

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Plan B Papers

Student Theses & Publications

1-1-1966

The Relationship Between Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Personality Variables and Resident Assistant Effectiveness

David Eatock

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/plan_b

Recommended Citation

Eatock, David, "The Relationship Between Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Personality Variables and Resident Assistant Effectiveness" (1966). *Plan B Papers*. 463.

https://thekeep.eiu.edu/plan_b/463

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Plan B Papers by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

The Relationship Between Edwards Personal
Preference Schedule Personality Variables
and Resident Assistant Effectiveness
(TITLE)

BY

David Eatock

PLAN B PAPER

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE MASTER OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION
AND PREPARED IN COURSE

Education 591

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY,
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1966

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS PLAN B PAPER BE ACCEPTED AS
FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE DEGREE, M.S. IN ED.

8-4-66.

DATE


ADVISER


DATE


DEPARTMENT HEAD

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Carl Green for his help with development and organization. Thanks also to Dr. Crane and Dr. Doughty, who were critical readers.

To those who gave their approval and time for this study-- Dean Kluge, Dean Hocter, Mr. LaRue, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Oliver, and Mr. Rogers--many thanks.

The help of all the Resident Assistants who made this study possible is also much appreciated.

CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem	
Scope of Problem	
Limitations	
Definitions	
II. RELATED RESEARCH	9
University of Texas	
Michigan State University	
University of Illinois	
United States Air Force	
III. METHOD AND TREATMENT OF DATA	14
Development of RA Effectiveness Criteria Checklist	
Development of RA Evaluation Form	
Selection of Personality Inventory	
Administration of Personality Inventory	
Comparison of RA Evaluation Form Results with Personality Inventory Results	
IV. FINDINGS	21
RA Effectiveness Checklist	
RA Evaluation Form	
Personality Inventory	
Comparison of RA Evaluation Form Results with Personality Inventory Results	
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	32
APPENDIX	35
BIBLIOGRAPHY	44

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Problem

This investigation was designed to provide information which could be valuable to college residence hall programs. Essentially the investigation was aimed at the improvement of the Men's Residence Hall Program of Eastern Illinois University, but it was hoped that the results would be pertinent for any institution of higher education with a residence hall program similar to Eastern's. The primary purpose was to measure, through the use of a commercial personality inventory, certain personality variables of all the male Resident Assistants (hereafter to be indicated by RA) employed by Eastern Illinois University during the Spring quarter of the 1965-1966 academic year and to compare these personality variables with a measure of each RA's effectiveness. It was assumed that such a comparison would test the following hypotheses.

First Hypothesis--Those RA's who are judged most effective by the Residence Hall Directors will share similar personality traits.

Second Hypothesis--Those RA's who are judged least effective by the Residence Hall Directors will share similar personality traits.

Third Hypothesis--There is no relationship between RA effectiveness and RA experience.

In order to obtain uniform and objective evaluations of RA effectiveness, it was necessary to develop, as a secondary purpose of this study, an RA Evaluation Form. It was felt that such a form would prove valuable not only in the course of this investigation but also in the future selection, evaluation, and training of RA's at Eastern Illinois University.

Scope of Problem

During the past twenty years the guiding concepts concerning the goals of university residence halls have changed. The residence hall is no longer considered to be merely a physical facility, providing the student with a place to live and little else. Today most colleges and universities consider the residence hall to be an extension of the classroom; students living in modern residence halls learn social skills every bit as important as formal classroom instruction. In addition, these students enjoy the use of extra facilities and services designed to make their college experiences more profitable.¹

In this book, Planning Functional College Housing, Harold C. Riker stated residence hall purposes as follows:

1. The hall will help student residents to identify themselves as persons with living groups of significance to them.

¹Dean of Men's Professional Staff, Eastern Illinois University, "Handbook for Resident Assistants, 1964-65" (Duplicated material, Men's Residence Halls, Eastern Illinois University), n.p..

2. The hall will foster the development or strengthening of important cooperative action, and cultural appreciation.
3. The hall will seek to sharpen student perception of the continuity of learning on the college campus.
4. The hall will furnish informal training in the art of human relationship.
5. The hall will take a supportive role in assisting the student during the transition from his family environment to that of the broader civic community.
6. The hall will endeavor, as an aid to motivation and learning, to maintain open lines of communication between students, between students and staff, and between students, staff, and the college community.
7. The hall will provide a physical environment which will contribute to physical and mental health and to the development of interest in a personal standard of living.
8. The hall will present an example of efficient administration.²

A competent staff of guidance and student personnel workers is of prime importance to the operation of a modern, comprehensive hall program. Care must be taken in the selection of the staff members who will plan and operate these programs. Educational background and professional experience can be used as guides in selecting Residence Hall Directors and other professional staff members, but these criteria are of little help in the selection, evaluation, and training of the undergraduate students who are part of most residence hall staffs. It was hoped that this study

²Harold C. Riker, Planning Functional College Housing (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956), pp. 57,58.

would provide information and tools which would be of use in future RA programs.

The Eastern Illinois University Handbook for Resident Assistants, 1964-65, presents the following list of the specific responsibilities of male RA's employed by Eastern Illinois University.

1. Assist the Director in the general administration of the Hall, i.e., assist in checking students in and out of the hall; assist the Director in clerical and administrative duties necessary for the efficient operation of the Hall.
2. Be present for all meals in the dining room and assist in maintaining University and Hall standards for dress and manners.
3. Be available for counseling all residents; the purpose is to be of service in helping them gain a better understanding of their educational, social and personal problems. Problems should be referred to the Director when they are beyond the ability of the Resident Assistant.
4. The Resident Assistant will be on duty weekends as scheduled by the Director.
5. The Resident Assistant will be available for night duty as assigned by the Director. He is not permitted to leave the Hall while on duty except in case of emergency.
6. The Resident Assistant shall attend all meetings with the Director and Dean of Men as scheduled.
7. Make written reports to the Director of violations of rules and regulations (both Hall and University).
8. Make room inspections periodically and report in writing to the Director any damage to or loss of University property.
9. Keep the Director of the Hall informed as to unusual symptoms of students, i.e., illness, homesickness withdrawal from the University, etc.
10. Serve as advisor to the corridor group during corridor meetings, explain rules and regulations of the Hall and University, and in general discuss topics which will aid the overall development of the Residence Hall Program.

11. The Resident Assistant should be responsible for the encouragement of positive and responsible citizenship on the part of the group with which he is working.³

Because, as the above list shows, competent and efficient RA's are so necessary for a successful residence hall program, the Dean of Men and his professional staff have taken great care in their selection. During Winter quarter, 1965-66, each candidate for an RA position submitted an application form to his Hall Director or to the Dean of Men if he did not live in a residence hall. Each residence hall staff evaluated its own candidates and submitted a list of preferred candidates to the Dean of Men. This was a very subjective preliminary evaluation, although a rating sheet was used by the various hall staffs to clarify their thinking about each candidate. (Rating sheet in Appendix)

The Dean of Men and his professional staff then interviewed each candidate for an RA position who was approved by the preliminary screening done by the residence hall staffs. Using the following scale the candidates were rated by the Dean of Men, the Assistant Dean of Men, and the four Residence Hall Directors.

- 1--excellent candidate
- 2--good candidate but some reservations
- 3--mediocre but satisfactory candidate
- 4--perhaps acceptable as an alternate
- 5--definitely not acceptable⁴

³Dean of Men's Professional Staff, n.p..

⁴Interview with Donald LaRue, Director, Thomas Hall, June 8, 1966.

Although this procedure represented an improvement over selection methods used in previous years, one serious difficulty was apparent. There was no formal agreement among the selection staff as to the traits and skills which a successful RA should possess. Some variance among the ratings each professional staff member gave a particular candidate was to be expected, for the ratings were subjective in nature. Lack of agreement on what constitutes a good RA, however, make the ratings less accurate than they might have been. The need for a list of the criteria necessary for successful performance of the RA job was demonstrated.

Such a list also served to make the evaluation of present RA's more objective, thus making such evaluations more useful for training and research purposes. It was necessary to develop this list of accepted criteria for RA success during the course of this investigation; in order to determine if there is any relationship between certain personality variables and RA effectiveness those RA's who were most effective and those who were least effective had to be identified. By having each Director rate those RA's under his direct supervision according to a list of criteria commonly agreed upon, an attempt was made to make the ratings of RA effectiveness somewhat more objective. It was recognized, however, that the ratings were still rather subjective in nature.

During 1965-66 there were three men's residence halls at Eastern Illinois University. Lincoln and Douglas Halls were built in 1952 and housed 164 residents each. Thomas Hall was built in 1963 and housed 438 residents. Lincoln and Douglas each had a staff of one full-time Director, one Graduate Assistant, and four RA's. Thomas

Hall was staffed by two Directors, three Graduate Assistants, and thirteen RA's. At the time of this study Thomas Hall had only eleven RA's, however, due to the dismissal of one RA and the resignation of another.

Limitations

Several factors were considered to be limitations of this investigation. The validity and reliability of the findings were somewhat decreased due to these limitations.

Since the validity of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule is very low,⁵ no conclusions were drawn concerning the correlations between the personality variables as precisely defined by the EPPS Manual⁶ and RA effectiveness. It was possible to show only correlations between undefined variables and effectiveness ratings.

The subjective selection processes inherent in the use of the RA Effectiveness Criteria Checklist and the subjective ratings gained through the RA Evaluation Form left the reliability of these instruments open to error. In addition, the relatively small sample of RA's involved in this study was a limitation which must be taken into account.

It was decided, however, that these limitations were not prohibitive. The findings of this study were still valuable, for they would only be used as tools to give direction to improvements needed in the Residence Hall Program. Further research should serve to make these tools more valid and reliable and thus more valuable.

⁵Allen L. Edwards, Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Manual (New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1959), pp. 21,22.

⁶Ibid., p. 11.

Definitions

RA's--All of the male undergraduate Resident Assistants employed by Eastern Illinois University at the close of Spring Quarter, 1966. RA's were chosen by the Dean of Men and his professional staff to assist the various Residence Hall Directors with the administrative, counseling, and disciplinary functions of the Men's Residence Halls.

Professional Staff--As used in this investigation, those full-time student personnel workers and counselors who had the primary responsibility for selecting and evaluating RA's. During the period of time included in this investigation this staff included the Dean of Men, the Assistant Dean of Men, and the four Residence Hall Directors. Each professional staff member held at least a Master's degree in some phase of student personnel work.

Residence Hall Directors--Those professional staff members who were directly in charge of the Residence Halls. They were responsible for directing physical plant maintenance, supervision of Hall employees, resident counseling, RA training, room assignments, and many other matters related to Residence Hall operation.

CHAPTER II

RELATED RESEARCH

Although no research was found which was directly related to the present study, there were four investigations which are similar in some ways. The experimental group in the University of Texas study had a role similar to that of Eastern Illinois University's RA's, but the groups in the other studies were not comparable in terms of position or role. The United States Air Force study explored the relationship between personality variables and effectiveness, as did the present study. The investigations conducted at Michigan State University and the University of Illinois were concerned with the personality variables of counselors, but no attempt was made to compare these variables to measures of effectiveness.

University of Texas

A three-year study developed at the University of Texas was designed to measure the differences in the perception of the RA's role as seen by Hall residents, Hall Directors, Administrators, experienced RA's and inexperienced RA's. The RA role perceptions of these five groups were measured through the use of the Counselor Perception Blank. The measurements of the variables Achievement, Autonomy, Exhibition, Dominance, Intraception, and Nurturance were used for the purpose of this study.

It was found that there were significant differences in perceived RA role among three broad groups--Administrators, RA's, and Hall

residents. The most important of these differences, according to the study's authors, was the ranking of Nurturance and Intraception by RA's and Hall residents. The RA's ranked Nurturance and Intraception above all other variables, while Hall residents ranked them below all other variables. Evidently, the authors concluded, Hall residents had reservations concerning the RA's ability to handle their problems.

The Counselor Perception Blank scores of all participating groups were also evaluated as a whole. In general, the "ideal" RA was characterized by Nurturance and Intraception, to a lesser extent by Dominance and Achievement, and least of all by Autonomy and Exhibition. The authors concluded that conflicting perceptions of RA role by Hall Directors, Administrators, RA's, and Hall residents lessened the effectiveness of the Residence Hall Program.

This study involved female RA's of the University of Texas, but they were similar to the RA's of Eastern Illinois University in that both groups were expected to assume counseling, clerical, and disciplinary duties. The results of the Counselor Perception Blank were not correlated with any measure of RA effectiveness.¹

Michigan State University

Thirty-seven counselors in the Michigan State University Counseling Center were given the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. In addition to scoring the inventories in the usual manner, five non-random components of the scores were determined through statistical processes. These components were:

1. Social Service Need (general counselor need to help others).

¹George G. Gonyea and Roy E. Warman, "Differential Perceptions of the Student Dormitory Counselor's Role," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI (December, 1962), pp. 350-355.

2. Masculinity.
3. Non-Directive (preference for client-centered rather than counselor-centered counseling).
4. False Aggression (brash and aggressive attitude which was not really felt).

The Social Service Need had its highest correlation with the EPPS Intraception variable while Achievement and Dominance had the highest correlations with the Masculinity component. The Non-Directive component correlated highly with Deference and Intraception. False Aggression was characterized by high correlations with the EPPS variables Deference and Aggression. The conflict between these two variables was indicative of False Aggression.

As with the University of Texas study, there was no attempt to correlate counselor personality variables with counselor effectiveness. It should also be noted that the roles of the Michigan State University counselors and the RA's involved in the present study are not particularly comparable.²

University of Illinois

The authors of the University of Illinois study stated that the personality of the counselor is perhaps the most important variable in counseling, and that "the problems of judging counselor effectiveness are great."³ The study concerned University of Illinois graduate students enrolled in four different counseling courses. These four courses

²David H. Mills, William J. Chestnut, and John P. Hartzell, "The Needs of Counselors: A Component Analysis," Journal of Counseling Psychology, XIII (Spring, 1966), pp. 82-84.

³John B. Mordock Jr. and C. H. Patterson, "Personality Characteristics of Counseling Students at Various Levels of Training," The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, XIII (Summer, 1965), p. 265.

represented a continuum in the level of counselor training; students enrolled in beginning counseling courses were at the lowest level of the continuum while those enrolled in the Counseling Practicum course were at the continuum's highest level.

The California Psychological Inventory was given to each subject-student. Those students who were at the highest level of counselor training were found to be "more permissive, more flexible and adaptive, more spontaneous, self-confident and poised in social interaction, and more intellectually efficient than beginning students."⁴

Again, it should be remembered that RA's are not trained counselors nor are they counseling and guidance students. This study showed, however, that there is a positive relationship between experience and personality traits generally associated with effective counselors.⁵ The third hypothesis of the present study dealt with this same type of relationship.

United States Air Force

The purpose of this Air Force investigation was to determine if efficient tactical training instructors can be selected through the use of a personality inventory. Beginning tactical instructors at Lackland Air Force Base completed a personality inventory based on Guilford's study of human interests. These instructors were later evaluated for job effectiveness by their supervisors. The correlations between effectiveness ratings and personality variables were not significant;

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., pp. 265-269.

it was concluded that personality inventory results could not predict tactical instructor effectiveness. This was the only study found that directly attempted to measure the relationship between effectiveness and certain personality variables.⁶

⁶Walter R. Borg, "Personality and Interest Measures as Related to Criteria of Instructor Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Research, I (May, 1957), pp. 701-709.

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND TREATMENT OF DATA

Development of the RA Effectiveness Criteria Checklist

In order to determine what criteria of RA effectiveness were considered most important by the Dean of Men and his professional staff, a checklist was developed to sample their opinions and to make comparisons of these opinions. Some of the criteria were taken from the preliminary rating sheet previously discussed, others were suggested by various professional and student staff members, and still other criteria were drawn from the author's own experience. A total of twenty-one criteria was included with space provided for any additional criteria a participant might want to add. Those given the checklist were encouraged to write in any criterion they felt was important for RA effectiveness.

The checklist contained an introductory section which explained the checklist's purpose and presented directions for its completion. Each checklist was delivered personally, however, in order to insure understanding on the part of the six participants as to what was desired of them. A copy was given to the Dean of Men, the Assistant Dean of Men, and the four Residence Hall Directors. As mentioned previously, this group is the professional staff most involved with evaluating, selecting, and training RA's. Each of these six participants was asked to mark, in the space provided, those skills or traits he considered most important for RA effectiveness.

A total selection of ten criteria was suggested, but participants were free to select more or less than ten criteria if they so desired. This was done because more might be learned from the checklist if it were not rigidly structured.

Participants were asked to circle the check marks of items they considered to be absolutely essential. As originally conceived, this method was intended to further differentiate among the most and least essential criteria of RA effectiveness. Also, it was thought that if two participants felt any certain criterion to be absolutely essential, this criterion could be included on the RA Evaluation Form even though the criterion was not chosen by any other participants. Inclusion of criteria selected in this way might make the RA Evaluation Form, which was developed from this checklist, more acceptable to all professional staff members. The author's use of these circled items was optional, however, they were included in order to make the checklist more flexible and possibly more useful.

When all six checklists had been returned, the results were tabulated. The RA Effectiveness Criteria Checklist is reproduced in the Appendix.

Development of the RA Evaluation Form

Twelve criteria of RA effectiveness, suggested by the data obtained from the checklist, were included in the RA Evaluation Form. The reasoning behind the selection of these twelve particular criteria will be explained in Chapter IV, at this point it suffices to say that the majority of the participating professional staff members agreed upon the importance of these criteria of RA effectiveness. Using these criteria, each of the four Residence

Hall Directors was asked to evaluate the RA's working in his Hall or wing.*

The Directors were asked to use a scale of (4) for very good, (3) for good, (2) for fair, and (1) for poor. Each RA was evaluated for each of the twelve criteria, and the results were totaled to give a total score of each RA's effectiveness. An example of the evaluation form appears in the Appendix.

A grid was devised to show the following:

1. Each RA's score for each criteria
2. Each RA's total score, or measure of effectiveness
3. The totals of the scores obtained for each criteria of RA effectiveness.

The score totals for item three of the above list were obtained in order to determine the areas of highest and lowest RA effectiveness in terms of the total Residence Hall Program. The grid and the scores are shown in Chapter IV.

Selection of the Personality Inventory

In order to obtain objective measurements of normal personality variables for the RA's included in this investigation, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule was administered. This commercial personality inventory purports to measure fifteen variables which are drawn from a list of manifest needs prepared by H. A. Murray and others.

*Note: In that Thomas Hall had two Directors, one living in each wing, each Thomas Hall Director evaluated only those RA's living on his particular wing.

These fifteen normal variables are:

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Achievement (ach) | 9. Dominance (dom) |
| 2. Deference (def) | 10. Abasement (aba) |
| 3. Order (ord) | 11. Nurturance (nur) |
| 4. Exhibition (exh) | 12. Change (chg) |
| 5. Autonomy (aut) | 13. Endurance (end) |
| 6. Affiliation (aff) | 14. Heterosexuality (het) |
| 7. Intraception (int) | 15. Aggression (agg) ¹ |
| 8. Succorance (suc) | |

The definitions of these terms, as given in the EPPS manual, are presented in the Appendix.

The EPPS was chosen primarily because it purported to measure fifteen relatively independent normal personality variables, more than most other commercial inventories. A high number of variables would increase the possibility of finding a relationship between RA effectiveness and one or more personality variables. The validity of the EPPS was not an essential factor, for even if the validity of one or more of the variables were rejected the differences among the RA's scores would make possible comparisons with effectiveness ratings. For example, a positive correlation between high RA effectiveness and a high score for the variable Aggression would not have to be interpreted as meaning that the most effective RA's would, presumably, respond to the items purporting to measure aggression in the same way. Thus it was hoped that even though the

¹Edwards, p. 5.

status validity of the EPPS is open to question, the predictive reliability of the fifteen variable scores would prove valuable.

The EPPS manual gives both split-half and test-retest reliability coefficients. According to the data provided by the publisher, the split-half coefficients, termed coefficients of internal consistency, ranged from a low of .60 for the variable Deference to a high of .87 for the variable Heterosexuality. With the exception of Deference, all of the fifteen variables measured by the EPPS had coefficients of internal consistency of .70 or better. The test-retest reliability coefficients, or stability coefficients, ranged from .74 for Achievement and Exhibition to .88 for Abasement. The test-retest reliability coefficients were based upon data obtained from a relatively small group, however, and are thus of questionable value.²

The limitations of the EPPS in regard to validity and, to a lesser extent, reliability, were not considered to be prohibitive to the purpose of this study. As previously noted, the face validity could, if an investigator so desired, be disregarded; the emphasis could be placed on the inventory's reliability in differentiating among various traits.

Administration of the Personality Inventory

The EPPS was administered to the nineteen male RA's employed by Eastern Illinois University during the Spring Quarter of the 1965-1966 academic year. When possible, the inventory was given to each of the three Residence Hall's RA's as a group. In those cases in which an RA could not be present to complete the inventory with his group, the inventory was administered individually.

² Edwards, p. 19.

The directions for administration found in the EPPS manual were followed closely. In addition to these directions, the RA's were told that their inventory scores would be used for research aimed at improving the Residence Hall Program and that their scores would be kept confidential. They were also told that the examiner would interpret their scores for them if they wished. In order to promote valid responses, the RA's were not told that each RA was to be evaluated for effectiveness by the Hall Directors and that these evaluations would be compared to the EPPS scores. The Hall Directors, however, were appraised of this fact before the inventory was administered.

The RA's were asked to indicate on their answer sheets the number of quarters they had served as staff members, including the quarter they were about to complete. This was done to determine any possible relationships between RA experience and RA effectiveness. It was possible that there might also be a relationship between experience and the responses to certain groups of inventory items.

The EPPS answer sheets were then scored by hand. It was found that four of the RA's had consistency scores of nine or lower out of a perfect consistency score of fifteen. The EPPS manual suggests that the personality variable scores of any subject with a consistency score of nine be questioned;³ for this reason the scores of the four RA's with low consistency indications were eliminated from further consideration.

The scores of each of the remaining fifteen RA's were then recorded on a grid so that they could be easily seen in relation to the scores

³Edwards, p. 16.

of the other RA's. In order to maintain the confidential nature of the personality variable scores, each RA was given a code designation. This same code was used to report the effectiveness evaluations of the RA's. The grid obtained from this procedure is reproduced in Chapter IV.

Comparison of the RA Evaluation Form Results with the Personality Inventory Results

As presented in the purpose of this study, it was hoped that an examination and comparison of the RA Evaluation Form results and the personality inventory results would test the hypotheses enumerated on pages 1 and 2. The results of this comparison are discussed in the latter part of Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

RA Effectiveness Criteria Checklist

The tabulation of the data from the RA Effectiveness Criteria Checklist showed the following results. The number before each criterion indicates how many of the participants who completed the checklist (The Dean of Men, the Assistant Dean of Men, and the four Residence Hall Directors) considered the criterion to be important for evaluating RA effectiveness.

- | | |
|---|---|
| (5) 1. <u>Leadership.</u> | (1) 12. <u>High grade point average.</u> |
| (4) 2. <u>Participation in Res. Hall affairs.</u> | (6) 13. <u>Time spent in Hall.</u> |
| (6) 3. <u>Emotional stability.</u> | (2) 14. <u>Tact.</u> |
| (3) 4. <u>Dependability.</u> | (4) 15. <u>Empathy.</u> |
| (6) 5. <u>Relationship with residents.</u> | (4) 16. <u>Ability to handle discipline situations.</u> |
| (4) 6. <u>Relationship with staff members.</u> | (2) 17. <u>Reaction in stress situations.</u> |
| (6) 7. <u>Degree of flexibility.</u> | (3) 18. <u>Self-confidence.</u> |
| (0) 8. <u>Professional motivation.</u> | (2) 19. <u>Sound value system.</u> |
| (4) 9. <u>Counseling ability.</u> | (1) 20. <u>Masculine image.</u> |
| (2) 10. <u>Work and study habits.</u> | (5) 21. <u>Knowledge of campus.</u> |
| (6) 11. <u>Adequate grade point average.</u> | |

One participant checked fifteen criteria as important for RA effectiveness, two participants checked fourteen, two participants checked eleven, and one participant checked ten criteria. There was a total of seventy-five checked criteria. The twelve criteria which

were checked by four or more participants accounted for sixty checks, or 80 per cent of the total. This percentage represented a significant amount of agreement among the participants as to which criteria were most important for RA effectiveness. For this reason it was decided that the twelve criteria selected by four or more participants should be included on the RA Evaluation Form.

Aside from these twelve criteria, two criteria were selected three times, four criteria were selected two times, two criteria were selected once, and one criteria was not selected by any participant. In that these selections represented only 20 per cent of the total number of selections, the nine criteria with a total of three selections or less each were eliminated from further consideration.

As a group, the participants circled twenty-seven criteria; seven criteria were circled more than once. These circles indicated which criteria of RA effectiveness the participants felt to be absolutely essential for RA success. Fifteen different criteria were so designated by one or more of the participants. These criteria, with the number preceding them referring to the number of times each was circled, are as follows:

- | | |
|---|---|
| (3) 1. <u>Leadership.</u> | (3) 13. <u>Time spent in Hall.</u> |
| (1) 2. <u>Participation in Res. Hall affairs.</u> | (1) 14. <u>Tact.</u> |
| (4) 3. <u>Emotional stability.</u> | (1) 15. <u>Empathy.</u> |
| (1) 4. <u>Dependability.</u> | (2) 16. <u>Ability to handle discipline situations.</u> |
| (3) 5. <u>Relationship with residents.</u> | (1) 17. <u>Reaction in stress situations.</u> |
| (2) 6. <u>Relationship with staff members.</u> | (1) 18. <u>Self-confidence.</u> |
| (1) 7. <u>Degree of flexibility.</u> | (2) 11. <u>Adequate grade point average.</u> |
| (1)10. <u>Work and study habits.</u> | |

As noted in Chapter I, any criterion which was circled by two or more participants might merit inclusion in the RA Evaluation Form even if such criteria received no other check marks.

By comparing the total number of times each criteria was checked with the number of circled checks each criteria received, it was found that no criterion circled two or more times had a total of less than four checks overall. It was not necessary, therefore, to add any criteria items to the list of twelve already selected for inclusion in the RA Evaluation Form.

RA Evaluation Form

The grid shown as Table 1 on page 25 was produced by compiling the data obtained from the RA Evaluation Forms completed by each Hall Director. The total score for each RA indicated his measure of effectiveness in discharging the duties of his position. The RA's were ranked from most effective to least effective.

<u>RA</u>	<u>Total Score</u>	<u>Ranking</u>
T6	44	1
T4	43	2
T1	42	3.5
T3	42	3.5
D1	41	5.5
T2	41	5.5
L1	40	7.5
T7	40	7.5
T8	37	9
L3	33	10

<u>RA</u>	<u>Total Score</u>	<u>Ranking</u>
L2	32	11.5
T5	32	11.5
T9	30	13
D2	22	14
D3	21	15

The arithmetic mean of the Total Scores was 36.2. Divided by the total number of criteria, this indicated that an average effectiveness rating of 3.02 on the 4.00 rating scale used by the Hall Directors. The highest ranking RA had an average effectiveness rating of 3.67, placing him more than midway between 3.00 (good) and 4.00 (very good). The lowest ranking RA had an effectiveness rating of 1.75, placing him somewhat below the 2.00 (fair) level of effectiveness.

Nine RA's, or 60 per cent, had average effectiveness ratings which were between good and very good. Four RA's, or 26.7 per cent, had average effectiveness ratings which were between fair and good. Two RA's, or 13.3 per cent, had average effectiveness ratings which were between poor and fair. Although the limitations imposed by the subjective quality of these RA effectiveness ratings was recognized, the fact that 86.7 per cent of the RA's had average ratings above the level of fair indicated that the RA selection and training methods used in the past have been rather successful.

The Total Scores obtained for each criteria of RA effectiveness were also evaluated through the use of the same scale of 4.00 for very good, 3.00 for good, 2.00 for fair, and 1.00 for poor. This evaluation determined the areas of highest and lowest RA effectiveness in terms

TABLE 1
RA EVALUATION FORM RESULTS

RA	Leadership	Participation in Residence Hall affairs	Emotional stability	Relationship with residents	Relationship with staff	Degree of flexibility	Counseling ability	Adequate grade point average	Time spent in Hall	Empathy	Ability to handle discipline	Knowledge of campus	TOTALS
D1	3	2	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	2	41
D2	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	2	22
D3	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	21
L1	4	2	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	4	4	2	40
L2	2	3	3	3	4	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	32
L3	2	3	4	3	4	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	33
T1	3	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	2	4	4	4	42
T2	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	41
T3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	2	4	4	2	42
T4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	2	4	4	4	43
T5	1	4	3	3	3	1	2	4	4	3	1	3	32
T6	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	44
T7	3	1	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	2	40
T8	3	2	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	37
T9	1	3	4	2	3	2	2	4	3	2	2	2	30
TOTALS	41	37	50	44	49	40	42	49	35	46	45	38	

of the total Men's Residence Hall Program. Group RA effectiveness was ranked as follows:

Criteria of RA Effectiveness	Total Score	Ranking
<u>Emotional Stability.</u>	50	1
<u>Relationship with other staff members.</u>	49	2.5
<u>Adequate grade point average.</u>	49	2.5
<u>Empathy.</u>	46	4
<u>Ability to handle discipline situations effectively.</u>	45	5
<u>Relationship with residents.</u>	44	6
<u>Counseling ability.</u>	42	7
<u>Leadership.</u>	41	8
<u>Degree of flexibility.</u>	40	9
<u>Knowledge of campus.</u>	38	10
<u>Participation in Residence Hall affairs.</u>	37	11
<u>Time spent in Hall.</u>	35	12

The arithmetic mean of the Total Scores was 43. The average effectiveness rating obtained by the RA's as a group was 2.87, close to a 3.00 (good) level of effectiveness. As a group the RA's performed at a 3.33 level of effectiveness for the highest ranking criteria, Emotional Stability. They performed at a 2.33 level of effectiveness for the lowest ranking criteria, Time spent in Hall. As in the case of the individual RA rating, it was noted that the Hall Directors were agreed that the average level of RA effectiveness was well above a 2.00, or fair, performance.

Personality Inventory

The results of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule were recorded on the same type of grid used for studying the results of the RA Evaluation Form. This grid, reproduced as Table 2, showed the percentile scores of each RA for each personality variable measured by the EPPS.

Comparison of the RA Evaluation Form Results with the Personality Inventory Results

By computing the coefficient of correlation between each personality variable and the measures of RA effectiveness, it was possible to determine the relative relationships of the two types of scores. Using Spearman's formula for determining coefficients of correlation,¹ the following coefficients were found to exist between the EPPS personality variable scores and the RA effectiveness ratings.

Personality Variable	r (Coefficient of Correlation with with RA Effectiveness Rating Total Scores)
Achievement.	r= .182
Deference.	r= .324
Order.	r= .023
Exhibition.	r= .228
Autonomy.	r= .060
Affiliation.	r=-.321
Intracception.	r=-.201
Succorance.	r=-.417
Dominance.	r=-.306

¹Eugene D. Fitzpatrick, "Statistical Processes in Education," Educational Psychology, ed. Charles E. Skinner (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 642.

Personality Variable	r (Coefficient of Correlation with with RA Effectiveness Rating Total Scores)
Abasement.	r= .168
Nurturance.	r= .083
Change.	r= .792
Endurance.	r= .322
Heterosexuality.	r=-.085
Aggression.	r=-.155

The only significant correlation was found to be between the RA effectiveness rating Total Scores and the personality variable, Change. With a positive coefficient of correlation of .792, it can be assumed that there is a strong tendency for those RA's who are judged most effective to score highly on the Change variable of the EPPS. Thus the first and second hypotheses of this investigation were supported as being correct.

Certain limitations must be recognized, however. The subjective nature of the RA Evaluation Form made the coefficients of correlation, including the high coefficient for the Change personality variable, less reliable than their levels indicated. The relatively small number of RA's involved with this study also left the reliability of the results open to question. It should again be noted that the high coefficient of correlation between RA effectiveness and the Change personality variable did not necessarily indicate that the most effective RA's exhibit the characteristics of Change as defined in the Appendix. Rather, the most effective RA's tended to score high on this particular variable while the least effective RA's tended to score low; it was possible that the EPPS was not actually measuring what it defined as the personality factors of Change but some other personality variable.

In order to test the third hypothesis--there is no relationship between RA effectiveness and RA experience--the coefficient of correlation between RA effectiveness and RA experience, expressed by the number of quarters employed as an RA, was determined. The experience of the fifteen RA's involved in this investigation is shown below, along with the RA's effectiveness ranking.

RA	Number of Quarters Employed as RA	Ranking in Terms of Experience	Ranking in Terms of Effectiveness
D1	6	5	5.5
D2	3	10.5	14
D3	3	10.5	15
L1	7	3.5	7.5
L2	3	10.5	11.5
L3	1	15	10
T1	9	1	3.5
T2	3	10.5	5.5
T3	3	10.5	3.5
T4	8	2	1
T5	3	10.5	11.5
T6	4	6	2
T7	7	3.5	7.5
T8	3	10.5	9
T9	3	10.5	13

The coefficient of correlation between RA effectiveness and RA experience was found to be .665. As was expected, the third hypothesis proved to be false. There was a significant positive correlation

between relatively long experience as an RA and RA effectiveness.

The .665 coefficient of correlation was not so high as to preclude the possibility of superior effectiveness by a relatively inexperienced RA, however.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study was moderately successful in attaining its goal of providing information which could prove valuable to the Men's Residence Hall Program of Eastern Illinois University or to a similar residence hall program. Several guidelines and practical tools were developed which should aid in the future selection, evaluation, and training of RA's. As was discussed in Chapter I, the importance of effective RA's to the total Hall Program cannot be overestimated.

RA Evaluation Form

The most successful development to come from this investigation was the formulation of the RA Evaluation Form. Use of this instrument made the Hall Director's evaluations of RA effectiveness somewhat more objective; more importantly, it served to consolidate the thoughts concerning RA effectiveness which were held by the Dean of Men and his professional staff. The divergent philosophies held by those most concerned with the Residence Hall Program have in the past caused some difficulties, particularly in the area of RA selection. It was shown, however, that the importance of the RA effectiveness criteria included in the RA Evaluation Form was accepted by a large majority of professional staff members, including the Dean of Men. Use of this commonly agreed upon list of evaluative criteria, then, should markedly alleviate the problems of RA selection and evaluation

caused by supposedly divergent philosophies concerning the characteristics of an effective RA.

The data obtained from the RA Evaluation Form showed that 86.7 per cent of the RA's had average effectiveness ratings above the level of fair performance of their duties. Indeed, 60 per cent had average effectiveness ratings between good and very good. These percentages indicated that the overall level of effectiveness by the RA's included in this investigation was pleasingly high. This high level of effectiveness was further substantiated by the fact that as a group the RA's had an average effectiveness rating of 2.87, very close to a 3.00 (good) level of performance. As a group, the RA's were shown to be most effective in the criteria, Emotional stability, Relationship with other staff members, and Adequate grade point average. The RA's were least effective in the criteria, Time spent in Hall, Participation in Residence Hall Affairs, and Knowledge of campus. The RA Evaluation Form thus served to identify those areas in which additional in-service training was needed.

RA Effectiveness Checklist

The RA Effectiveness Checklist, from which the RA Evaluation Form was developed, might be used regularly to sample the opinions of those who plan and operate the Residence Hall Program. In this way the RA Evaluation Form could be revised as needed to keep it an accurate description of majority opinion on criteria on RA effectiveness. The Checklist might also be used as a self-rating sheet by individual RA's, the results being used in planning small group or all-Hall training programs.

First Hypothesis--Those RA's who are judged most effective by the Residence Hall Directors will share similar personality traits.

This hypothesis was supported only in the case of the EPPS variable, Change. The most effective RA's tended to obtain the highest scores on this personality variable. Due to the low validity of the EPPS, however, it cannot be assumed that the most effective RA's exhibit the behavior characteristics of Change as defined in the Appendix. If further research bore out the fact that there is a high positive correlation between RA effectiveness and Change the EPPS might be used for selection purposes. The scores of RA candidates on the Change variable would be somewhat indicative of their future success as an RA. It is not suggested that such scores be used to the exclusion of other selection criteria and methods.

Second Hypothesis--Those RA's who are judged least effective by the Residence Hall Directors will share similar personality traits.

As the corollary to the first hypothesis, this hypothesis was also shown to be correct only for the EPPS variable, Change.

Third Hypothesis--There is no relationship between RA effectiveness and RA experience.

This hypothesis was not supported, as was expected. The coefficient of correlation between RA effectiveness and RA experience was found to be .665. The reliability of this correlation may perhaps be questionable due to the subjective nature of the RA Evaluation Form. There seems reason to believe, however, that a policy of hiring RA's who would be available to serve two or more years would be desirable.

APPENDIX

NAME _____ Fr. ____ So. ____ Jr. ____ Sr. ____

Bases for Rating

- 4 pts--One who consistently stands out
- 3 pts--One who periodically stands out
- 2 pts--Average
- 1 pt---Below average

RATING

1. Appearance: consistently neat, clean and well-dressed----- _____
2. Initiative: handles new situations competently----- _____
3. Emotional Stability: not given to erratic or impulsive
behavior----- _____
4. Dependability: ----- _____
5. Social Adjustment: understands and behaves in a manner which
is consistent with the expectations placed upon him by the
peer group and the administration----- _____
6. Leadership: able to assume responsibility as the head of
a group----- _____
7. Respect for Rights and Privileges of Others: consistent
in his actions----- _____
8. Work and Study Habits: utilizes his time wisely----- _____
9. Participation in Campus Affairs:----- _____
10. Participation in Residence Hall Affairs: ----- _____
11. Personality Adjustment: how does he relate with his peer
group----- _____
12. Ability to Work with Others: enjoys association with peer
group----- _____
13. Ability to Learn: easily adjusts to new situations----- _____

TOTAL POINTS _____

Comments: _____

Degree of acquaintanceship--how long and how well do you know the applicant?

Date _____ Submitted by _____ Position _____

QUESTIONNAIRE

EVALUATION OF RESIDENT ASSISTANTS

Dear _____;

As part of the research for my M.S. in Ed. degree thesis, I would like to determine the criteria you consider most important in evaluating undergraduate residence hall counselors employed by Eastern Illinois University. Below is a list of traits or skills that may be valuable to a Resident Assistant; will you please check ten that you personally consider to be most needed for effective student personnel work by your undergraduate staff members?

If you check any item which you believe to be absolutely essential, please circle that check mark. Feel free to check more or less than ten items, if necessary, and to add other evaluative criteria in the spaces provided at the end of the list.

Please return the completed form to me via campus mail. My address is: David Eatock, room 257, Lincoln Hall. Thank you very much for helping me with this research.

- _____ 1. Leadership. (the ability to effectively guide and influence the behavior and opinions of others as the leader of a group)
- _____ 2. Participation in Residence Hall affairs.
- _____ 3. Emotional stability. (not impulsive, erratic, or given to extreme mood swings)
- _____ 4. Dependability. (completes assigned jobs promptly; seldom needs reminders)
- _____ 5. Relationship with residents. (respected by and friendly with most of the Hall's residents)

- _____ 6. Relationship with other staff members. (works well as a member of a team; is respected by and friendly with fellow Resident Assistants)
- _____ 7. Degree of flexibility. (able to adjust to new situations; avoids highly structured approach to policies and rules)
- _____ 8. Professional motivation. (interested in student personnel work for its own sake, as opposed to strictly financial or other motivational factors)
- _____ 9. Counseling ability. (able to help those residents who have an academic, social, or personal problem)
- _____ 10. Work and study habits. (sets good example for the men of the Hall)
- _____ 11. Adequate grade point average. (not in danger of being placed on academic probation or of being dropped)
- _____ 12. High grade point average. (consistently earns quarter grade point averages of 2.50 or better)
- _____ 13. Time spent in Hall. (spends a good amount of free time in the Hall, beyond that required by the duty schedule)
- _____ 14. Tact. (able to discern the most appropriate manner of dealing with a problem)
- _____ 15. Empathy. (interest in helping others understand and approach their problems; understanding of another's viewpoint)
- _____ 16. Ability to handle discipline situations effectively.
- _____ 17. Reaction in stress situations. (able to think clearly and work effectively in emergencies or difficult situations)
- _____ 18. Self-confidence. (willing to take initiative and to be self-assertive)
- _____ 19. Sound value system.
- _____ 20. Masculine image. (acceptable to peers and able to earn their respect)
- _____ 21. Knowledge of campus. (acquainted with referral agencies, university facilities, university policies, etc.)
- _____ 22. _____
- _____ 23. _____
- _____ 24. _____

RA EVALUATION FORM

The following criteria of RA effectiveness were the ones most often chosen by Dean Kluge, Dean Hoctor, and the four Residence Hall Directors. Using these criteria, will you please evaluate each RA in your wing or hall? Evaluate each Assistant for each criterion, using a scale of (4) for very good, (3) for good, (2) for fair, and (1) for poor. I shall add the twelve separate scores to get a total score. I realize that this will not give an exact picture of an RA's effectiveness, but for the scope of my research this will not be too important.

1. Leadership. (the ability to effectively guide and influence the behavior and opinions of others as the leader of a group)
2. Participation in Residence Hall affairs.
3. Emotional stability. (not impulsive, erratic, or given to extreme mood swings)
4. Relationship with residents. (respected by and friendly with most of the Hall's residents)
5. Relationship with other staff members. (works well as a member of a team; is respected by and friendly with fellow Resident Assistants)
6. Degree of flexibility. (able to adjust to new situations; avoids highly structured approach to policies and rules)
7. Counseling ability. (able to help those residents who have an academic social, or personal problem)
8. Adequate grade point average. (not in danger of being placed on academic probation or of being dropped)
9. Time spent in Hall. (spends a good amount of free time in the Hall, beyond that required by the duty schedule)

10. Empathy. (interested in helping others understand and approach their problems; understanding of another's viewpoint)
11. Ability to handle discipline situations effectively.
12. Knowledge of campus. (acquainted with referral agencies, university facilities, university policies, etc.)

Definitions of Edwards Personal PreferenceSchedule Variables

1. ach Achievement: To do one's best, to be successful, to accomplish tasks requiring skill and effort, to be a recognized authority, to accomplish something of great significance, to do a difficult job well, to solve difficult problems and puzzles, to be able to do things better than others, to write a great novel or play.

2. def Deference: To get suggestions from others, to find out what others think, to follow instructions and do what is expected, to praise others, to tell others that they have done a good job, to accept the leadership of others, to read about great men, to conform to custom and avoid the unconventional, to let others make decisions.

3. ord Order: To have written work neat and organized, to make plans before starting on a difficult task, to have things organized, to keep things neat and orderly, to make advance plans when taking a trip, to organize details of work, to keep letters and files according to some system, to have meals organized and a definite time for eating, to have things arranged so that they run smoothly without change.

4. exh Exhibition: To say witty and clever things, to tell amusing jokes and stories, to talk about personal adventures and experiences, to have others notice and comment upon one's appearance, to say things just to see what effect it will have on others, to talk about personal achievements, to be the center of attention, to use words that others do not know the meaning of, to ask questions others cannot answer.

5. aut Autonomy: To be able to come and go as desired, to say what one thinks about things, to be independent of others in making decisions, to feel free to do what one wants, to do things that are

unconventional, to avoid situations where one is expected to conform, to do things without regard to what others may think, to criticize those in positions of authority, to avoid responsibilities and obligations.

6. aff Affiliation: To be loyal to friends, to participate in friendly groups, to do things for friends, to form new friendships, to make as many friends as possible, to share things with friends, to do things with friends rather than alone, to form strong attachments, to write letters to friends.

7. int Intraception: To analyze one's motives and feelings, to observe others, to understand how others feel about problems, to put one's self in another's place, to judge people by why they do things rather than by what they do, to analyze the behavior of others, to analyze the motives of others, to predict how others will act.

8. suc Succorance: To have others provide help when in trouble, to seek encouragement from others, to have others be kindly, to have others be sympathetic and understanding about personal problems, to receive a great deal of affection from others, to have others do favors cheerfully, to be helped by others when depressed, to have others feel sorry when one is sick, to have a fuss made over one when hurt.

9. dom Dominance: To argue for one's point of view, to be a leader in groups to which one belongs, to be regarded by others as a leader, to be elected or appointed chairman of committees, to make group decisions, to settle arguments and disputes between others, to persuade and influence others to do what one wants, to supervise and direct the actions of others, to tell others how to do their jobs.

10. aba Abasement: To feel guilty when one does something wrong, to accept blame when things do not go right, to feel that personal pain and misery suffered does more good than harm, to feel the need for punishment for wrong doing, to feel better when giving and avoiding a fight than when having one's own way, to feel the need for confession of errors, to feel depressed by inability to handle situations, to feel timid in the presence of superiors, to feel inferior to others in most respects.

11. nur Nurturance: To help friends when they are in trouble, to assist others less fortunate, to treat others with kindness and sympathy, to forgive others, to do small favors for others, to be generous with others, to sympathize with others who are hurt or sick, to show a great deal of affection toward others, to have others confide in one about personal problems.

12. chg Change: To do new and different things, to travel, to meet new people, to experience novelty and change in daily routine, to experiment and try new things, to eat in new and different places, to try new and different jobs, to move about the country and live in different places, to participate in new fads and fashions.

13. end Endurance: To keep at a job until it is finished, to complete any job undertaken, to work hard at a task, to keep at a puzzle or problem until it is solved, to work at a single job before taking on others, to stay up late working in order to get a job done, to put in long hours of work without distraction, to stick at a problem even though it may seem as if no progress is being made, to avoid being interrupted while at work.

14. het Heterosexuality: To go out with members of the opposite sex, to engage in social activities with the opposite sex, to be in love with someone of the opposite sex, to kiss those of the opposite sex, to be regarded as physically attractive by those of the opposite sex, to participate in discussions about sex, to read books and plays involving sex, to listen to or to tell jokes involving sex, to become sexually excited.

15. agg Aggression: To attack contrary points of view, to tell others what one thinks about them, to criticize others publicly, to make fun of others, to tell others off when disagreeing with them, to get revenge for insults, to become angry, to blame others when things go wrong, to read newspaper accounts of violence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Edwards, Allen L. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Manual. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1959.
- Fitzpatrick, Eugene D. "Statistical Processes in Education," Educational Psychology. Edited by Charles E. Skinner. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.
- Ricker, Harold C. Planning Functional College Housing. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956.

Periodicals

- Borg, Walter R. "Personality and Interest Measures as Related to Criteria of Instructor Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Research, L. (May, 1957), 701-709.
- Gonyea, George G. and Warman, Roy E. "Differential Perceptions of the Student Dormitory Counselor's Role," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI (December, 1962), 350-355.
- Mills, David H., Chestnut, William J., and Hartzell, John P. "The Needs of Counselors: A Component Analysis," Journal of Counseling Psychology, XIII (Spring, 1966), 82-84.
- Mordock, John B. Jr. and Patterson, C. H. "Personality Characteristics of Counseling Students at Various Levels of Training," The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, XIII (Summer, 1965), 265-269.

Other Sources

- Dean of Men's Professional Staff, Eastern Illinois University.
"Handbook for Resident Assistants, 1964-65." Men's Residence Halls, Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois, 1964.
(Duplicated material)
- _____. Personal interview with Donald LaRue, Director, Thomas Hall, Eastern Illinois University. June 8, 1966.