information, confidentiality, respect for others, sensitivity to others, and conveyance of liking). Information provided by the questionnaire was contrasted with the counselors' performance on several standardized tests. The standardized tests used were the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, and the California Psychological Inventory. Schroeder and Dowse found none of these instruments useful in discriminating effective counselors. Schroeder and Dowse noted that the Minnesota Multiphase Personality Inventory was used as a selection device though they provided no data supporting its ability to discriminate successful counselors.

Wotruba (1969) administered several standardized tests to 300 students applying for 60 dormitory counselor positions. The standardized tests employed were Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, the Bell Adjustment Inventory Profiles, and the Myers-Brigg Type Indicator. The counselors chosen for employment were rated by the staff of the Dean of Students office, fellow counselors, and hall residents for their effectiveness as dormitory counselors. Wotruba concluded there were significant differences between effective and
ineffective counselors in their performance on the standardized tests. On the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule effective dormitory counselors scored higher than ineffective counselors on achievement, order, intraception, dominance, and nurturance. Ineffective counselors appeared less emotionally secure, more submissive, and more hostile than effective counselors on the Bell Adjustment Inventory Profiles. Results from the Myers-Brigg Type Indicator indicated effective counselors had a greater preference than ineffective counselors for intuition, feeling, and perception.

Dameron and Wolf (1971) employed the Duncan Resident Advisor Form (Duncan, 1962) as a criterion measurement in an investigation of the ability of several standardized tests to discriminate effective counselors. The standardized tests examined were the California Psychological Inventory, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, and the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. These tests were administered to 117 dormitory counselors at North Texas State College. The results of the examination were inconclusive. Little relationship was found between effectiveness as a dormitory counselor and performance on the standardized tests.

Atkinson, Williams, and Garb (1973) at Moorhead State College evaluated the Personal Orientation Inventory for its effectiveness in discriminating effective dormitory counselors. They administered the P.O.I. to 27 female and 17 male dormitory counselors. A local rating scale was used as a criterion measure. This local scale rated dormitory counselors on six subscales (promoter of self-responsibility
among floor residents, promoter of educational and social growth experiences, promoter of community spirit on the floor, an example for floor residents, a referral agent, and a counselor). Atkinson, Williams, and Garb concluded the P.O.I. successfully discriminated effective dormitory counselors.

The California Psychological Inventory in Vocational and Education Assessment

The central position of the California Psychological Inventory (C.P.I.) to this study supported a review of this test's use in Educational and Vocational Assessment. The use of the C.P.I. in areas other than in dormitory counselor evaluations is reviewed in this section.

Gough (1969) evaluated the C.P.I. for its ability to discriminate social leaders among students. Gough used the nominations of the principals of 15 high schools to select 90 male and 89 female student leaders. Their C.P.I. scores were compared with the scores of students at 8 high schools. Gough concluded the male student leaders were higher than the norm on all C.P.I. scales except Flexibility and Femininity. Female leaders, Gough concluded, were higher than the norm on 11 of the 18 C.P.I. scales.

Several studies evaluated the relationship between performance on the C.P.I. and success in student teaching. Veldman and Kelly (1965) divided a group of 34 University of Texas student teachers into groups of "more" and "less" effective teachers. The division was made on the basis of supervisor ratings. The student teachers
rated more effective were significantly higher than those in the other group on nine C.P.I. scales. Major differences were reported by Gough on five scales (Capacity for Status, Dominance, Psychological Mindedness, Good Impression, and Achievement via Conformance). Durlflinger (1963) administered the C.P.I. to 20 men and 130 women student teachers and correlated their scores with their supervisors' ratings and their grade in student teaching. Durlflinger concluded teachers who were very self-assured, assertive, and verbal got lower ratings from supervisors.

Gough and Hall (1964) used the C.P.I. in a study of medical students. They administered the C.P.I. to 100 medical school applicants of whom 34 eventually graduated from medical school. Gough and Hall concluded three C.P.I. scales were significant predictors of success in medical school (Sociability, Tolerance, and Communality).

In another study of medical students, Korman, Stubblefield, and Martin (1968) compared students' performance on the C.P.I. with ratings of their success in medical school and internship and with ratings of the students' humanism. In contrast to the results of Gough and Hall (1964), Korman, Stubblefield, and Martin found no significant correlations between success in medical school and performance on the C.P.I.

Query (1966) evaluated the relationship to success among seminary students. Query compared the C.P.I. profiles of 25 seminarians who were advised to discontinue their studies with 25 who were eventually ordained. Successful seminarians scored significantly
higher on three C.P.I. scales (Capacity for Status, Tolerance, and Flexibility).

Holland and Astin (1962) studied the relationship between academic and scientific achievement and performance on the C.P.I. They studied 681 male and 272 female National Merit Scholars who took the C.P.I. in their senior year of high school. These students were evaluated three years later. Significant correlations between success and C.P.I. performance for the males were found on twelve scales (Dominance, Capacity for Status, Sociability, Self-Acceptance, Well-Being, Responsibility, Socialization, Good Impression, Achievement via Conformance, Communality, Intellectual Efficiency, and Flexibility). For the females significant correlations were found on seven scales (Dominance, Sociability, Self-Acceptance, Tolerance, Communality, Achievement via Independence, Psychological Mindedness, and Flexibility). These correlations were generally low for both groups.

Datel, Hall, and Rufe (1965) studied the relationship between selected C.P.I. scales and success in an Army language training program. 300 men were administered the Achievement via Conformance, Achievement via Independence, and Intellectual Efficiency scales. Scores of the 269 men who eventually graduated were compared with those of the 21 men who dropped out. Graduates appeared significantly higher on Achievement via Independence and Intellectual Efficiency. In another study of military men, Rosenberg, McHenry, Rosenberg, and Nichols (1962) attempted to predict success of 64 men in advanced

Summary
Several areas of research contribute to this study of selection procedures for dormitory counselors. This review of the literature examines three categories of research: (1) Roles and Functions of the Dormitory Counselor; (2) Evaluation Procedures for Dormitory Counselors; and (3) Use of the California Psychological Inventory in Vocational and Educational Assessment.

Wise (1958) delineated three roles for residence hall staff including the Managerial role, the Psychological Services role, and the Social Education role. Stark (1960) added an Academic Education role to the functions of the residence hall staff.

Techniques and instruments used to evaluate dormitory counselors included individual interviews, group interviews, role-playing, standardized tests, and local rating scales. The individual interview was the most commonly employed technique. Local rating scales such as those developed by Duncan (1967) and Harshman and Harshman (1974) were also frequently used. Attempts to use standardized
tests resulted in generally inconclusive results though some success was reported.

The California Psychological Inventory has been widely used. Gough (1969) found the C.P.I. to successfully discriminate social leaders in high school. Veldman and Kelly (1965) and Durflinger (1963) reported success in using the C.P.I. to discriminate effective from ineffective student teachers. Other studies evaluated the C.P.I. for its ability to predict success in medical school (Gough and Hall, 1964), success among seminary students (Query, 1966), academic and scientific achievement (Holland and Astin, 1962) and success in military schools (Datel, Hall, and Rufe, 1965). The results of the studies that were reported generally showed significant but low correlations between the C.P.I. scales and the criterion measurement.
Chapter 3

Research Design and Procedures

Methodology

Subjects

The sample in phase one of this study was comprised of two primary groups. Each group was comprised of 32 dormitory counselors. Dormitory counselors employed by the University of the Pacific in the College of the Pacific and Elbert Covell College during the Spring term of 1974 and 1975 were asked to participate. Both groups were drawn from the same eight residence halls. Counselors from the 1974 group were included in the 1975 group as they were retained on staff for the 1974-1975 academic year. These dormitory counselors were selected on the basis of having the following qualifications: (1) making application for the position; (2) having at least a 2.25 grade point average for all college work; (3) being a full time student, and (4) participating in interviews in which they were judged by dormitory counselors and supervisors on staff at the time of the interviews. In some cases dormitory counselors were selected outside of this procedure through action of the Dean of Students Office. All members of the two groups met these qualifications and in that sense were matched. Although other factors such as age and intelligence were not formally matched, it was assumed such factors were randomly distributed in both groups. Ten individuals in the 1974 group were also part of the 1975 group.

Two other groups also participated in phase one of this study.
Dormitory residents and dormitory counselors, as well as dormitory counselor supervisors, were asked to rate the effectiveness of individual dormitory counselors. A total of 320 dormitory residents and 13 dormitory counselor supervisors received the rating form in the Spring term of 1974 and in the Spring of 1975. Dormitory residents were selected on a random basis from among residents of the area of the hall served by the counselor they were to rate.

The sample in phase two of the study was comprised of the 149 individuals who, during the Spring semester of 1975, applied for the position of dormitory counselor. These applicants met the four qualifications for the dormitory counselor previously noted.

A second group participating in phase two was comprised of the 32 dormitory counselors and 15 supervisors on the residence staff of Elbert Covell College and the College of the Pacific during Spring term, 1975. These staff members provided ratings of the applicant's performance during the group interview. These ratings were employed in the hiring decisions made by the Dean of Students Office.

Apparatus

Data for this study was gained through the use of the following instruments:

1. The California Psychological Inventory (C.P.I.). This is a self-administering, paper-and-pencil personality test. While designed for group administration it can be taken individually. No time limit is imposed though most subjects finish in about an hour. Unless the items are read aloud to the subjects the test requires
fourth grade reading ability. There are 468 statements in the question booklet of which 12 appear twice for a total of 480 items. The content of most statements consists of reports of typical behavior patterns and common feelings, attitudes, and opinions about social, ethical, and family matters. Compared with the MMPI, the C.P.I. is notable for its lack of symptom-oriented material. The content is geared to students and young adults more than older or very young individuals (Gough, 1969(b)).

The C.P.I. was developed through examining the setting in which the test is to be used and developing measurements based on constructs already in operational usage. Thirteen of the 18 C.P.I. scales were derived empirically using external criteria. In developing these scales Gough drew primarily upon San Francisco Bay area populations of students and young adults. The remaining five scales were constructed rationally. The norms for the C.P.I. were collected from more than 6,000 men and 7,000 women. Although not a true random or stratified sample of the general population—whites are over-represented for example—the sample did include subjects of widely varying age, socioeconomic status, and geographical area.

The C.P.I. is typically scored for 18 scales that Gough has divided into four groups as an aid to profile interpretation. The Class I scales measure poise, ascendancy, self-assurance, and interpersonal adequacy. The six scales included are for Dominance, Capacity for Status, Sociability, Social Presence, Self-Acceptance, and Sense of Well-Being. The Class II scales assess socialization,
maturity, responsibility, and intrapersonal structuring of values. The six Class II scales are Responsibility, Socialization, Self-Control, Tolerance, Good Impression, and Communality. Class III groups together scales relating to achievement potential and intellectual efficiency. The three scales in Class III are Achievement via Conformance, Achievement via Independence, and Intellectual Efficiency. Gough's last category, Class IV, is described as measuring intellectual and interest modes. The three scales included are Psychological Mindedness, Flexibility, and Femininity. Of the 18 C.P.I. scales, 15 are designed to measure various personality traits and three, Sense of Well-Being, Good Impression, and Communality, are validity scales which also have interpretive significance (Megarese, 1972, p. 6).

2. R.A. Performance Evaluation. This evaluation sheet is a rationally devised, nonstandardized, rating sheet. It allows ratings of the dormitory counselor to be made on 11 items. A five point rating range, from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree, is provided on each item (see Appendix A).


4. Individual Interview Evaluation. This evaluation sheet is
a rationally devised, nonstandardized rating sheet. It allows ratings of applicants on five qualities (Honesty, Background, Perception, Ability to Respond, Ability to Communicate) (see Appendix D).

Procedure

Design

This research project was designed to evaluate a selection procedure for dormitory counselors for its utility in identifying applicants who would be effective dormitory counselors. A significant component of this design was an attempt to identify a profile of psychological characteristics which distinguished effective from ineffective counselors. Three hypotheses were formulated which this study attempted to test:

Hypothesis one. There will be one or more of the 18 regularly scored scales of the C.P.I. which will correlate with dormitory counselor effectiveness as measured by the R.A. Performance Evaluation.

Hypothesis two. Dormitory counselors hired will evidence a profile, on those scales of the C.P.I. which were indicated in phase one to correlate with dormitory counselor effectiveness, different from the profile of those not selected for employment.

Hypothesis three. The directions of the difference in profiles between those hired and those not hired will be such that those hired more closely approximate the profile of effective dormitory counselors.
The research design was implemented in two phases. The objective of phase one of this study was to develop a profile, based upon the C.P.I., of effective dormitory counselor. This phase consisted of testing the dormitory counselor groups with the C.P.I. and obtaining ratings of these counselors' effectiveness using the R.A. Performance Evaluations. Ratings of a given counselor's effectiveness were correlated with his C.P.I. scores. Formal statistical correlation analysis of ratings and C.P.I. scores with the results from the 1975 group of counselors was to be done only if 15 or more pairs of ratings and scores were available.

The objective of phase two was to evaluate the selection process for dormitory counselors for its utility in selecting for employment those individuals whose psychological characteristics most closely approximate the personality characteristics of successful dormitory counselors. The C.P.I. profiles of those individuals hired and those not hired were to be compared with the C.P.I. profiles of effective dormitory counselors. Phase two was to be carried out only if the results of phase one were significant.

Data Collection

Data employed in phase one were historical and were gathered prior to the organization of this study. C.P.I. testing of the dormitory counselors was done in May of 1974.

The counselors on staff in the Spring of 1974 (Group A) took the C.P.I. while they were on staff. The building supervisors administered the C.P.I. to the counselors employed in their respective
buildings. The investigator provided the building supervisors with uniform directions for administering the C.P.I.

The counselors on staff in the Spring of 1975 (Group B) were tested in May of 1974. The 32 counselors in the 1975 group were primarily tested during the hour preceding or following their participation in the group employment interview for potential counselors. The investigator was the primary test administrator to this group. Instructions and directions for administering the C.P.I. were identical for both counselor groups (see Appendix C).

Ratings of the effectiveness of the counselors in Group A were made in March of 1974. Ratings of the effectiveness of the counselors in Group B were taken in March of 1975. All ratings were done using the R.A. Performance Evaluation form. Both groups were rated by individuals living within their buildings. The dormitory counselors were not involved in the administration of the evaluation form. All dormitory counselors in Groups A and B were asked to rate their peers within their assigned buildings. All building supervisors were asked to rate only the dormitory counselors assigned to their hall. Dormitory residents who were asked to complete the forms were picked on a random basis with the limitation that they were living in close proximity to the counselor they were to rate. The Dean's office requested approximately 10 dormitory residents to rate each counselor. Building supervisors administered the evaluations within their buildings.

To implement the testing of the hypotheses of phase two, C.P.I.
testing of the applicant group was undertaken. The investigator was the principal person to administer the C.P.I. to this group. This testing was accomplished in March of 1975. Applicants were tested during the hour preceding or following their participation in the group interview section of the employment process. This testing provided the first component of the data to be employed in phase two.

Judgments of the applicants' performance during the employment process were provided by the currently employed residence staff who observed the group interview. Activities during this group interview were much like those proposed by Brady (1955). Applicants were seated around a table with each other. The applicants were read a problem situation and asked to respond by describing how they would resolve or deal with the problem if they were dormitory counselors. The group interview sessions lasted for one hour. Applicants were asked to participate in individual interviews following participation in group interviews. In this second series of individual interviews applicants met with small groups of then current staff members. Ratings from group and individual interviews were provided to the office of the Dean of Students. The Associate Dean of Students, with consultation from the building supervisors, made the decision to employ or not to employ. The decision to employ or not to employ an individual at the end of the selection process provided the second component of the data that was to be evaluated in phase two (see Appendix E).

Some problems were encountered in the data collection aspect
of this study. The first developed in the response to the R.A. Performance Evaluation form distributed to dormitory residents. Only approximately 75 percent of the forms distributed were returned completed. A second problem developed in response to administration of the C.P.I. Given the nature of the information yielded by the C.P.I., the investigator felt it necessary to make taking the test optional. Thirty-two dormitory counselors were in Group A but only 28 completed the C.P.I. Thirty-two counselors were in Group B and only 13 completed the C.P.I. Approximately 150 individuals applied for the position of dormitory counselor in May of 1975 but only 119 applicants completed the C.P.I. Of those hired from the May, 1975 applicant group, only 12 took the C.P.I.

Analysis

Hypothesis One was tested by the application of a multiple correlational analysis comparing the obtained scores on the C.P.I. of Groups A and B with obtained scores from the R.A. Performance Evaluation form. A "t" test was applied to test for the significance of the obtained correlations. The correlational analysis was to be performed using the BioMed 2-R program (Dixon, 1971).

Hypothesis Two was to be tested by the application of a "t" test, comparing the performance of applicants hired and those not hired on those scales of the C.P.I. selected in phase one. The sources of data for this test were to be the scores achieved by the applicants on the selected C.P.I. subtests.

Hypothesis Three was to be tested by the application of a "t"
test, comparing the performance of the applicants hired with those not hired on those scales of the C.P.I. selected in phase one. Data employed for this test were to be the scores achieved by the applicants on the selected C.P.I. subtests.

The critical value for tests of significance was set at .05 in all cases. The computer facilities at the University of the Pacific computer center were used to complete the analyses.
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Results

Introduction

The research data were analyzed to provide information regarding the acceptance or rejection of the three experimental hypotheses:

There will be one or more of the 18 regularly scaled scores of the C.P.I. which will correlate with dormitory counselor effectiveness as measured by the R.A. Performance Evaluation.

Dormitory counselors hired will evidence a profile, on those scales of the C.P.I. which were indicated in phase one to correlate with dormitory counselor effectiveness, different from the profile of those not selected for employment.

The directions of the difference in profiles between those hired and those not hired will be such that those hired will most closely approximate the profile of effective dormitory counselors.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

The hypothesis that one or more of the 18 regularly scored scales of the C.P.I. will correlate with dormitory counselor effectiveness as measured by the R.A. Performance Evaluation can be tentatively rejected on the basis of the data. No correlations achieved significance when C.P.I. scores were compared to the mean of the evaluations when the evaluations provided by the three groups were combined. No significant correlations were found when comparing
evaluations provided by the dormitory counselors and C.P.I. performance. Looking at correlations between evaluations provided by supervisors and C.P.I. performance, one scale achieved significance, Achievement via Conformance. The correlation between supervisors' ratings and performance on the Achievement via Conformance scale was negative. One other relationship achieved significance. The performance of dormitory counselors on the Communality scale was found to be positively correlated with ratings these counselors received from building residents. No strong, consistent trends were noted in the data.

Hypothesis Two

The results of the testing of hypothesis one did not permit testing of hypothesis two. No conclusions can be reached regarding this hypothesis.

Hypothesis Three

The results of the testing of hypothesis one did not permit the testing of hypothesis three. No conclusions can be reached regarding this hypothesis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.P.I. Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Evaluations from Supervisors</th>
<th>Evaluations from Dormitory Counselors</th>
<th>Evaluations from Residents</th>
<th>Combined Evaluation Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Status</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Presence</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Well-Being</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Impression</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communalinity</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.41&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement via Conformance</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-.42&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement via Independence</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Efficiency</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Mindedness</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Correlations significant at the .05 level.
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Discussion

Introduction

The results of the data analysis will be reviewed in terms of support or rejection of the three experimental hypotheses formulated in the study. Additionally, implications for further research in the area of dormitory counselor selection for the University of the Pacific and the university situation at large will be discussed.

Hypotheses

The data gathered failed to support Hypothesis One and did not allow an evaluation of Hypotheses Two or Three. Hypothesis One, that one or more of the eighteen regularly scaled scores of the C.P.I. will significantly correlate with the measured success of the dormitory counselor, must be rejected on the basis of the correlational data. None of the eighteen variable scores of the C.P.I. reached significance at the .05 level in terms of correlating with ratings of the effectiveness of dormitory counselors when the ratings from supervisors, dormitory counselors, and hall residents were combined. Two characteristics did reach significance at the .10 level when correlated with combined ratings. These variables were Well-Being and Achievement via Conformance. In both cases the correlations were negative. The meaning of these results is unclear.

One characteristic from the C.P.I., Achievement via Conformance, achieved significance at the .05 level when only ratings provided by supervisors were correlated with the C.P.I. scores. This correlation
was negative. Three other variable scores from the C.P.I., Well-Being, Communality, and Flexibility approached significance when compared with the ratings provided by supervisors. Well-Being and Communality held negative correlations while Flexibility held a positive correlation. These results suggest supervisors preferred dormitory counselors who could function without strict guidelines, who were adaptable to changing circumstances in the hall, and who stood out from the student population. Correlations developed using only ratings provided by dormitory counselors did not yield a similar picture. The Well-Being score did approach significance when correlated with the ratings provided by dormitory counselor and the correlation was negative. None of the other variable scores from the C.P.I. were found to approach significance.

Ratings provided only by hall residents yielded a significant correlation when compared with the Communality scores of the C.P.I. The correlation was positive. No other correlations employing only ratings from hall residents approached significance. The positive correlation achieved with the Communality scores suggests residents preferred dormitory counselors who fit-in with the general student population. This observation is contrary to that drawn from the ratings provided by the supervisors.

Examination of the intercorrelation matrix (Table 2) of the ratings from the three groups (supervisors, dormitory counselors, and hall residents) indicates the order of the difference between the groups. The data in the matrix suggest supervisors and
Table 2

Intercorrelation of Evaluation Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluators</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Supervisors</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dormitory Counselors</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Hall Residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mean of 1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

counselors were most alike in their view of a given counselor's effectiveness while supervisors and hall residents were least alike. Dormitory counselors as a group appear more like supervisors than hall residents in their ratings of a given counselor's effectiveness.

The differences in the ratings given by the various groups can be taken as reflecting disagreement about the role of the dormitory counselor. Such disagreement and confusion as to the role of the dormitory counselor has been a problem frequently noted (Dameron and Wolf, 1971; Murphy and Ortenz, 1966). Use of the R.A. Performance Evaluation form at the University of the Pacific assumed that the frequent interaction among supervisors, staff, and residents, and an awareness of the behaviors contributing to an effective counselor would yield an accurate and consistent perception of the functioning of a given counselor. A comparison of the ratings provided by the several groups suggests little general agreement as to the functioning of dormitory counselors. Such lack of agreement limits the utility of any test instrument such as the R.A.
Performance Evaluation or the C.P.I. In view of the disagreement among the rating groups acceptance of Hypothesis One would have been surprising.

General Implications

Insofar as selection procedures are concerned, the results suggest that paper and pencil test information used to predict dormitory counselor effectiveness is inconsistent and the use of such information in evaluating the efficiency of a given selection procedure appears limited. It is apparent that before psychometric data of the traditional type will reach its full usefulness in evaluating a given selection process or as a part of a selection process for dormitory counselor certain steps must first be taken. A better conceptualization of the role and function of the dormitory counselor at the University of the Pacific is needed, and valid, reliable measures of counselor effectiveness must be developed.

Before making attempts to predict the effectiveness of the residence hall counselor it is necessary to define what it is the counselor is to do and be. When the concept of what the counselor is to do and be is vaguely defined, systematic selection procedures, even if possible, lose much of their effectiveness. Similarly, attempts to evaluate such procedures are handicapped. Hill's (1961) conclusion describes the underlying difficulty:

Evaluation of the effectiveness of present methods of selecting students for preparation and service in student personnel positions is seriously handicapped by confusion
as to the nature of student personnel work and by the
diversity and complexity of positions in the field.
Hill's comment is especially pertinent to the task of residence
hall staffing. The role of the dormitory counselor at the University
of the Pacific and colleges in general is in a state of change, as
is the entire college and university structure, in response to the
changing needs of students. The list of competencies currently
required of dormitory counselors at U.O.P. indicates the diverse
demands placed on these counselors (see Appendix E). A line of
study that could lead to clarification of the role of the dormitory
counselor was suggested by Albright's (1958) comments.

Albright suggested that the roles of counselor and supervisor
be separated. While Gifford (1974) concluded that students do
want an authority figure in the residence hall, this function might
be performed by someone other than the dormitory counselor. It
could be fruitful to establish and to study a residence hall struc-
ture at U.O.P. where the dormitory counselors functioned only in
the role of advisors and not in the conflicting role of disciplinarian.
The role of the officer who must enforce rules could be removed to
the building supervisor or to designated assistants. The effectiveness
of such a structure in meeting the needs of the students could be
judged in terms similar to those employed by Gifford (drop-out rate,
noise level, damage to the hall, and grade-point average). It is
expected that the dormitory counselor who did not perform both
advisor and police functions would be seen by students as more
effective than counselors who were required to perform both functions. The narrowing of the role of the counselor should also facilitate the development of an effective counselor selection process.

Despite the broad role of the dormitory counselor, further work with the C.P.I. may yield a satisfactory measure of dormitory counselor success. Gough originally regarded the C.P.I. as an "open" inventory from which new scales could be drawn. Well over 200 scales in addition to the 18 regularly scored scales have been developed. These new scales were developed to meet special needs. Many of these scales were developed through a factor analytic, item analysis approach. Data developed for the current study consisted of scaled scores and did not yield to item analysis. Further research with the C.P.I. at the University of the Pacific could be directed toward obtaining data in a form suitable for item analysis. While the regularly scored C.P.I. scales failed to yield much useful information on counselors, item analysis might yield a scale that would satisfactorily discriminate dormitory counselor success.

The instrument in use at the University of the Pacific for measuring the effectiveness of dormitory counselors was the R.A. Performance Evaluation form. This scale was developed on a rational basis by members of the University's residence staff. No reliability or validity studies were undertaken during its development or subsequent to its use. The correlational matrix (see Table 2) suggests limited reliability when different rating groups are used. The use given the form in the evaluation of staff and the potential utility
of such an instrument in employment decisions and research justify a study of the form's reliability and validity. Failure to establish the form's validity would call for the development of a new form. The procedure employed by Duncan (1967) which involved empirical development of a scale for rating dormitory counselors would seem useful in developing a new form.

In summary, systematic and effective procedures for the selection of dormitory counselors are needed. Paper and pencil tests, such as the C.P.I., may be able to aid in selection and in the evaluation of selection procedures for residence hall counselors. The utility of such tests, however, is severely limited by the diverse functions performed by dormitory counselors and by a lack of valid measures of dormitory counselor effectiveness. Selection procedures at U.O.P. might be improved if the role of the counselor was more narrowly and clearly defined. Improvement in the selection procedures might also be possible if the validity of the current counselor evaluation form was established or a new, valid form were developed.
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Below is a list of qualities considered important in the role of resident assistant. We are asking you to evaluate as a staff member using these qualities as a guideline. We hope that you will give this evaluation your serious consideration as your input is essential in the continued development of an effective residence staff. Please complete this form and return it to your head resident as soon as possible. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please check one box only in each area:</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Please do not mark in these spaces.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Responsible, dependable; fulfills functions and duties effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unavailable and inaccessible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unfair, partial, lacking in objectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mature, stable and consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perceptive, warm, sensitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Uncooperative and inflexible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Creative, imaginative, and enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lacks initiative and self-confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Possesses a high degree of integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Does not take position seriously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Would you recommend this person for the staff again next year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments or remarks: (use reverse side if you wish)
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Group Interview Evaluation

INSTRUCTIONS FOR EVALUATING APPLICANTS

I. Rate each R.A. applicant twice.

1st. Indicating your response immediately following the group interview.

2nd. Indicating your response after staff members have discussed the qualifications of the applicant.

(Note: Many of the natural skills needed to be an effective staff member will manifest themselves during the group interview. No matter what the perceptual base of individual evaluators, the accumulated responses of all the observers do indicate the applicants with the best potential.)

II. In judging applicants for fitness for fulfilling R.A. duties, keep these qualities in mind:

1. Acceptance by peers and leadership capacity.

2. Sensitivity to others.

3. Self-confidence and maturity.

4. Dependability.

5. Enthusiasm.


7. Open-mindedness.

8. Initiative.


(Note: Try to be aware of these qualities in the dynamics of the leaderless group interviews. The discussion is task oriented, and applicants must work with the group and with each other as individuals.)
Rate the applicants using the numerical scale listed below. The ratings should indicate your response to each applicant as a potential staff member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING SCALE:</th>
<th>Preliminary Rating</th>
<th>Final Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 = Very High</td>
<td>Score Given</td>
<td>Score Given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = High</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Average, Neutral</td>
<td>Following Interview</td>
<td>Staff Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicants' Names</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Preliminary Rating</th>
<th>Final Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use backside for any additional comments.
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EXAMINER'S INSTRUCTION FOR ADMINISTERING
THE CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGICAL INVENTORY

Please read the following after passing out the Answer Sheets and the Test Booklets.

"This test provides measures of an individual's psychological characteristics. The results of this test are intended for research only and will not be a factor in your employment, though it is hoped that our research with this instrument will provide us with a tool that will help us with our future employment decisions.

"The results of any individual's performance on this test are confidential. The test results will be held by the Clinical Services Testing Office of the University. By taking this test you are giving us permission to use the results in our research. Your test results will be anonymous when used in this research. The Testing Office will identify an individual's test results only with the express written permission of the individual involved.

"Read the instruction on the back of the Answer Sheet. Read the instructions on the cover of the Test Booklet.

"Work as rapidly as you can but answer the best you can.

"Answer all questions - if you are not sure, give the best answers you can.

"The test takes approximately one hour.

"Please, no talking during the test."

Note: Please make sure that all Answer Sheets and Test Booklets are turned in (there should be 25 Test Booklets in total) and please collect all of the pencils.
FORMAT FOR INDIVIDUAL R.A. INTERVIEWS

April 1 - April 4, 1975

GOALS

Keep in mind that the goals for the individual interviews are not absolute. They are guidelines to assist you in successfully and fairly assessing each applicant — both in terms of the applicant himself and the position of resident assistant.

To this end, we recommend that the purpose of the interview be:

1) to gain insight into why an applicant seeks the R.A. position.

2) to determine what background he or she brings to it.

3) to discover what things a applicant perceives as being important in a residential living community.

4) to discover what the applicant perceives as important in the R.A. role.

5) to evaluate the applicant's ability to hear questions and respond to them.

6) to evaluate the applicant honestly with himself — in terms of job demands and his own needs.

7) to clarify on an individual basis any questions an applicant may have.

8) to determine how well qualified the applicant is for the position.
QUESTIONS

These questions are generalized. While we recommend that you adapt them to your own speaking and interviewing styles, we request that the basic format inherent in the questions remain the same. Question number one serves as a stable opener for the session, and questions eight and nine will provide the information and tone needed for closure. How many of the other questions you will be able to ask will depend on the time and the applicant.

1) Interest question....."You probably have some hobbies or special interests. How about telling us about them?"

2) "Give and get" question....."How do you expect to benefit from this job and just what do you expect to give as an R.A.?"

3) Background question....."What kinds of past experiences have you had that would allow you to operate particularly effectively in this job?"

4) "Describe for us the kind of living community or group that would best suit you."

5) "What problems have you perceived in living groups?"

6) "Based upon your experiences and observations (on the problems you have noticed) what part of the R.A. role seems the most important to you?"

7) What kinds of inherent personal problems do you think you will have with this job?

8) Information question....."Will you accept a position anywhere on the campus or do you have a particular preference?"

9) Closure question....."Is there anything that you would like to say or ask of us at this point?"
R.A. SELECTION PROCESS
INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW EVALUATION

APPLICANT'S NAME ____________________________

In addition to your comments, rate the applicant in the appropriate areas using the following scale:
5—very high, 4—high, 3—average, 2—low, 1—very low.

1) Candidate's honesty and openness (reason for seeking job, willingness to expose true self). Rating ______

2) Candidate's background (special skill, experiences). Rating ______

3) Candidate's perceptions (what is important to a residential living community, what is important to the role or R.A., awareness of possible problems). Rating ______

4) Ability to hear and respond to interview questions. Rating ______

5) Ability to communicate own feelings and ideas. Rating ______

6) In your opinion, what kind of a living community is he or she best suited for? Indicate any preferences the applicant may have expressed.

Based on this interview, indicate your overall rating and recommendation regarding this applicant.

Overall Rating ______

Evaluator's Signature ____________________________

Use the back for any additional comments
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R. A. SELECTION PROCESS

Step 1. Group Interviews & C.P.I. Test
(All applicants participate)

Step 2. Individual Sessions with a three man Interviewing Team composed of one Head Resident and two R.A.'s
(Approximately one-half of all applicants will be invited back for the second step; all applicants will be notified whether or not they will be continuing to this phase by April 1st.)

Step 3. Applicants recommended by the Interviewing Teams for final consideration may be invited to participate in activities designed to acquaint them with different aspects of the Residence System and its programs.

Step 4. Final selection and assignment to halls. Notices will be posted on the door of the Dean of Students Office (Knoles Hall) and on the doors of all Head Residents.

SOME THINGS YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE JOB!

1. Presently R.A.'s receive full board and one-half room as compensation.

2. R.A.'s will be expected to report for Staff Orientation no later than the evening of August 27, 1975.

3. During vacation periods and school closing, R.A.'s are expected to remain later and return earlier than other students.

4. R.A.'s are required to assume regularly scheduled on-duty hours evenings and week-ends.

5. R.A.'s are expected to spend a reasonable portion of their time in the residence hall.

6. R.A.'s are expected to attend all meetings pertaining to their function and training as R.A.'s.

7. R.A.'s may not assume any additional employment without the express approval of their Head Resident and the Associate Dean of Students.

8. R.A.'s may not pledge any social fraternities or sororities while they are members of the Residence Staff.

9. R.A.'s are expected to be in residence during Winter Term.

10. R.A.'s are required to be enrolled full-time. They are expected to carry a normal but not excessive course load.

11. R.A.'s are expected to remain in the position for the full academic year beginning at the end of August and ending after commencements at the end of May.
RESIDENT ASSISTANT 
JOB DESCRIPTION

The Resident Assistant (R.A.) is a member of the University of the Pacific residence hall staff and is appointed for a full academic year based upon the "4-1-4" system. The R.A. has a basic responsibility for the entire residence hall program with specific emphasis being given to the students on their floor or section. The R.A. is a full time student and may carry a full but not excessive course load. Since the R.A. position is reserved for those who can maintain a satisfactory level of scholastic achievement and still fulfill the responsibilities of the position, a minimum GPA of 2.00 is required of all applicants. This minimum GPA must be maintained during the tenure of the position.

Each R.A. is expected to participate in pre-service workshops, to begin actual service prior to fall registration, and to remain on the job through the end of each term and during periods in which any college is in session, including Winter Term. Each R.A. is expected to give priority to this position over all other areas of activity with the exception of academic work. Any additional employment cannot be assumed without the express approval of both the Head Resident/Director and the Associate Dean of Students. Additionally, an R.A. may not pledge a social fraternity or sorority while a member of the residence staff. The R.A. receives remuneration of full board and room as payment for services rendered. The position is subject to guidelines set forth in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The following job description outlines the functions that an R.A. is expected to perform as a staff member. While this job description is general enough to apply to R.A.'s across campus, staffs within individual halls may be expected to perform additional functions which will enable them to meet the needs of a particular community.

A. Staff functions:

1. Attend in-service training program sessions.
2. Attend regular residence staff meetings as set by individual Head Resident/Director.
3. Assist with the opening and closing of the residence hall.
4. Report regularly to the Head Resident, Director or Assistant Director about general problems and concerns influencing students and the hall living environment (personal concerns as well as physical plant maintenance);
5. Assist in the selection of new staff.
6. Initiate and maintain contact between students and other staff members.
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7. Assist with hall and desk coverage.
8. Participate on committees or job related projects when requested, commiserate with academic load.
9. Assist with staff evaluation.
10. Inform residents of hall and University regulations, policies, and safety procedures.
11. Encourage students to abide by all University regulations and policies. Inform the Head Resident/Director when violation occurs.
12. Be supportive of all basic University regulations and policies.
13. Be cognizant of the rights and responsibilities of all members of the University community.

B. Management functions:

1. Assist with resident check-in and check-out procedure.
2. Investigate and report public area and room damage.
3. Conduct housing surveys when requested.
4. Provide access to storage facilities for luggage where available.
5. Know the procedures for room and building changes.
6. Insure that all housing forms are completed properly and are in order.
7. Know the living options available in the University and community.
8. Support the enforcement of University and residence hall policies including individual hall policies; such as limited visitation and quiet hours.
9. Support enforcement of University and residence hall policies related to behavior in food service facilities.
10. Assist in the identification of non-residents who make unauthorized use of hall facilities.
11. Assist in maintaining residence hall security and in implementing appropriate action.

C. Community building:

1. Review the responsibilities and dynamics of group living with all residents.
2. Assess with residents their needs and/or wants in the living environment. Assist them in evaluating these preferences in terms of options available.
3. Assist new residents in getting acquainted.
4. Assist with the organization of activities to meet the interests and needs of the hall residents.
5. Assist with the organization of hall government.
6. Attend house/hall meetings.
7. Attend appropriate house/hall functions.
D. Programming:

1. Assist in the assessment of student's interests and needs.
2. Help introduce students to individuals and programs relating to their interests (extra-curricular and academic).
3. Assist and advise house government by serving as a resource person with respect to program ideas, University policies and procedures, and available University and community resources and by offering other assistance as appropriate.
4. Provide, support, and encourage athletic, cultural, social, and academic events.

E. Resource/Referral functions:

1. Be familiar with University offices offering academic and non-academic services.
2. Be familiar with University informational literature (Student Handbook, University catalog, general academic requirements, academic calendar, activities calendar, etc.).
3. Communicate to residents information about hall and University services.
4. Be a referral agent for University community services such as the Counseling Center, Student to Student Advising program, Health Center, Housing and Food services, Student Activities Office, ASUOP, Financial Aids Office, Placement Center, Special Academic Offices, and off-campus services.
5. Utilize the Head Resident/Director as a direct counseling referral or for assistance within the general area of resource/referral.

Note: Appendix F is a xerox copy of material published by the Office of Student Life, University of the Pacific. No alterations or changes were made in this material for its inclusion.