THE RELATIONSHIP OF BEHAVIORAL STYLES TO JOB PERFORMANCE OF RESIDENCE HALL STUDENT ASSISTANTS

By

JEFFREY HERBERT LEDEWITZ

Bachelor of Arts
Stetson University
DeLand, Florida
1968

Master of Arts in Education
The George Washington University
Washington, D.C.
1969

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1975

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

MAY 12 1976

THE RELATIONSHIP OF BEHAVIORAL STYLES TO JOB PERFORMANCE OF RESIDENCE HALL STUDENT ASSISTANTS

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

938956

PREFACE

This study examined the use of the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement in identifying and describing student assistant behavioral styles indicative of successful job performance. The research results were then reviewed in terms of their application to an employee selection model.

Impetus for this study was generated by my academic and employment experiences at The George Washington University. My graduate studies were partially financed by my employment as a residence hall adviser. Upon completion of my master's degree I remained at GWU an additional year to direct an experimental staffing program in one residence hall. At the time, GWU utilized only graduate students as resident hall advisers. In the residence hall I directed, all staff were undergraduates. A committee of residents interviewed all applicants and made the final selection. My first choice for a staff member was not on their final list. Their choices were excellent. The undergraudate resident advisers surpassed their graduate counterparts in both job commitment and job performance, with the most noticeable effect being the establishment of staff-student rapport.

I had become acquainted with the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement (JAIM) during a master's degree course taught by Dr. Shirley McCune. Dr. McCune discussed the research which she and JAIM author Dr. Regis Walther had conducted. I discussed the application of JAIM generated data to the assessment of residence hall staff job performance with Dr. McCune and Dr. Walther. It was through their encouragement that this study was finalized.

I wish to acknowledge the assistance and professional guidance offered by the members of my dissertation committee: Dr. Frank E. McFarland, chairman; Dr. Larry M. Perkins; Dr. Kenneth D. Sandvold; and Dr. James M. Seals.

The encouragement and support provided by Dean Herbert Mansfield, Dean John Spears, Mrs. Elaine Duffy, and particularly my wife Betty are gratefully acknowledged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

> ... the residence hall can be and should be a scene of guided growth and development for the individuals concerned; growth in the sense of achieving intellectual and social maturity of personality; development in the sense of achieving social as well as academic competency not likely to emerge from classroom experiences alone. . . . --John W. Kidd (1956, p. 52).

Colleges and universities recognize that the classroom is but one of the campus learning centers. The Gestalt approach of educating the "whole student" has increased the responsibility of residence halls as informal living-learning environments. The acceptance of this philosophy necessitates a more careful allocation of resources than were required by the old "bed and board" dormitory concept.

A prime influence in the structuring and maintenance of the living-learning environment as well as the main force in providing guided student growth is the residence hall student assistant. This individual is expected to embody the institution's particular student-oriented philosophy and to reflect this through one-to-one interactions with residents, through development of programs and through administration of applicable policies and procedures. Because he has more

contact with students than any other administrator, the effectiveness of the student assistant is of major importance. Job performance is contingent upon the student assistant's knowledge, skills and behavioral styles and the expression of these in the work situation.

Different jobs and different job emphases require different behavioral styles. "The achievement of an adequate level of job satisfaction and performance requires an adequate psychological match between the job and the individual" (Walther, 1973, p. 1). It is important that an institution first ascertain the behavioral style requirements of a job and then establish selection procedures which permit identification and assessment of applicants' behavioral styles.

The importance of matching job and employee behavioral styles at the point of selection is of particular importance to the residence hall student assistant position. Employee recruitment, selection, placement, orientation, in-service training, supervision, and evaluation are costly investments of administrative staff time. Poor selection necessitates increased staff-time expenditure in one or more of the aforementioned efforts.

Unfortunately, present hiring procedures do not adequately screen applicants according to the important behavioral styles that a student assistant should possess in order to succeed (Hoyt, 1967). More precise focusing of selection procedures would promote the delivery of student

services as well as improve the cost-effectiveness of administrative time invested.

This research sought to identify the potential usefulness of the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement (JAIM) in selecting student assistants with behavioral styles indicative of successful future job performance. It was hoped that the instrument would discriminate between the behavioral styles held by superior performing and weak performing student assistant groups--and furthermore, that this distinction could be made prior to job placements. Then, steps could be suggested which might, in part, improve the staff selection procedures and ultimately result in improved delivery of services in residence hall living-learning centers.

Statement of the Problem

The basic problem addressed by this study was the assessment of the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement as a tool for identifying the relationship of behavioral styles to job performance of student assistants. The purpose was to determine if the JAIM would generate information regarding student assistant behavioral styles which would be useful in the selection process. The selected research strategy entailed identification of superior and weak performing student assistants and the analysis of the behavioral styles of each group.

The stability of each group's behavioral styles was examined first through a test-retest format. It was deemed important to limit further analysis only to those behavioral styles which were not susceptible to significant change over a six month period of employment. The study examined the ability of the JAIM to discriminate between the behavioral styles of the superior and weak performing groups.

If it were found that significant differences did exist, then the JAIM could be used to define and describe these job performance indicators and administrators responsible for hiring student assistants could integrate refined assessment of the behavioral style indicators into the selection process. Furthermore, if it were found that any significant behavioral style differences existed prior to job placement, then the JAIM could be said to have potential predictive value.

Need for the Study

Two forces impinging upon the student personnel administrator spotlight the critical need to improve student assistant selection procedures. First, there is an increasing number of applicants for this position. At the institution studied in this research, four times as many students apply as are hired. Second, attrition is high. At Oklahoma State University approximately half of the experienced student assistants do not reapply for a second year of

employment in this position. An effective selection procedure would aid in reducing these problems.

The beginning point for the development of a selection procedure is an understanding of the theoretical framework upon which such a procedure is founded. In its ideal form, the selection procedure involves the following three steps:

1. The establishment of minimum job entrance requirements. This is a statement of the knowledge, skills and behavioral styles which an applicant should possess. The desired attributes are ranked according to their perceived importance to successful job performance.
2. The development and use of instruments and procedures focused on accumulating relevant data on each applicant.
3. The analysis of the data in terms of the established job requirements. Comparison of applicants is followed by selection of candidates determined to be best qualified, and hence, possessing the highest potential for success.

This procedure is seldom followed in its ideal form. Its weakest point is consideration of applicant behavioral styles as one important basis for selection.

In most institutions of higher education, the job description is used as the statement of job entrance requirements. While desirable knowledge and skills may be specifically spelled out or easily deduced from job

descriptions, behavioral styles tend to be ignored or only vaguely indicated. The following example was excerpted from the Oklahoma State University Student Assistant Job Description. The underlining was added to emphasize the references to desirable behavioral styles.

> Work closely and cooperatively with the student government and student leaders. Cultivate high morals and understanding of the Residence Counseling Program. Set an example through good behavior, dress, academic progress, and ethics. . . encourage respect for private and public property, and encourage respect for visitors in the students' residence living area. (Appendix A).

Data gathering instruments for selection procedures include self-reports (application forms), reports by others (recommendations), and personal assessment (applicant interview). In comparison to data solicited on the applicant's knowledge and skills, data on behavioral styles (if requested at all) tend to be biased when reported. The applicant's response to "State Your Student Personnel Philosophy" or "Why Are You Interested in This Position" is written to impress the reviewer. References listed for recommendations are chosen with the same purpose. Personal interviews are more apt to expose the applicant's verbal agility and adaptability than his values or future job behavioral styles.

Consequently, the analysis of the data (incomplete or biased) against the established criteria (which are at best extremely general) is a serious dilemma if "proper"

behavioral styles are considered important to the job and hence are a variable in selection.

There is a need to specify desired behavioral styles; to systematically and more objectively gather data on the applicant's possession of these behavioral styles; and to consider those behavioral styles which are associated with successful job performance when making staff selection. This study examines the potential use of the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement to meet this need.

Significance of the Study

If findings in this study show significant differences in the behavioral styles of the superior performing student assistant group as compared to the behavioral styles of the weak performing student assistant group, then several positions can be taken.

First, behavioral styles, per se, may be an important indicator of superior student assistant job performance (as institutionally defined) and, as such, should receive more consideration in the selection process. Second, the JAIM has value in determining which specific behavioral styles differentiate between superior and weak performing student assistant groups and thus has usefulness to the selection process by refining the evaluation of applicant data. Third, the JAIM may have some predictive value and, therefore, is an appropriate data-gathering instrument which should be incorporated into the selection process.

In addition to ascertaining information on selection, the research has relevance for four major audiences. The results of the research will benefit student personnel administrators of the institution studied, Oklahoma State University. This information will enable the institution to initiate steps to improve the procedures for selecting student assistants. If determined desirable, the selection procedures may incorporate the use of the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement. Potential benefits include a more competent and conscientious staff as well as a reduction in staff turnovers.

The dissemination of the study's results may encourage other institutions to examine their own staff selection procedures. If institutions so desire, the methodology and design suggested by this study can be utilized with a minimum of time, effort, personnel, expertise, and cost. Arrangements for obtaining copies of the test, having the tests scored and securing desired tabulations of the results can be made through the test's author, Dr. Regis H. Walther. The design of this research would not be difficult to replicate. Administering the instrument, individually or in a group setting, to student assistants during the staff orientation period and again after six months on the job could be accomplished with little interruption of the on-going staff schedule.

The research has significance to practitioners in the general field of personnel work. Although the use of

ability and aptitude tests as criteria for employee selection is widespread in government and business, there is a noticeable gap in research related to the use of behavioral tests for this purpose.

Further, the research helps extend and refine knowledge concerning the JAIM. Study of the instrument continues in evaluating its effectiveness of differentiating occupational categories and high and low performers within occupational categories. This is particularly important when a revised form of the instrument is developed. The research conducted with student assistants at Oklahoma State University utilizes the most current form which was developed in June, 1969. The hypotheses of this research are compatible with the long-range validity and reliability goals described by the test's author.

Hypotheses

Each of the null hypotheses below is examined for each of the following scales as measured by the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement: Optimism, Self-Confidence, Interpersonal Trust, Open System, Plan Ahead, Orderliness, Perserverance, Emotional Control, Schedule Activities, Self-Assertive, Supportive of Others, Take Leadership, Move Toward Aggressor, Move Away From Aggressor, Move Against Aggressor, Concrete-Practical, Systematic-Methodical, Act Independently, Work As An Assistant, Directive Leadership, Motivate By Rewards, Motivate By Results, Social Interaction,

Mechanical Activities, Group Participation, Activity-Frequent Change, Job Challenge, Status Attainment, Social Service, Approval From Others, Intellectual Achievement, and Role Conformity.

H_1: There is no significant difference in the scores of the superior performing student assistant group when they retake the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement after a six month period on the job.

H_2: There is no significant difference in the scores of the weak performing student assistant group when they retake the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement after a six month period on the job.

H_3: There is no significant difference in the behavioral styles of superior performing and weak performing student assistant groups as measured by the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement in August, 1971.

H_4: There is no significant difference in the behavioral styles of superior performing and weak performing student assistant groups as measured by the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement in February, 1972.

Definition of Terms

The terms used throughout this study are defined as follows:

1. Behavioral styles--The consistent ways individuals organize their physical, emotional and energy resources. The operational definition of the term is based on the measurements on the scales of the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement and encompasses work preferences and values.
2. Director--An individual employed by an institution of higher education to reside in a residence hall and to perform certain duties assigned by student personnel administrators.
3. JAIM--The Job Analysis and Interest Measurement developed over the past 14 years by Walther of the Social Research Group, The George Washington University. Form 669 was utilized in the study and is attached as Appendix B. The corresponding response sheet and answer key are included as Appendices C and D, respectively. Scales of the JAIM are reported in Appendix E.
4. Residence hall--A building that houses students living on the campus of an institution of higher education. The alternate form dormitory is sometimes used to designate a residence hall.
5. Student assistant--A student employed by an institution of higher education to reside in a residence hall and to perform certain duties assigned by the director of that residence hall. Alternate terms of staff member, resident

assistant, student counselor and paraprofessional are sometimes used to designate a student assistant.

6. Student personnel administrator--Individuals employed by an institution of higher education required to give overall direction to the residence halls. The alternate term of housing administrator is sometimes used.
7. Superior performing student assistant group--The highest performing 25 per cent of the staff members in each participating residence hall as identified by the director in February, 1972. Each director was allowed to use his own definition of competent job performance.
8. Weak performing student assistant group--The lowest performing 25 per cent of the staff members in each participating residence hall as identified by the director in February, 1972. Each director was allowed to use his own definition of least competent job performance.

Limitations of the Study

The study limits the population to one co-educational, midwestern state university with an enrollment of approximately 19,200. The institution's sixteen residence halls have a capacity for housing 7,316 students and are staffed by a total of 135 student assistants. Due to the

uncontrolled variables of time and the possible impact of concurrent "outside" events; personalities and philosophies of the student personnel administrators; personalities and philosophies of the directors who supervised and rated student assistants; and unique characteristics of the institution and its facilities, the results of this research cannot be generalized to any other population.

A second limitation is suggested by a potential weakness of the instrument. A self-report inventory such as the JAIM suffers from the possibility of "faking": respondents may check items that they feel are "right" or desirable, rather than those items which are truly descriptive of their own behavioral style.

A third limitation is that caution should be exercised in generalizing the results and potential use of the JAIM to stress situations--such as when a respondent's scores would qualify or disqualify him for a job. Previous research on the JAIM has included one study of the effect of stress on responses. While stress did influence the answers given, the average respondent did not appear to be able to predict what answer would benefit him the most (Walther, 1964). In the research described herein the student assistant subjects were administered the JAIM in a non-stress situation.

Assumptions of the Study

The theoretical assumptions underlying the development of the JAIM are in harmony with those associated with this

research:

> The identification of the common characteristics which distinguish high from low performers within a job category ... is useful for inferring both job requirements and worker qualifications ... This led to the following additional assumptions:
>
> 1. Jobs establish behavioral requirements, and provide opportunities for personal satisfaction and feelings of value;
>
> 2. Individuals bring to the job a behavioral style, preferences, and criteria for the judgment of success; and that
>
> 3. The degree of match between job and the individual, in these dimensions, crucially influences how well the individual will perform in the job (Walther, 1964, p. 2).

Another assumption of the JAIM is that behaviors (components of behavioral styles) are distinguishable; they are capable of being classified, identified, and described and, therefore, are subject to measurement--albeit approximate measurement. Finally, the JAIM assumes that "a reasonably well-adjusted individual knows what he likes and what he dislikes and what works or what does not work for him" (Walther, 1964, p. 2). It then follows that a self-report questionnaire can be utilized to measure his behavioral styles.

Utilization of the JAIM in the research strategy of this study assumes that student assistant job requirements imposed by the institution would remain constant throughout the study. Also, it is postulated that there would be some uniformity in the evaluation criteria used by directors to designate superior and weak job performance.

The research is grounded in the belief that the residence hall is a valid enrichment aspect of a student's higher education experience and the student assistant contributes to the impact of this experience.

Summary

This chapter discussed the importance of residence hall staff to the growth goals of college and university students. Behavioral styles of student assistants were discussed in terms of their impact upon successful job performance. A theoretical framework for selection procedures was described; an analysis of these procedures indicated the need to specify desirable student assistant behavioral styles and to explore ways to identify individual styles prior to hiring. The Job Analysis and Interest Measurement was cited as an instrument with potential usefulness in discriminating between behavioral styles of superior performing and weak performing employee groups and an overview of its use in this research was presented.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The emergence of residence halls as living-learning centers with responsibilities for informal education was particularly relevant to this study. Concomitant with the changing role of the residence hall has been the changing role of the staff. To examine the student development emphasis of residence halls was to document the need for staff competent to direct this emphasis. To identify the varied nature of residence hall informal education endeavors was to underscore the importance of discriminating employee selection procedures geared to match specific knowledge, skills, and behavioral styles with specific job performance requirements.

A historical perspective on the changing role of the residence hall was deemed important to introduce three contemporary roles: the residence hall as a center for growth through group interaction, the residence hall as a center for education, and the residence hall as a center for personal adjustment through counseling. This discussion was then related to the changing role of the student counselor

and a foundation was laid relative to the importance of employee selection. The literature was then reviewed to ascertain the "state of the art" of selection procedures in general and of student assistant selection procedures in particular.

Historical Perspective of Residence Halls

Charles Eliot, President of Harvard, in a letter to a friend in 1856 stated:

> 'This parietal business is a nuisance, disagreeable to shirk and disagreeable to do. Of the two the last evil is the least, though a certain damage to one's influence as a teacher is to be included among the bad consequences of doing this sort of work.' He might have elaborated further, but he was interrupted by a disturbance in the dormitory (Shay, 1964a, p. 182).

The road to acceptance has been stormy for residence halls on college campuses. During the colonial era college housing was initiated as a modification of the British system which was based on the belief that a student's residence was vital to his experiences at college. But the translation was poor for American colleges were isolated, religious, and catered to a young clientele. Instead of housing becoming part of a student's experience, it became an austere place of lodging with stringent rules. The following paragraph records what followed:

> Accounts of the activities in the educational institutions of the colonial era are filled with disciplinary problems. These incidents have generally been attributed to student reaction to the rigid pattern of their lives prescribed by the college. Rudolph (1962) cites an instance in

> which a duel resulting in the death of a student was precipitated by two students' grabbing for the same plate of trout at dinner. In the South violence was even greater. Earnerst (1953) tells of two college presidents who were killed by students. According to him, tutors were often barraged with sticks and stones, and in one case members of the faculty at the University of Virginia were horsewhipped by students. Students experienced so much difficulty in getting permission to leave campus that some University of Georgia students disguised themselves as Negroes, went to a circus, and sat in a section reserved for slaves so as not to be detected (Shay, 1964b, p. 27).

The 1800's, especially after mid-century, became the time of the decline and, in some cases, the disappearance of residence halls. Charles Eliot had had a distasteful reaction to his years as a tutor. Colleges were moving from religious to secular control. Faculty members at the time had studied at German universities and were influenced by the laissez-faire attitude of their alma maters toward responsibilities for students out of the classroom. Money was scarce and Henry Tappan, President of the University of Michigan, 1851, converted dormitories into classrooms. Even more important was the attitudinal reaction. The president of Brown, Francis Wayland, was quoted as describing dormitory life as <u>the</u> major contributor to the evils of American higher education (Shay, 1964a).

The twentieth century brought a swing toward the revival of residence halls. Community pressures mounted for greater control of the college student for rowdiness had become a major issue. Matthew Vassar had endowed a women's college which brought a new dimension to residence halls,

that is, "educating women to be ladies and ultimately good wives and mothers" (Shay, 1964a, p. 181).

Dormitories grew over the "dead bodies" of more than a few professors. They grew because they seemed to be the only instrument to promote the American ideal on college campuses. Regardless of one's background, everyone was to live together. After the war they grew as a reaction to the German educational processes, and for "ivy league" schools, they grew from the fear of mass education and the loss of a small college atmosphere. And, as they grew, there was a decrease in the separation of curricular and extracurricular activities (Shay, 1964b). They began to grow most rapidly in the same institutions which had previously been instrumental in the former demise of residence halls, the large state universities (Shaffer and Ferber, 1965).

This growth reflected the recurring concern for the "total education" of the child which prevails to this day. Students were also becoming more academically oriented; and the "Roaring '20's" brought an intellectual as well as a social revolution. As skirts became shorter discussions in dormitories of current topics became longer. The 1930's had brought sober, vocationally-oriented youths into higher education. And, as college enrollments mushroomed, Federal monies were employed in building housing projects on campuses. More importance was given to staffing the residence halls. Sociological and psychological concepts were being applied to dealing with students. Positions such as

Director of Housing were created to manage the residence halls which were becoming so large in number (Shay, 1964a). The concept of a residence hall as a place of learning emerged around the dual democratic principles of the opportunity for individual growth and development of each student and the indoctrination of that student into the society of which he is a part.

In summary, when viewed from a historical perspective, the history of college housing was a mirror of the educational philosophy of the times. When the emphasis was on intellectual and spiritual development, the concerns in residence halls were largely religious. When attention was focused on the German conception of residence halls, they became places which provided food and shelter. As the industrial revolution occurred, theories of learning were advanced. It was during the span of time in which the English philosophy dominated the thinking concerning residence halls that they flourished.

Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia, expressed the contemporary point of view by saying: "the chief purpose of the residence hall is not the housing of students, but of education and educational influence" (Fossett, 1957, p. 27).

Group Interaction Within Residence Halls

Helen Schleman described the offerings of a residence hall as being conducive to individual growth and development

in terms reflective of a college catalogue's course descriptions:

> S.E.1 --a four-year course in elementary Social Education offered by the Department of Residence Halls . . . An intensive, first-hand study of the fundamental principles underlying human behavior with special emphasis upon techniques of getting along with people. . . . Involves daily laboratory experiments in analyzing the other fellow's point of view accompanied by . . . mediation, conciliation and compromise. I.E. & D. 1 --a four-year course in Individual Education and Development. . . a practical course in the development of interests, tastes, personal habits, and personality traits. . . direct observation . . . of oneself and those of a similar age group (Fossett, 1957, pp. 28-29).

In her dissertation study, Freeda Odessa Hartzfeld (1947) drew from the sciences of biology, anthropology, sociology, and psychology, and established four basic assumptions about general growth and development. She applied these assumptions to residence halls and concluded that residence halls serve well as laboratories for socializing and developing students.

From biology she drew the tenet that a human being is a product of his environment, as well as of his inherited genes. She applied the anthropological findings that while general societal influences affect an individual, the influential differences between societies is that the experiences which activate on life in one society will produce a result which differs from the results achieved in another identified society. (An army will produce a different individual, for example, than a university.) Sociologists' views on adolescent peer pressure groups were

discussed relative to residence halls. And finally, she devoted her attention to the psychologists' terminology of the need to become self-sufficient, the need to develop a satisfying point of view, the need for emotional independence from a family, and the need to develop relationships to the opposite sex (Hartzfield, 1947).

Hartzfield discussed the residence hall as a particular societal grouping offered by colleges to provide students the opportunity to work out the problems of independence and growing maturity where college administrators offer freedom and guidance for self-direction. She described it as a vital setting for warm friendships, for activities which foster responsibility and social skills, and for mutual support. Her discussion is summed up in the words of Harriet Hayes:

> They (residence halls) have power greatly to further the essential purposes of colleges, which include the development of socialized human beings as well as the promotion of scholarship. They may become the college's best agency for the promotion of a democratic social life among its students--a life which should be rich in experiences and broadening in its influences (Hartzfeld, 1947, p. 21).

The Harvard housing system, as discussed by Jencks and Reismann (1962), was founded on the aforementioned principles. The administration of Harvard in the 1930's decided that housing did as much to improve undergraduate education as did increased faculty salaries and library books. The houses that Harvard established have been viewed as centers of learning and leisure, with the dining area as

the most important feature. The master ran the house assisted by senior tutors, graduate students, nonresident tutors, senior associates and faculty members who attended house functions. The result is that:

> . . . in this atmosphere, the houses re-enforce the student's own desire to find friends in an unforced setting, uncontaminated by ambition, uncoerced by the brotherhood of the club or fraternity. . . . These friends will largely be from within his own house which is large enough to satisfy his developing sense of self, and by this time familiar enough to seem protective and comfortable (Jencks and Reismann, 1962, p. 750).

The importance of growth through interaction was further affirmed by a study of 3,000 students at Michigan State University which concluded, "The most significant reported experience in the collegiate lives of these students was their association with differing personalities in their living unit" (Dressel and Lehmann, 1965, p. 255).

To list the ways personal and social growth occur in a residence hall would not be as important as to say that persons live in residence halls and bring with them into the setting vitality, creativity, leadership qualities, talents and other attributes. While this is individual, it merges to create a Group, a Personality. The residence hall's greatest offering to a developing individual was brought into focus by former President Wilber of Stanford when he said: "Since living in a dormitory with several hundred boys for a number of years I have discovered no new kind of man and no new kind of human reaction" (Hartzfeld, 1947, p. 21).

While group association and personal interaction are growth promoting, per se, colleges and universities have been experimenting with living environments structured to enhance this impact. Hubbell and Sherwood (1973) described living-learning residences which match environmental options to individual student needs and thus aid students in their personal, social, and educational development. The University of Delaware, recognizing that learning should occur outside the classroom and that this is an on-going process without parameters, has experimented with various living-learning centers in an attempt to meet diversified student needs (Littlefield and Spencer, 1973).

Morstain (1972) described the "speciality houses" program at the University of California at Davis where each freshman residence hall centers on a specific theme. For instance, freshmen residing in the theme center "Self in Society" shared a common "course" which helped them examine their relationship to the university and to society. Morstain pointed out that resident advisors are selected not only on their interpersonal abilities but also on their academic competencies since they become small group leaders. The program has encouraged on-campus and off-campus student involvement, taking the form of committee work, research, governance, and other approved self-initiated projects.

Residence halls have also been structured to provide a logical setting for integrated efforts toward applied leadership and participatory governance. The Carnegie Commission

on Higher Education (1973) investigated undergraduate attitudes toward student participation in residence halls. Of the 10,002 students queried, 78 percent stated that undergraduates should have some form of "control" or voting power on committees concerned with residence halls.

Hoelting (1973) cited a case study of student participation in residence hall programming. Students were encouraged to form interest groups through which they generated program ideas and planned, financed, and administered the selected activities. As a result of the emphasis and methodology, 1,246 students were involved in group work initiated within the residence hall, as compared with 40 the previous year. Since the residence hall held only 500 students, the effort had campus-wide effect.

The literature also reported the structuring of living environments to integrate the institution's academic goals with the residence hall's growth-through-association goals. Both Southern Illinois University and Indiana University have emphasized faculty involvement in the residence halls. At the former university, the fusion of living and learning has occurred as faculty members live in residence units. The Indiana program included group dynamics, leadership training, and co-curricular learning activities in the residence halls. The number of faculty members associated with the residence halls has grown from 20 to 70 in less than four years (Shaffer and Ferber, 1965). DePauw University in Chicago established eight orientation sessions

directed to incoming residents. Session topics included the responsibilities of a college educated person, academic freedom, discrimination, and types of societies. The emphasis by the faculty-rank staff was on awareness and free and open discussion (Campbell and Richards, 1964).

Educational Influence of Residence Halls

Whether, in fact, an institution's educational goals are influenced or promoted by the existence of residence halls has been an issue of continuing controversy. Several theories have been established to explain the direct and indirect influence of residence halls on the educational advancement of students. There has been a pleading tone in the statements of those scholars who recognize the potential of residence halls as educational centers. Stephen Leacock, in an address at McGill University, expressed this philosophy:

> As a college teacher, I have long since realized that the most that a teacher, as such, can do for the student is a very limited matter. The real thing for the student is the life and environment that surround him. All that he really learns, he learns, in a sense, by the active operation of his own intellect and not as the passive recipient of lectures. And for this active operation what he needs most is the continued and intimate contact with his fellows. Students must live together and eat together, talk and smoke together. Experience shows that this is how their minds really grow. And they must live together in a natural and comfortable way . . . If a student is to get from his college what it should give him, a college dormitory, with the life in common that it brings is his absolute right. . . . A university that fails to give it to him is cheating him (Fossett, 1957, p. 32).

The literature reported tangible evidence of the controversy. Chickering (1974) investigated the differences between commuting students and resident students and concluded that the residence hall environment had a significant impact on the changes in attitudes, values, future plans, aspirations, personal development, and intellectual competency of freshmen students. An opposite finding was reported by Baird (1969) who studied the effects of college residence groups on student's self-concepts, goals, and achievements. His sample included 2,295 men and 2,854 women attending 20 colleges. Six groups were created: dormitory, fraternity/sorority, off-campus apartments, on-campus apartments, off-campus rooms, and living at home. College grades and self-ratings were used to determine academic achievement and an analysis of covariance was applied to assess effects. Baird concluded that the living group "apparently had little effect on college achievement in science, writing, humanities, speech and drama, art and music" (p. 1020). The most definite statement Baird made about dormitory students was that they are the least likely to have cars! His concluding thoughts indicated the present status of residence halls as educational centers: while the potential impact is present, it is as yet unrealized.

That the potential impact may be realized through the influence of residence hall staff was advanced in a study by Zirkle and Hudson (1975). They examined the behavioral styles of student assistants and related these to grades and

maturity of residents. Their study involved 229 freshmen male residence hall students from Pennsylvania State University. The subjects were asked to classify their student assistants as being counselor-oriented or administrator-oriented. Grade point averages were utilized to pinpoint academic achievement; responses to the Perceived Self-Questionnaire produced an overall maturity score. The statistical results showed that the students living under a counselor-oriented student assistant had grade point averages and maturity scores significantly higher than the students residing under administrator-oriented staff.

Personal Adjustment Focus of Residence Halls

The need for counselor-oriented student assistants was further documented by the literature relative to the role of the residence hall as a center for personal adjustment and growth through counseling. "It matters not in which type of housing a student lives . . . it is here that the student personnel program of the institution can really function" (Cunningham, 1958, p. 24).

Rhoda Orme (1950) in Counseling in Residence Halls identified five factors which contribute to making residence halls the most promising location for on-campus counseling.

The initial factor considered was the residence hall's informal atmosphere. Since the counselor participated in

activities and daily experiences of the residents, conversation comes to be natural, relaxed and responsive.

Second, she cited the unlimited opportunity for observation. Said an experienced resident director, "I have often found it impossible to discover a situation before it assumes tragic proportions" (p. 12).

The third factor was the student assistant's opportunity to deal with many kinds of needs. If a personal crisis occurs, the student assistant is an immediately available counseling source. If a student is exhibiting unusual behavior it is relatively easy for a staff member to inquire about the health of the resident. If the student assistant is aware of a withdrawn or emotionally upset resident he can attempt to merge conversation with counseling.

Next was the residence hall's ideal location for general adjustment problems. How to manage one's time, how to live with others in the same rooms, how to assume social responsibilities, and how to practice democracy are intertwined in dormitory living and reinforced by the counseling.

Finally, the flexibility of conducting interviews was viewed as paramount. Interviews can be scheduled or spontaneous, formal or informal.

The restrictions of office hours are usually absent; and, the student assistant who is accessible encourages communications that, in different surroundings, might not have taken place.

The literature has documented the variety of problems brought by residents to their staffs, thus affirming the importance of residence halls as locations conducive to counseling. Lipsetz (1973) has reported that student assistant counseling is a major factor in helping students in their individual development. Karman (1974) investigated students at a public and private college to determine differences in expectations of the two groups as measured by five sub-scales. Students from both colleges selected "Personal Development" as being most important. After interviewing faculty members and assessing their reluctance to deal with matters relating to students' individual growth, Karman recommended that the student personnel administrators coordinate and implement programs to meet this need.

Noting the importance of the interaction between student assistants and residents, Johnson (1958) surveyed the types of problems which students discussed with their staff members. Major problems included housing and dormitory information; academic information; basic values and issues; and interpersonal adjustment.

Similar results were reported by Frye (1961) who identified and classified 3,786 student problems brought to residence hall assistants into 13 major categories. Five categories accounted for over 70 percent of the problems: aid in homework and study problems; university rules and dormitory information; academic information; social poise and etiquette; and interpersonal adjustment. While the

remaining categories represented proportionally fewer problems, their inclusion further documented the variety of concerns with which student assistants must deal. They included religious problems, ethics discussions, physical health problems, vocational concerns, financial problems, legal problems, family relations, and interpersonal conflicts.

Frye (1961) studied the importance of residence hall counseling by examining the number and types of problems voluntarily brought by male students to undergraduate student assistants and to Deans of Men. Data were collected through questionnaires and interviews with student assistants and Deans at ten midwestern colleges and universities. His study had two major findings. First, he stated that over four times as many problems were taken by students to the counselors than to the Deans. Second, he found that of the 3,786 problems brought to the undergraduate student assistants, they referred only 280 of them and only 69 to the Deans. The importance of counseling within the residence hall is underscored by his results.

A broader-based study by Dramer, Berger, and Miller (1974) confirmed the variety of student concerns. Questionnaires were distributed to 1,200 students and the response of 433 usable questionnaires were analyzed. Reported results included the finding that 48 percent of the male respondents and 61 percent of the female respondents checked vocational choice as being a serious concern. Personal

unhappiness was listed by 33 percent of the males and 56 percent of the females. Academic concerns were reflected by 25 percent of the males and 34 percent of the females.

The literature also reported the perspective of student attitudes toward the counseling and guidance functions of the residence hall staff. Staff members from the Division of Student Affairs at Indiana University devised the Residence Hall Environment Index to determine undergraduate students' attitudes toward student assistants. Of the 1,350 selected, 1,100 responded. Tabulation showed that 74.6 percent believed the role of the student assistant was to aid students in academic, personal, and social development (Duvall, 1969).

Sedlucek and Horowitz (1974) examined freshmen responses to the College and University Environmental Scales and found that the subjects "expected a highly studious environment emphasizing self-understanding, but at the same time practical, with some consideration of others" (p. 48). Within the residence hall environment, the student assistant has been directed to meet this need.

Changing Role of the Student Counselor

The previous sections have discussed the role of the residence hall as a growth-stimulating facility which potentially promotes group interaction, education, and personal adjustment. The catalytic and direct involvement of the residence hall staff has had a major impact on the

degree to which these goals were attained. The established and emerging role of the student counselor--implicit in the foregoing discussions--has been explicitly discussed in this section.

Historical Perspective

In the 1930's skeptics considered student personnel "an educational upstart with little academic breeding to merit scholarly attention" (Cunningham, 1958, p. 34). At the same time, however, some institutions were experimenting with undergraduate student assistants in the residence halls. The growth of residence hall counseling programs began slowly, with two programs established from 1930-1935, seven programs established from 1936-1940, and eight programs established from 1941-1945.

To have participated in the use of undergraduate women as student assistants prior to 1940 was to have been a pioneer in the field. Ohio Wesleyan University and the University of Maine reported the earliest date for the establishment of such programs and remained the sole institutions with such programs for five years. Women's colleges had developed student advising plans but coeducational campuses had yet to entertain the thought. And, it was not until 1946 that teacher training institutes began to utilize student assistants.

The growth of residence hall counseling programs evidenced a slight surge during the next decade with 25

programs established from 1946-1951 and 35 programs established from 1951-1956. As programs grew, the responsibilities of the student assistants began changing from semi-administrative functions to duties involving the actual counseling of freshmen. In indicating the rapid advancement of the responsibilities of undergraduate student assistants it was startling to realize that as late as 20 years ago the student assistants at a midwestern school were hired to sit in the corridors to maintain order in the evening (Cunningham, 1958)!

Margaret L. Cunningham (1958), in her dissertation entitled "Dormitory Counseling Programs in Selected Colleges and Universities Which Utilize Undergraduate Women Counselors," reported finding two universally-mentioned functions of residence hall student assistants in her review of job descriptions: first, to make residence hall programs personal for each student; and, second, to perform distinct services as a liaison between students and staff.

Riker (1965) viewed student assistants as the people who can identify student needs and, when necessary, refer the student to appropriate sources of assistance. Another study noted that staff were expected to counsel students on study habits and personal problems (Crane, 1961).

Contemporary and Emerging Roles

The student assistant role is that of a paraprofessional. Student personnel administrators have been

concerned with the effectiveness of paraprofessionals and with the degree to which they can accept responsibilities traditionally delegated to those with credentials (Allen, 1974). Zunker and Brown's study (1966) compared the effectiveness of certified school counselors to the effectiveness of student assistants in helping freshmen. The results noted that the student assistants were not only more effective, but also better accepted by their clients.

The effective utilization of student assistant paraprofessionals on the college campus has not been limited to the residence halls. One study reported successful use of paraprofessionals as group leaders for interpersonal communications skills training (Archer, 1972); another described their use as group leaders in psychology classes (Wrenn and Mencke, 1972).

Pyle and Snyder (1970) have reported an increased use of student paraprofessionals by community colleges. Daytona Beach Community College (1975) has identified specific tasks appropriately assigned to paraprofessionals and has established a peer counseling program to facilitate implementation. Peer counselors have facilitated the reception of new students to campus; interpreted the college's philosophy; explained the college catalogue, degree requirements, and course information; assisted students in planning tentative academic programs; interpreted and promoted counseling services; participated in growth groups with professional counselors; befriended lonely students; and acted as referral

agents. Brown (1974) found that many studies regarding paraprofessionals have been of poor design, but that well-designed studies concluded that student-paraprofessionals contribute positively to the improved adjustment of the student-clients.

The literature cited expanded use of paraprofessionals in a variety of the "helping" professions: as telephone crisis workers (Tucker, Mengenity, and Virgil, 1970); within social services (Gartner and Riessman, 1974); within elementary and secondary schools (Varenhorst, 1974); within mental health agencies (Nicoletti and Flater-Benz, 1974); in minority programs (Thomas and Yates, 1974); in employment work (Gordon, 1974); in drug education (Rudow, 1974); and with community counseling centers (DeMoss, 1974).

Training Emphasis

The broadening role of the student counselor has necessitated implementation of training efforts to improve job-related knowledge, skills, and behavioral styles. Many colleges and universities have established a credit course for this purpose. A frequently used model has been Carkhuff's empathic understanding which centers on the ability to listen, to respond to feelings, and to avoid well-intentioned approaches that are more damaging than beneficial (Bishop, 1972). Taking a portion of Carkhuff's scale, Newton (1974) designed and tested a training program specifically oriented toward improving empathic understanding,

respect, and communicative accuracy of student assistants.

An absence of empathy training for student counselors was noted in the article "Effects of Short-Term Training on Residence Hall Assistants" (Mitchell, 1971). The author's review of the literature reported that although 40 percent of the colleges using student assistants required them to counsel students for personal problems, only 20 percent of these utilized role playing or practice exercises in their training. The remainder utilized less participatory and/or basic information oriented teaching techniques. In response to this Mitchell designed and tested an empathy-oriented training course. A control group and an experimental group were selected from the pool of resident assistants at the University of Arkansas. After the empathy training was directed to the experimental group post-tests were administered to both groups in the form of simulated counseling interviews. The experimental group had significantly higher "accurate empathy" and "warmth" scores than did the control group.

Another model proposed to meet the training needs of student assistants was that of the psychoecological counselor (Peterson and Spooner, 1973). The thesis advanced was that a student is influenced by peers, faculty and staff and, therefore, a student assistant should work with the individual student and the "significant others." Training would aid the student assistant in helping the client to "act,

experience the consequences of his actions, and have an opportunity to reflect on his experiences and feelings about them" (p. 47).

Nickerson and Harrington, authors of The College Student as Counselor (1972), reported that their text is utilized in the resident assistant training program at Lewis and Clark College. Here staff have been encouraged to assume varied responsibilities including problem solving, friction reduction, supportive action, and project initiation. The authors have stated that the text's usefulness as a teaching tool is enhanced by its descriptions of staff roles and responsibilities (e.g., how the residence hall experience can help students mature; staff responsibility for student personal growth; the resident assistant as referral agent); descriptions of techniques (e.g., counseling approaches; how to deal with serious problems; the floor as a cooperative unit); and descriptions of specific problems in residence halls.

Job-oriented training for residence hall student assistants has been only one aspect of contemporary paraprofessional training. Danish and Brock (1974) described a broader training program oriented to any paraprofessional. True and Young (1974) described the recent Associate Degree in Mental Health-Human Services that is offered in 174 colleges. In a somewhat different vein, Moore (1974) had advocated the training of professionals in the skills of utilizing, supervising, and evaluating paraprofessionals.

He has further described a systematic approach to this training.

Brown (1974) stated that institutions utilizing student assistants want individuals who are empathic, warm, sensitive, self-confident, and who can accept other people's values. The discussion of the emerging role of the student counselor referenced job emphases requiring these abilities. Training efforts have been directed to improving expression and utilization of these qualities. Of ultimate importance, however, is the initial selection of employees embodying these qualifications. The final two sections examine the "state of the art" of selection procedures.

Overview of Employee Selection Procedures

It is possible, but extremely difficult, for employers to define the knowledge, skills, and behavioral styles necessary for an employee to successfully perform a given job. That the actual demands of a position can be identified--and that steps have been taken to accomplish this--was described in a study by Rabourn (1967). Middle managers having supervisory responsibilities over employees in one job category were asked to identify the important variables predictive of job success; the 13 managers identified 41 variables.

The ideal situation is when the employer knows "the exact requirements of the job, the degree of importance of each requirement to the total position, and, of course, the

accuracy of the predictor in measuring each requirement and the total, or whole, job" (Rabourn, 1967, p. 211).

One way to approach the problem of predicting job performance is to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of successful versus unsuccessful businessmen. A study conducted at Harvard University analyzed the Thematic Apperception Test scores of 473 executives. It was found that 11 traits exclusively identified successful businessmen; 12 different traits identified unsuccessful businessmen. In some of the cases both successful and unsuccessful executives' scores on the test were not in accord with superiors' ratings. In these cases an examination was made of the businessmen's letters of recommendations. More often than not the appraisals cited in the recommendations were in agreement with the test scores (Gardner, 1948).

Once the desirable abilities and characteristics have been established for a given job or position, the next step is to implement procedures for gathering relevant data on applicants for that position. Using tests for this purpose has been an established practice by business.

> Surveys show that 80 percent or more of business and industrial organizations, excluding only the smallest, have testing programs. The most frequent purposes of these programs are to help assure good employee selection, placement, and appraisal for promotion (French, 1966, p. 19).

In 1965 the Administrative Management Society surveyed 88 members and requested information concerning screening procedures for hiring recent high school graduates. Results

showed that 66 companies gave typing tests; 40 companies assigned shorthand tests, and 36 companies used math tests. However, only 11 companies adopted any interest, temperament, attitude, or personality testing program ("A.M.S. Survey Shows New Trends in Employment Testing," 1965).

While there is little documented use of such self-report inventories in selection procedures, the use of these instruments is not foreign in the business world. For many years business has used the attitude survey to identify employee complaints and organizational weaknesses. Prompting the use of the survey has been management's desire to facilitate communications among lower, middle, and top levels of employees (McClure, 1966).

The positive or negative attitudes of employees toward their jobs were studied in the Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company. An eight item attitude test utilizing a five point Likert scale was administered to technical employees. The results from this test were compared to information obtained at the time of hire including interviewer's prediction of future effectiveness and scores on the Minnesota Engineering Analogies Test. Neither the interviewer's predictions nor the engineering knowledge test scores seemed to be related to consequent employee attitudes toward work. However, when employees were asked to rate their own performance, there was a relationship between this and the attitude scores. Any value in the study's results appears to have been negated by comments of the company's

Director of Personnel Research who pointed out that the eight items were not necessarily good samples of attitude and that the assessment of job performance may not have been particularly good (Kirchner, 1967).

Analysis of the data gathered on each applicant in order to make selection decisions necessitates consideration and evaluation of the procedure used for collecting the data. "Some advocates feel that any additional insights a manager can glean into the inner thoughts, personality traits, and motivations of a job applicant are legitimate aids to finding the best man to fill responsible positions" ("Two Authorities Put Psychological Testing on The Couch," 1967, p. 37). Of particular concern is data gathered relevant to applicants' behavioral styles.

The personal interview is one of the major procedures utilized to gather data on applicants' behavioral styles. The validity of the interview approach was questioned in a study by Wedell (1951). Two hundred subjects were asked to rate their attitudes toward certain critical situations. The subjects were then questioned by six trained and experienced interviewers in relation to self-reported attitudes by subjects. Perhaps more important was the finding that there was little agreement among the various interviewers. An assumption that the responses of the more experienced interviewers would indicate more insight in appraisal of employee attitudes was rejected after reviewing the data.

The validity of the employee interview was also questioned by Lipstreau (1966), Professor of Management in the School of Business at the University of Colorado. Lipstreau theorized that the interviewer's preponderance of subjectivity distorted what occurred in the interview situation. Problems have also resulted from inexperienced interviewers who tend to either oversell or undersell a position. Poor communication skills and appraisal skills have also been cited as contributing to poor selections. Lipstreau urged that interview skills be upgraded periodically in order to aid the selection process.

Regardless of expressed dissatisfaction with interviewing as a selection technique, it has remained the most widely used process (Mandel, 1956). The interview has been perpetuated by its attributes: it is inexpensive; it is a rapid device requiring little preparation; it permits managers to see an applicant; and it is personal.

King Whitney, Jr., president of The Personnel Laboratory, Inc., and Dr. Robert N. McMurry, psychologist and head of the McMurry Company, discussed the relative value of tests ("Two Authorities Put Psychological Testing on The Couch," 1967). Both men agreed that tests were more beneficial in describing an individual, while McMurry's philosophy was that tests or any selection device should be used as a means of predicting the applicant's future performance. Whitney stated:

> You can do away with psychological testing or with an interview with a psychologist, but you can't do away with psychology in the selection process. Someone is going to practice it--the man's immediate supervisor or the personnel department. We all use it in everyday living (p. 44).

Caution has been advised in using tests not specifically designed for the purpose of job selection. If such tests are used, their results should be given minimum weight and should only be used as an aid in examining impressions based on other data collected (Ellovich, 1968).

Sidney Morris, assistant treasurer, American Savings and Loan Association, Detroit, strongly recommended the use of testing programs for applicant selection. His organization's testing program utilized both aptitude and personality tests. He reported that the latter assisted in identifying indications of extroversion, stability, anxiety levels, leadership qualities, creativity, and initiative. With the implementation of such an extensive testing program, test proponent Morris (1967) hastened to add:

> Even a perfect score on all of these factors will not assure us of the perfect trainee and employee. The tests are strictly a guide to be used in addition to the applicant's job experience, personality, appearance, references, and interviews by department heads (p. 48).

No surveys have proven beyond a reasonable doubt that possession of success predictors--whether they be grades, attitudes, abilities, or activities--will result in success, or that without them an applicant will be unsuccessful. However, "by utilizing personnel tests, you have a guideline; without them, at best, you are guessing" (Morris, 1967, p.48).

Counselor Selection Procedures

Selection procedures are credited as one of the most important factors determining the success of a residence hall counseling program (Cunningham, 1958).

> Recruiting staff for residence halls necessitates that the student personnel administrator have a clear concept of the contributions the halls are to make to the educational objectives of his institution . . . He must create realistic job descriptions which include emphasis upon the relationship between jobs and the relationship between individuals on the jobs (Shaffer and Greenleaf, 1965, p. 28).

The literature outlines a plethora of job requirements assigned to student assistants. These in turn suggest particular knowledges, skills, and behavioral styles which student assistants should possess in order to perform effectively.

What methods do administrators use to collect data on applicants in order to select those best qualified to perform the job of student assistant? Dixon (1970) studied the student assistant selection procedures employed in 279 small private institutions. The results indicated that most used an application form, personal interview, and references. A similar study by Murphy (1964) confirmed the predominant use of these three practices in 107 other institutions. Brown and Zunker (1966) found that institutions with an enrollment over 2,000 emphasized grade point average and the residence hall director's recommendation. Similar institutions gave greater weight to peer-acceptance ratings.

Data on an applicant's leadership abilities has been deemed important in selection. Kidd (1952) believed that a mistake in judgment in the selection of a student assistant could make a difference in the growth of the students in the residence hall. He devised a sociometric test and found that the Leadership score was most important. He viewed the following criteria as necessary for a good student assistant: grades, reputation, appearance, speech, philosophy, and general maturity. Kidd found some administrators used their own "personal knowledge" of student leaders as a selection method. Others utilized sociometric techniqes. At two Michigan State University residence halls, 94 percent of the 639 students responded to a questionnaire which requested their choices of friends and leaders in the residence halls. This information was considered in the selection procedures.

Murphy (1964) found that only 22 percent of the 107 institutions which he surveyed reported using test scores as one basis for selection. However, the literature suggested that tests can be used effectively--not only to gather data on applicants, but also to assist in determining which applicants have the most potential for success.

Simons (1968) found significant differences between successful and less successful groups of student assistants on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperment Survey and on the Religious and Theoretical Value scales of the Allport-Vernon Study of Values. The results also suggested that tests are fairly valid and reliable when used for selection.

Conflicting results have been reported concerning the use of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank and the Edwards Personal Preference Scales. Some researchers found these tests to have predictive value in distinguishing successful student assistants from those less successful (Dolan, 1965); other researchers found no significance in the results (Murphy, 1966). Such negative results should not cancel out the potential usefulness and predictive ability of the positive results. Lawshe (1952) supported this by citing the principle of situational validity which ". . . refers to a validity statistic specifically determined in a particular selection situation; no effort (should be) made to apply this statistic to populations other than the one from which the validating sample was drawn" (p. 31).

It might be hypothesized that a psychological test would aid in discriminating between high performing and low performing groups of student assistants. However, research involving the use of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory for this purpose revealed no significant differences between these two groups (Schroeder, 1968).

Relevant to this discussion was research conducted with 560 subjects who held Indiana school counselor certificates and were employed by public schools as either full-time teachers, administrators, or counselors. The purpose of the study was to determine if "life history" factors were indicative of career commitment. Subjects identified as having a career commitment were those who were still employed as

full-time counselors. "The scored life history utilized the collection of data which are representative of self-report information pertaining to unplanned, typical events and circumstances in the everyday life of individuals"(Frey, 1969, p. 952). Items on the instrument, particularly those relating to personal needs for giving and receiving affection and intimacy, were predictive of a counselor career commitment.

Summary

The historical development of the residence hall has been traced to its present-day status as a living-learning center geared toward effecting student self-actualization. The residence hall counselor has been responsible for the delivery of services deemed necessary to optimize the residence hall's influence as a center for growth through group interaction, as a center for education, and as a center for personal adjustment through group counseling. Established and emerging roles of the residence hall counselor, job responsibilities necessitated by these roles, and employee qualifications required for effective job performance have been identified by the literature.

In his role as a staff member, the student assistant has served as a direct source of institutional information: advising students on university rules, academic information, and dormitory information. Furthermore, he has acted as a referral agent, linking students to specialized assistance

and other university and community resources. The group environment of the residence hall has established certain job functions. The student assistant has been charged with fostering social interaction, including the facilitating, planning, and/or implementing of programs.

Although the aforementioned student assistant job responsibilities have an effect upon student adjustment and growth, the literature has emphasized that his primary job function is the promoting of individual students' personal development through counseling and guidance. The student assistant job has required that he identify and respond to student problems. The position also has dictated that he influence student growth and maturity through the personal example which he sets. Fulfillment of these responsibilities has required the student assistant to be accessible; to interact with students; to be a role-model for interpersonal actions; to be empathic and supportive; and, thereby, to establish a rapport which will encourage students to seek his assistance and which will permit him to intervene if he feels his guidance is needed.

Student personnel administrators have been confronted with the difficulty of selecting staff with the knowledge, skills, and behavioral styles oriented to this job performance. Most selection has continued to be based on three data sources: the application form, references, and the personal interview. Some utilization of tests to gather information on applicant behavioral styles has been noted.

Research on the use of tests for this purpose has been more evident in business than in education.

This review has discussed the importance of the student assistant position and has indicated some of the behavioral style requirements viewed as necessary for successful job performance. The literature has confirmed the need for more thorough exploration of behavioral styles as a basis for selection. The research design of this study has assessed the usefulness of the JAIM to elicit student assistant behavioral style information relevant to the selection process.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study examined behavioral styles of weak performing and superior performing student assistant groups at two points in time through use of the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement. The hypotheses were developed to determine which behavioral styles reflected test-retest stability for each group and, of these, if any differentiated between the two groups at either the test or retest point in time. The primary purpose was to ascertain if data gathered via the JAIM would be a useful adjunct to the student assistant selection process.

Subjects

The student assistants utilized as subjects were employed by Oklahoma State University for the school year beginning September, 1971. All student assistants, and thus all subjects, were undergraduates.

A residence hall with a student assistant staff of less then eight was not analyzed in this study because of the difficulty in discriminating superior performing from weak performing student assistants among a small number of staff

members. The following 11 residence halls were utilized: East Bennett, West Bennett, Cordell, Drummond, Kerr, Murray, Stout, Wentz, Willard, Willham North, and Willham South. Table I identifies all residence halls at Oklahoma State University, the number of student assistants on the staff, and the total number of students residing in the hall as of September, 1971.

In February, 1972, each director of the 11 designated residence halls was asked to identify his 25 percent best performing student assistants. (Rounding off was permitted if there was not a whole number when taking 25 percent.) This group was designated as the superior performing student assistants. The same request was made in order to identify the 25 percent lowest performing student assistants in each dormitory. This group was then designated as the weak performing student assistants. The student assistants who were not rated (the middle 50 percent in each residence hall) were not investigated in the study.

The 11 participating residence halls had the following number of student assistants as subjects in the study: Stout, Wentz, and Willard--the two superior performing and the two weak performing student assistants from each dormitory; East Bennett, West Bennett, Cordell, Drummond, Kerr, Murray, Willham North, and Willham South--the three superior performing and the three weak performing student assistants from each dormitory. Of the initially identified 60 student assistants, subject mortality and unusable JAIM response

TABLE I

RESIDENCE HALL STAFF AND
OCCUPANCY STATISTICS

Residence Hall:	Student Assistants:	Designed Occupancy:
Brumley	3	120
*Drummond	11	705
North Hall	4	138
*Stout	8	413
*Wentz	9	567
*West Bennett	12	545
*Willard	8	413
*Willham South	13	824
Total Women:	68	3725
Athletic	4	236
*Cordell	12	500
Cordell Annex	1	22
*East Bennett	12	551
*Kerr	11	705
*Murray	8	400
Parker	4	236
Scott	4	236
*Willham North	11	705
Total Men:	67	3591
Grand Total:	135	7316

*Residence Halls Which Participated in This Study

sheets reduced the total number to 44 subjects. This represented a 21 member superior performing group and a 23 member weak performing group. Each group comprised a 70 percent minimum response.

Procedures

Permission was obtained from the test's author, Dr. Regis Walther, to utilize the JAIM for this research. The proposed study was discussed with Oklahoma State University Housing Department staff members. Permission was secured to utilize residence hall student assistants as subjects, and the Housing Department staff so informed the residence hall directors.

The initial data-gathering step was to administer the JAIM to all student assistants during the staff's orientation week in August, 1971. A testing period of 75 minutes was scheduled for this purpose.

> It has been found that it requires about 50 minutes for the average person working in a whitecollar job to complete the JAIM and almost all will finish it within 60 minutes. There is no time limit, but subjects should be encouraged to work as rapidly as possible (Walther, 1964, p. 11).

The testing session was introduced with a brief explanation of the JAIM; it was emphasized that the JAIM was not a test with "right" or "wrong" answers, but a survey-type instrument constructed to examine behavioral styles of student assistants. Instructions were given relative to completion of the response sheets (Appendices B and C) and the students

instructed to begin. The total testing period required 70 minutes.

Student assistants who were absent from the group-administered testing session were contacted and scheduled for individual test appointments. Individual tests were administered in a manner identical to that used in the group setting. Approximately one week elapsed before all testing was completed. Although the JAIM was administered in both group and individual settings, this was not viewed as consequential to the results:

> The JAIM may be administered either individually or to large groups. . . . It is desirable, but not essential, that the JAIM be given under test conditions (Walther, 1964, p. 11).

In February, 1972, all available subjects were individually retested using the same instrument. The process required three weeks to complete, due to difficulty in contacting and scheduling the subjects.

Concurrent with the second testing, each participating residence hall director was individually instructed to identify the 25 percent superior performing student assistants and the 25 percent weak performing student assistants on his staff. Selection criteria were not presented to the residence hall directors since recommendations for employment and reemployment of student assistants at the time of this study were based primarily upon the director's subjective opinions.

The aforementioned procedures yielded test and retest response sheets for the identified superior performing and

weak performing student assistants. Response sheets were batched into four groups in preparation for data analysis: superior performing student assistant group as recorded in August, 1971; weak performing student assistant group as recorded in August, 1971; superior performing student assistant group as recorded in February, 1972; and weak performing student assistant group as recorded in February, 1972.

Scoring of the JAIM was coordinated through the test's author. The response sheets were sent to George Washington University (G.W.U.) where the computer program for the JAIM was stored. The computer program converted the raw scores into standard scores. Standard scores were calculated by the formula $z = \frac{x - \bar{x}}{S.D.} \times 100$. The scoring of a scale was accomplished in the following manner:

> Items keyed to a scale can have either positive or negative values. . . . The total score for each scale is computed by adding values algebraically. The higher the score on a particular scale, the more often the subject has chosen the options for this scale as being descriptive of himself in preference to the options for other scales and has avoided options which are negatively scored for the scale. The lower the score on a particular scale, the less often the subject has chosen the options for this scale as being descriptive of himself in preference to the options for the other scales and the more often he has selected options which are negatively scored for the scale (Walther, 1964, p. 12).

This process generated the standard scores on the 32 JAIM scales for each of the four established groups.

Data Analysis

At the beginning of this study it was not known if the JAIM scale scores of Form 669 were normally distributed. Blalock (1960), Champion (1970), and Siegel (1956) have stated that non-parametric statistics should be utilized if characteristics of distribution were in question. The use of parametric statistics would have required data to have a normal distribution and each sequence of observations to be random. This study could not satisfy these assumptions. The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test was determined to be an appropriate statistical technique to test for differences within groups (test-retest). The Mann-Whitney U test was deemed an appropriate statistical treatment to ascertain differences between the two groups (superior performing versus weak performing).

Data computations necessitated by the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test and the Mann-Whitney U test were completed at the Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University Computer Center utilizing all original computer cards obtained from the G.W.U. Computer Center.

The superior performing student assistant group's test-retest scores on each of the 32 scales were analyzed by use of the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test. This determined the stability of behavioral styles over the six month period. Results were assessed at the .05 level of significance. This rejection region permitted the

acceptance or rejection of the first hypothesis:

H_1: There is no significant difference in the scores of the superior performing student assistant group when they retake the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement after a six month period on the job.

The procedure was repeated for the weak performing student assistant group. Data results established acceptance or rejection of the second hypothesis:

H_2: There is no significant difference in the scores of the weak performing student assistant group when they retake the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement after a six month period on the job.

Those scales which had not changed from August, 1971, to February, 1972, for either group were then investigated. The objective was to ascertain if the JAIM could identify behavioral style differences between the superior performing and the weak performing student assistant groups (two-tailed test). If significant differences between groups occurred, then it could be stated that one group (superior performing or weak performing) had a higher preponderance or a lower preponderance of a given characteristic (behavioral style) than the other group, without saying how much higher or lower.

The Mann-Whitney U test was used to ascertain differences between the two groups. The third and fourth hypotheses were accepted or rejected based on the statistical results, accepted at the .05 level of significance.

H_3: There is no significant difference in the behavioral styles of superior performing and weak performing student assistant groups as

measured by the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement in August, 1971.

H_4: There is no significant difference in the behavioral styles of superior performing and weak performing student assistant groups as measured by the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement in February, 1972.

Instrumentation of the Study

JAIM Form 669, a 154 item self-report questionnaire, was normed against a college population of West Point Cadets. The stated purpose of this instrument suggested its potential usefulness in describing the desired behavioral styles of student assistants and in discriminating between the behavioral styles of superior performing and weak performing student assistant groups.

> The Job Analysis and Interest Measurement (JAIM) was designed to measure the personal qualities of the worker (other than his aptitudes, training, or knowledge) which have an influence on success or failure in a job. . . . It has commonly been observed that job failures often result not from lack of specific abilities, but from so-called "personality difficulties" . . . Experienced managers know that while every job requires some minimal level of knowledge and specific ability, after this level is reached the determinants of job success or failure are intangible and complex and often described in such terms as 'can't stand pressure,' 'can't get along with other people,' and so on. It was elements such as these that the JAIM was designed to measure (Walther, 1972, p. 1).

Creation of the JAIM began in 1957. The instrument contained 68 questions which attempted to predict adjustment to overseas service for Foreign Service personnel. Forced-choice responses were designed to give profiles of the following areas: grades, interest in school, hobbies,

relationship with parents, social activities, likes and dislikes of a job, and steadiness of employment. The JAIM's value proved to be limited for this first assignment. However, further analysis of the data showed that it did illuminate differences in various occupational groups as well as differentiate between high and low performers in the same occupational group.

The original survey has undergone many revisions. The most important modification was on Form 663 which emphasized the present and future instead of the past. The 125 questions attempted to identify the respondent's values, preferences, and behaviors. Between the original inventory in 1957 and Form 669 (June, 1969), the JAIM's various revisions combined scales or eliminated scales viewed as no longer useful.

> A scale is considered to have established its usefulness when on the one hand it makes reliable discriminations among occupational groups or within occupational groups on a criterion of job performance, stability, or satisfaction, and on the other hand the hypothesis for the scale can be integrated into a theory regarding occupational choice, success or failure (Walther, 1972, p. 2).

Reliability

During the past 14 years, the JAIM has been utilized to examine over 40 professions and occupations. A study of 26 clerical employees on preliminary Form 162 was conducted to establish JAIM's test-retest reliability after a two day interval; the range for 32 scales was from .69 to .96 with

an average product moment correlation of .85. A study of split-halves reliability of 100 Foreign Service Officer applicants on Form 162 showed a range from .46 to .76 on the 32 scales with an average correlation of .61. Walther theorized that this low reliability was a result of heterogeneous items. Data are insufficient to conclude the exact reliability of the JAIM. Walther (1964) has stated that the reliability is in the low to middle .80's for a homogeneous occupational group.

Validity

The predictive validity and concurrent validity of the JAIM have been examined to determine if it would differentiate between high and low performers in a job. In a study of Foreign Service secretaries and code clerks, scales were studied and combined in order to derive a formula for prediction. When the formula developed for secretaries was applied to the cross-validation group, it was possible to predict performance with a product moment correlation of .60; the correlation was .38 for code clerks (Walther, 1964). Examinations of the JAIM have demonstrated its concurrent validity.

> A number of studies have been completed demonstrating that the JAIM can be used effectively to differentiate among occupational groups. Data gathered on over 30 occupational categories reveal highly significant differences between categories, and stable results have been obtained when different samples have been taken from the same occupation (Walther, 1964, p. 29).

In a study of 43 clients in a university counseling center the following tests were given to determine the JAIM's construct validity: Kuder Vocational Preference Record, Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes, Otis Test of Mental Ability, Cooperative General Culture Test, Ohio State University Psychological Examination, and Q Sort (Comparing Self-Rating with Ideal Rating). Additionally, 40 Peace Corps employees responded to both the JAIM and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Finally, 624 candidates took the Foreign Service Officer examination and the JAIM. These were all correlated to ascertain if the JAIM scales were developed from an underlying hypothesis and if there was a relationship between scale items and the scale hypothesis (Walther, McCune, and Peterson, 1972). Varying degrees of concurrent validity were noted from a positive correlation of .70 on the Kuder Vocational Preference Record, to a negative correlation of .58 on the M.M.P.I.

Two factor analytic studies have been completed in an attempt to determine exactly what the JAIM measured. In the first study of 1,062 subjects from different occupations, seven factors from JAIM Form 162 accounted for 99.46 of the variance. Combined examination of studies found the JAIM measured: relation to authority, interpersonal relationship, leadership decision styles, leadership motivational styles, and reaction to aggression. Walther (1964) has admitted the need for more factor analytic research on the JAIM.

Summary

This chapter has detailed the methodology employed to identify superior performing and weak performing student assistant groups. The JAIM was employed as a data collection tool and procedures relative to the test-retest administration of the instrument were described. The rationale was presented for selection of the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test and the Mann-Whitney U test as appropriate statistical techniques for data analysis. The development of the JAIM and the status of its reliability and validity were discussed.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Introduction

Behavioral styles of superior performing and weak performing student assistant groups were identified by responses to the JAIM in August, 1971, and in February, 1972. Group standard scores for each of 32 scales were computed for both test dates.

Application of the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test produced a group test-retest stability statistic for each scale. Results permitted acceptance of the first two null hypotheses as discussed in the section titled Behavioral Style Differences Within Groups.

The ability of the JAIM scales to differentiate between superior performing and weak performing student assistant groups was analyzed using the Mann-Whitney U test. Statistically significant scales were identified for each of the two test periods. These data have been presented relative to rejection of the third and fourth null hypotheses in the section titled Behavioral Style Differences Between Groups.

In the next section, Behavioral Styles Descriptive of Student Assistants, data generated by the research are

discussed. Patterns have been identified which assist in relating relevance of results to desired job performance standards of student assistants.

Finally, methods of applying the research results to an employee selection model have been presented. The usefulness of the JAIM in improving student assistant selection procedures was then discussed.

Behavioral Style Differences Within Groups

Superior Performing Student Assistant Group

The responses of the superior performing student assistant group for each of the 32 JAIM scales as recorded in August, 1971, were compared to the same group's responses as recorded in February, 1972. The purpose was to ascertain which scales evidenced stability during the six month interval. The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test was applied to the test-retest group scores for each scale. No scale was identified as having a variance at the .05 level of significance. Thus, the first null hypothesis was accepted.

H_1: There is no significant difference in the scores of the superior performing student assistant group when they retake the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement after a six month period on the job.

Weak Performing Student Assistant Group

The test-retest stability of JAIM scale scores obtained by the weak performing student assistant group were statistically analyzed through application of the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test. All scales recorded a stability in excess of the .05 level. On this basis, the second null hypothesis was accepted.

H_2: There is no significant difference in the scores of the weak performing student assistant group when they retake the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement after a six month period on the job.

Behavioral Style Differences Between Groups

Comparison of Groups on First Test

The 32 scale scores obtained by each group as a result of the August, 1971, test session were statistically compared through application of the Mann-Whitney U test. The scale titled Take Leadership (scale 12) was significant at the .05 level. The third null hypothesis cannot be rejected for the remaining scales.

H_3: There is no significant difference in the behavioral styles of the superior performing and weak performing student assistant groups as measured by the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement in August, 1971.

Data generated by the Mann-Whitney U test have been summarized in Table II.

TABLE II

MANN-WHITNEY U AND CORRESPONDING RESULTS OF STUDENT ASSISTANT GROUPS IN AUGUST, 1971

Scale No.	Name	U	z	Probability	A or R
1.	Optimism	189	-1.24	.21	A
2.	Self-Confidence	240	- .02	.98	A
3.	Interpersonal Trust	219	- .53	.59	A
4.	Open System	214	- .64	.52	A
5.	Plan Ahead	213	- .67	.50	A
6.	Orderliness	203	- .90	.37	A
7.	Perseverance	236	- .12	.90	A
8.	Emotional Control	208	- .79	.42	A
9.	Scheduled Activities	215	- .62	.53	A
10.	Self-Assertive	233	- .20	.84	A
11.	Supportive of Others	168	-1.73	.08	A
12.	Take Leadership	156	-2.01	.04*	R
13.	Move Toward Aggressor	236	- .13	.89	A
14.	Move Away From Aggressor	233	- .20	.84	A
15.	Move Against Aggressor	231	- .25	.80	A
16.	Concrete-Practical	187	-1.30	.19	A
17.	Systematic-Methodical	196	-1.08	.28	A
18.	Act Independently	186	-1.36	.17	A

TABLE II (Continued)

Scale No.	Name	U	z	Probability	A or R
19.	Work As An Assistant	230	- .26	.79	A
20.	Directive Leadership	235	- .15	.88	A
21.	Motivate By Rewards	222	- .47	.63	A
22.	Motivate By Results	214	- .66	.51	A
23.	Social Interaction	188	-1.26	.17	A
24.	Mechanical Activities	215	- .62	.53	A
25.	Group Participation	214	- .65	.51	A
26.	Activity-Frequent Change	216	- .60	.55	A
27.	Job Challenge	207	- .81	.41	A
28.	Status Attainment	229	- .30	.76	A
29.	Social Service	222	- .46	.64	A
30.	Approval From Others	205	- .86	.38	A
31.	Intellectual Achievement	239	- .06	.95	A
32.	Role Conformity	206	- .83	.41	A

* $P < .05$

Comparison of Groups on Retest

The scale scores obtained by each group as a result of the February, 1972, administration of the JAIM were compared by use of the Mann-Whitney U test. Results showed that four scales differentiated between the behavioral styles of the superior performing and weak performing groups, acceptable at the .05 level of significance. The scale Take Leadership (scale 12) was again significant. The other three scales were Interpersonal Trust (scale 3), Emotional Control (scale 8), and Supportive of Others (scale 11). The fourth null hypothesis cannot be rejected for the remaining scales.

H_4: There is no significant difference in the behavioral styles of superior performing and weak performing student assistant groups as measured by the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement in February, 1972.

Data generated by the Mann-Whitney U test have been summarized in Table III.

Behavioral Styles Descriptive of Student Assistants

Behavioral Styles Reflected by Standard Scores

Statistical analysis of the null hypotheses has established that all scales reflected test-retest stability and that four scales significantly differentiated between the superior performing and weak performing student assistant groups. These data were useful in interpreting Table IV

TABLE III

MANN-WHITNEY U AND CORRESPONDING RESULTS OF STUDENT ASSISTANT GROUPS IN FEBRUARY, 1972

Scale No.	Name	U	z	Probability	A or R
1.	Optimism	232	- .23	.81	A
2.	Self-Confidence	199	- .99	.32	A
3.	Interpersonal Trust	154	-2.06	.03*	R
4.	Open System	201	- .95	.34	A
5.	Plan Ahead	237	- .11	.91	A
6.	Orderliness	170	-1.69	.09	A
7.	Perseverance	238	- .07	.94	A
8.	Emotional Control	158	-1.97	.04*	R
9.	Scheduled Activities	237	- .11	.91	A
10.	Self-Assertive	228	- .31	.75	A
11.	Supportive of Others	120	-2.87	.004*	R
12.	Take Leadership	156	-2.02	.04*	R
13.	Move Toward Aggressor	184	-1.38	.16	A
14.	Move Away From Aggressor	216	- .60	.55	A
15.	Move Against Aggressor	224	- .41	.68	A
16.	Concrete-Practical	185	-1.34	.18	A
17.	Systematic-Methodical	180	-1.49	.13	A
18.	Act Independently	231	- .26	.79	A

TABLE III (Continued)

Scale No.	Name	U	z	Probability	A or R
19.	Work As An Assistant	225	- .39	.69	A
20.	Directive Leadership	231	- .25	.80	A
21.	Motivate By Rewards	208	- .79	.42	A
22.	Motivate By Results	221	- .49	.62	A
23.	Social Interaction	219	- .53	.59	A
24.	Mechanical Activities	223	- .43	.66	A
25.	Group Participation	204	- .88	.37	A
26.	Activity-Frequent Change	198	-1.03	.30	A
27.	Job Challenge	192	-1.16	.25	A
28.	Status Attainment	220	- .51	.61	A
29.	Social Service	231	- .24	.81	A
30.	Approval From Others	225	- .38	.70	A
31.	Intellectual Achievement	233	- .19	.84	A
32.	Role Conformity	232	- .22	.82	A

*$P < .05$

TABLE IV

STANDARD SCORES OF STUDENT ASSISTANT GROUPS IN AUGUST, 1971, AND FEBRUARY, 1972

JAIM No.	Scale Name	S_1	S_2	W_1	W_2
1.	Optimism	41	34	6	23
2.	Self-Confidence	- 9	-12	-20	11
3.	Interpersonal Trust	9	18	14	-39
4.	Open System	30	51	10	28
5.	Plan Ahead	- 1	7	23	18
6.	Orderliness	-10	17	-34	-38
7.	Perseverance	-17	-34	- 9	-30
8.	Emotional Control	25	40	-12	-24
9.	Scheduled Activities	- 9	- 3	- 2	-12
10.	Self-Assertive	-29	-52	-31	-37
11.	Supportive of Others	68	92	21	8
12.	Take Leadership	- 2	4	-56	-42
13.	Move Toward Aggressor	22	49	28	20
14.	Move Away From Aggressor	-13	- 3	-16	5
15.	Move Against Aggressor	- 6	-44	- 7	-33
16.	Concrete-Practical	0	-15	-40	-61
17.	Systematic-Methodical	13	21	-20	-23
18.	Act Independently	8	8	-32	- 1

TABLE IV (Continued)

JAIM No.	Scale Name	S_1	S_2	W_1	W_2
19.	Work As An Assistant	61	25	53	20
20.	Directive Leadership	-41	-66	-34	-69
21.	Motivate By Rewards	14	42	0	62
22.	Motivate By Results	30	16	14	3
23.	Social Interaction	45	42	8	20
24.	Mechanical Activities	- 5	13	14	0
25.	Group Participation	18	47	36	23
26.	Activity-Frequent Change	0	-12	-22	11
27.	Job Challenge	-31	-41	-20	-18
28.	Status Attainment	-60	-61	-55	-65
29.	Social Service	71	73	63	68
30.	Approval From Others	31	23	8	20
31.	Intellectual Achievement	-15	- 2	-17	- 4
32.	Role Conformity	- 6	- 7	13	- 1

which has identified the standard scores of the superior performing group in August, 1971 (S_1), and February, 1972 (S_2); and the standard scores of the weak performing group in August, 1971 (W_1), and February, 1972 (W_2). For Table IV, the mean of the normative group (West Point cadets) was set at 0 and the standard deviation at 100.

Standard scores, presented in Table IV, recorded each group's performance on each scale at two different points in time. Standard scores assisted in clarifying score differences within groups and between groups, as well as noting subject group differences compared to the JAIM norm group, West Point cadets. Mann-Whitney U analysis relevant to each scale has been summarized in Tables II and III. A complete listing of individual ranked scores utilized for between-group comparisons has been included, by scale, in Tables V-XXXVI, Appendix F.

Behavioral Styles Reflected by JAIM Scores

Central units of statistical analysis in this study have been the 32 JAIM scale scores. These scales were represented as descriptive measurements of job-related behavioral styles. It has been deemed both useful and appropriate to review the results of this research in relationship to the 32 JAIM scales. The purpose of this presentation was to more thoroughly describe and discuss the behavioral styles of the subject groups. The format

utilized has been to identify each scale by number and title, followed by a quotation of the JAIM scale definition (Appendix E). This is followed by data analysis.

Scale 1: Optimism. "The degree to which the individual assumes that satisfactions can be expected in the natural course of events, and states that he gets a lot of fun out of life." The results showed that the superior performing student assistant group evidenced more optimism than the weak performing student assistant group; the latter was similar in optimism to the normative group. There was a greater difference in the between-group scores on the first test than on the retest as evidenced by an increase from .21 to .81 level of probability. This was due primarily to the increase in scores of the weak performing student assistant group in February, 1972.

Scale 2: Self-Confidence. "The degree to which the individual believes that he can, by his own actions, influence future events, expects to do well in the things he tries to do, and feels that he is as smart and capable as most other people." Both student assistant groups had scores similar to the West Point cadets. The self-confidence scores of the weak performing student assistant group were slightly higher than those of the superior performing student assistant group on the retest. The standard scores reflect a high degree of test-retest stability for the superior performing group. A much lower stability level was registered by the weak performing group

which changed its score from below to above the normative group mean over the six month interval.

Scale 3: Interpersonal Trust. "The degree to which the individual trusts other people and has confidence in their good intentions toward him." This scale was significant at the .03 level, effectively discriminating between the two subject groups as a result of the February, 1972, test. The superior performing student assistant group, the weak performing student assistant group, and the normative group were all similar on the first test. The superior performing group and the normative group were similar on the retest. Significance occurred from the extreme score decrease registered on the retest by the weak performing group.

The weak performing group registered a behavioral style of significant less trust and more suspicion in February. It was in February that resident directors were asked to rank student assistants as superior performing or weak performing. It was possible that the members of the weak performing group were consciously or unconsciously aware that their job performance was not satisfactory to their respective resident director. It was also possible that an outside factor--such as low expression of interpersonal trust in working with students--caused both events.

The weak performing student assistant group's retest score was representative of the following beliefs: (1) I have some/many enemies; (2) I have sometimes/often been

double crossed by people; (3) I have found that people sometimes/frequently break promises which they have made to me; (4) I believe that most people would cheat if they thought they wouldn't get caught; (5) I agree that most people are crooked when they have the chance; (6) I agree that it is hard to get ahead without breaking the law now and then; (7) My supervisors or teachers for the most part have been indifferent, shown lack of sympathy and understanding in dealing with me; and (8) I believe most people are more inclined to look out for themselves (Appendices B and D).

Scale 4: Open System. "The degree to which the individual is willing to experiment and try new things as opposed to preferring the established and conventional way of doing things." Both subject groups increased their standard scores from the first to the second test period which put them minimally above the normative group.

Scale 5: Plan Ahead. "The degree to which the individual establishes long-range goals and attempts to achieve them." Both subject groups were similar to the normative group on both test dates.

Scale 6: Orderliness. "The degree to which the individual is orderly, attends to details, and keeps things in their place." The weak performing student assistant group registered less orderliness than the superior performing group or the normative group. The weak performing group's scores remained stable. The superior performing group's

scores increased over time from below to above the normative group mean. This movement resulted in a Mann-Whitney U probability score of .09 in February, thus indicating dissimilarity between the groups.

Scale 7: Perseverance. "The degree to which the individual keeps at something even when he is not particularly interested in it, does not like to leave a task unfinished, and is thorough in anything he undertakes." Both subject groups decreased their scores over time. Both scored lower than the West Point cadets on this behavioral style.

Scale 8: Emotional Control. "The degree to which the individual keeps control of his temper, does not do things which he later regrets, and does not tell people off when they bug him." The scale significantly differentiated between the superior performing and the weak performing student assistant groups at the .04 level in February, 1972.

The standard scores identified an increase between testing periods for the superior performing group and a decrease for the weak performing group. Additionally, the standard scores reported that the weak performing group continued to score lower than the normative group, while the superior performing group continued to score higher than the normative group. Between-group movement in opposite directions accounted for the significant behavioral style differentiation on the retest. It should be noted that there was no distinction between the two groups on the

initial test as evidenced by the generated Mann-Whitney U probability of .42.

Scale 9: Scheduled Activities. "The degree to which the individual likes to follow a schedule or a daily routine." Superior performing student assistants, weak performing student assistants, and West Point cadets had a similar behavioral style relative to scheduled activities. Test-retest stability for both subject groups was indicated by the standard scores.

Scale 10: Self-Assertive. "The degree to which the individual likes competition and tends to pursue his own goals when they are in competition with others." Both subject groups registered lower self-assertive scores than did the West Point cadets. The superior performing student assistant group's scores decreased over time.

Scale 11: Supportive of Others. "The degree to which the individual is concerned about the feelings of other people, goes out of his way to support or comfort them, as opposed to doing what has to be done even if it doesn't please everyone." This scale was statistically significant at the .004 level in February, 1972. The August, 1971, score indicated a between-group dissimilarity at the .08 level.

A review of the standard scores indicated that the superior performing group had scores higher than the weak performing group. Both groups were more supportive of others than the normative group. After six months, the

superior performing group's scores increased while the weak performing group's scores registered a minimal decrease. This accounted for a high degree of statistical significance (.004) on the retest.

An additional point which merited attention was the extreme difference in behavioral styles of the superior performing student assistant group and the West Point cadets. On the retest, the superior performing group's score (92) approached the level of one standard deviation difference compared to the normative group.

In summary, the superior performing group was significantly more supportive of others than either the weak performing group or the normative group. This scale exhibited the greatest degree of significant difference between the two subject groups.

Scale 12: Take Leadership. "The degree to which the individual assumes a leadership role and likes to direct and supervise the work of others." This was the only scale which recorded a significant result on two of the hypotheses. It differentiated between the two subject groups at the .04 level of significance in both August, 1971, and February, 1972. The standard scores revealed within-group test-retest stability. This enhanced the potential usefulness of the scale in selection of student assistants.

The superior performing group and the West Point cadets recorded similar Take Leadership styles. The weak performing group reflected the following types of answers to

JAIM questions relevant to this scale: (1) I seldom find myself taking a position of leadership in a group I am with; (2) If I were asked to be an officer of an organization I would not choose to be president or vice-president; I may choose to hold no office at all; (3) I would prefer to work as a member of a group, by myself, or helping my supervisor with whatever needs to be done--rather than directing and coordinating the work of other people; (4) It bothers me a little/very much to have to give orders to other people; (5) I do not enjoy giving a speech or reciting before a large group--I try to avoid this; (6) I would prefer to be doing important and interesting work, or to be working closely with and being of assistance to a supervisor doing important and interesting work--as opposed to organizing and directing the carrying out of an interesting and important task (Appendices B and D).

Scale 13: Move Toward Aggressor. "The degree to which the individual tries to behave diplomatically when someone acts toward him in a belligerent or aggressive manner." The two subject groups were similar on the initial test as reported by a generated Mann-Whitney U probability of .89. This decreased during the six month interval to .16. While both subject groups were similar to the normative group in August, 1971, the superior performing group increased its tendency over time to select this as a self-descriptive behavioral style.

Scale 14: Move Away From Aggressor. "The degree to which the individual withdraws when someone acts toward him in a belligerent or aggressive manner." Subject group scores were similar to normative group scores at both test dates. The weak performing student assistant group's standard scores evidenced a minimal increase over time from below to above the JAIM mean.

Scale 15: Move Against Aggressor. "The degree to which the individual counter-attacks when someone acts toward him in a belligerent or aggressive manner." Initial scores of the subject groups were similar to the normative group. Both subject groups decreased their scores over time as reflected by the standard scores, giving this scale a low test-retest stability.

Scale 16: Concrete-Practical. "The degree to which the individual considers himself as practical, sensible with both feet on the ground in contrast to being imaginative, ingenious, and having novel ideas." Although not statistically significant, this scale represented dissimilarity between the two subject groups as documented by Mann-Whitney U probability scores of .19 in August, 1971, and .18 in February, 1972. The superior performing group initially scored the same as the normative group, then decreased its score on the retest. The weak performing group was lower than both other groups at all points in time. This group also registered a decreased score on the retest.

Scale 17: Systematic-Methodical. "The degree to which the individual uses step-by-step methods for processing information and reaching decisions." A minimal increase in the superior performing group's retest score and a minimal decrease in the weak performing group's retest score resulted in a differentiation between the groups of .13 in February, 1972, as calculated by the Mann-Whitney U.

Scale 18: Act Independently. "The degree to which the individual likes to have freedom in working out his own methods for doing the work rather than having definite procedures and instructions which he can follow." Scores of the superior performing student assistant group on both test dates and the retest score of the weak performing student assistant group were similar to the normative group. However, on the initial test, the weak performing group scored lower, resulting in a .17 level of dissimilarity between the two subject groups.

Scale 19: Work as an Assistant. "The degree to which the individual likes to work closely with his supervisor rather than working by himself." The standard scores for both groups decreased between the first and the second tests: there was a fairly high value placed on this behavioral style in August, 1971, but it became less important by February, 1972. Both subject groups remained above the normative group.

Scale 20: Directive Leadership. "The degree to which the individual believes than an effective supervisor makes

the decisions himself rather than consulting with subordinates and delegating as much as possible to them; and keeps a careful watch for deficient performance to discipline those who fall below standard." Both subject groups registered negative scores on this scale compared to the normative group in August, 1971. The subject groups decreased their scores over time.

Scale 21: Motivate by Rewards. "The degree to which the individual believes that people are best motivated by praise and rewards (extrinsic motivation)." The standard scores of the weak performing student assistant group increased from 0 to 62, thus rendering the scale extremely unstable, though not at a statistically significant level as measured by the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test. The weak performing group evidenced a major behavioral style change over the six month time interval, placing much more importance on this behavioral style in February, 1972, than at the beginning of employment. The superior performing student assistant group recorded a similar behavioral style change, although not as dramatic as the counterpart group's change.

Scale 22: Motivate by Results. "The degree to which the individual believes that people are best motivated by the chance to accomplish something (intrinsic motivation)." No significant results were evident in the data analysis of this scale. The subject groups were similar to each other and to the normative group.

Scale 23: Social Interaction. "The degree to which the individual likes work involving interaction with other people." No significant results were noted in analysis of this scale. The superior performing student assistant group scored slightly higher than the weak performing student assistant group in August as indicated by a Mann-Whitney U probability of .17.

Scale 24: Mechanical Activities. "The degree to which the individual likes mechanical activities." The behavioral styles reflected by the subject groups were similar to the normative group. Data analysis revealed no significant characteristics.

Scale 25: Group Participation. "The degree to which the individual likes to work as a member of a group." While both subject groups scored a minimal level above the mean, the superior performing student assistant group increased its score over time; the weak performing student assistant group decreased its score over time. In effect, the two subject groups reversed scores on the tests.

Scale 26: Activity-Frequent Change. "The degree to which the individual likes to be engaged in work providing a lot of excitement and a great deal of variety as opposed to work providing a stable secure future." No results were evident on this scale to differentiate between the two subject groups. However, the superior performing student assistant group decreased its score from the mean to below

the mean, while the weak performing student assistant group increased its score from below the mean to above the mean.

Scale 27: Job Challenge. "The degree to which the individual likes activities providing a challenge with high performance standards." Standard scores revealed a greater test-retest consistency in the scores of the weak performing student assistant group than in the scores of the superior performing student assistant group. No other results were noted on this scale.

Scale 28: Status Attainment. "The degree to which the individual values himself by his achievement of the status symbols established by his culture." The subject groups' extremely low scores on this scale represented the highest amount of negative divergence from the normative group (West Point cadets) compared to all other scales. The student assistants' behavioral style did not encompass the factors elucidated in the definition of this scale.

Scale 29: Social Service. "The degree to which the individual values himself by contributing to social improvement." Subject groups' standard scores were as divergent on this scale as on the preceding scale, this time registering extremely high scores compared to the normative group. This was not unexpected since the importance of social service has been a commonly stressed factor in the student assistant job description.

Scale 30: Approval from Others. "The degree to which the individual values himself by obtaining the approval of

others." No significant results were evident in the data analysis. Both subject groups were similar to the normative group.

Scale 31: Intellectual Achievement. "The degree to which the individual values himself through his intellectual attainments." No significant results were evident in the data analysis of test-retest stability or of the scale's ability to differentiate between the two subject groups. Subject groups had scores similar to the normative group of West Point cadets.

Scale 32: Role Conformity. "The degree to which the individual values himself according to how successfully he has conformed to the role requirements of the society." No significant results were evident in the data analysis. The standard scores of both subject groups were similar to the normative group.

Behavioral Styles Interpreted by Normative Group

Review of the standard scores has indicated that desired student assistant behavioral styles as measured by the JAIM Form 669 reflected high group scores on Social Service and Supportive of Others; and low scores on Status Attainment and Directive Leadership. When the JAIM has been used to identify a baseline of desired student assistant behavioral styles--and where standard scores have indicated one or more scales with major deviations from the JAIM mean--

then future use of the JAIM as a selection tool would require that applicant scores on these scales be evaluated to ascertain similarity to the score deviation and direction established by the baseline group.

Use of the JAIM as an instrument to describe desired behavioral styles of student assistants has required an understanding of and an interpretation of the standard scores, relative to the normative group. In comparing the scores of 35 occupational groups, it was found that West Point cadets, the normative group for JAIM Form 669, were among the lowest scoring groups on four scales (Walther, 1972, pp. 13-16). On two of these scales--Motivate by Results and Emotional Control--study of the superior performing student assistant group showed that they scored higher than the normative group. On the behavioral style of Act Independently, the superior performing student assistant group's scores were similar to the normative group's score. This suggested that the desired job performance of both the student assistant group and the West Point cadet group required a lower degree of exerted independence in relationship to authority than did many other jobs. The normative group scored low on Perseverance, compared to many other occupational groups; the superior performing student assistant group scored lower than the normative group. It should be noted, however, that social workers have also been low scorers on this scale.

Behavioral Styles Interpreted by
Social Worker Group

The residence hall counselor's emerging role as a paraprofessional has been documented by the literature. Descriptions emphasized involvement in the "helping" professions, not unlike the professional occupational category of social worker. In view of this, Walther's research on social worker's behavioral styles as reflected by high and low JAIM scores was reviewed to assess similarities in these behavioral styles to those reflected by student assistants (Walther, 1972, pp. 13-16). It was theorized that if the student assistant job category was a paraprofessional equivalent to the social worker job category, then desired behavioral styles as recorded by the JAIM would be similar. This was generally confirmed by the data results.

It was previously noted that the superior performing student assistant group evidenced high scores on Social Service and Supportive of Others. Research has reported social workers also recorded high scores on these two scales. The superior performing student assistant group's JAIM scores were low on Status Attainment and Directive Leadership. Walther reported the same finding regarding social workers.

Behavioral style similarities between the student assistant group and the social worker group were noted on five additional scales. Social workers were high scorers on

Group Participation and Move Toward Aggressor. The student assistant group's scores on these two scales were higher than the normative group's scores on the first test and increased on the retest. Social workers recorded low scores on the behavioral styles represented as Self-Assertive, Move Against Aggressor, and Perseverance. On each of these scales the student assistant group recorded scores below the JAIM mean on the first test and decreased scores on all three scales over time.

Five additional social worker scale scores were noted by Walther as being extremely high or low. These were not in agreement with student assistant group scores. Social workers scored high on Motivate by Result; and low on Mechanical Activities, Orderliness, Scheduled Activities, and Systematic-Methodical. Several observations were in order regarding non-confirmation of these behavioral style tendencies by the student assistants. Mechanical Activity, a statement of work preference, was more apt to be expressed by a group who had made a career commitment. Student assistants had not yet made a career commitment. Subject group scores on three of the scales might be partially explained by the group's full-time student status. Extremely low scores on Orderliness (attention to detail), Scheduled Activities (willingness to follow a schedule), and Systematic-Methodical (step-by-step processing of information) would be disfunctional and counterproductive to scholastic requirements.

In summary, on all four behavioral style scales where superior performing student assistants had extreme high or low scores, social workers had correspondingly extreme high or low scores. On five of the remaining ten behavioral style scales where social workers recorded extreme high or low scores, the superior performing student assistant group had scores which were initially in the same high or low direction and which became closer to the social worker's high or low extreme at the time of the retest.

A review of the extreme high or low scores recorded by 35 occupational categories (Walther, 1972, pp. 13-16), established that the behavioral styles of the superior performing student assistant group were more like the social worker job category than any other job category. It should be noted that the nine JAIM scales where the student assistant group and the social work group had similarly extreme high or low scores, army officers, F.B.I. agents, policemen, and business executives recorded extreme high or low scores in the opposite direction. This indicated that a high or low preponderance of certain behavioral styles appropriate and functional to the job categories of social worker and student assistant would be disfunctional and inappropriate to the job categories of the army officer, F.B.I. agent, policeman, and businessman. The converse would also be indicated.

Behavioral Styles Interpreted by
Performing Subject Group

Four JAIM scales were found to differentiate between the superior performing student assistant group and the weak performing student assistant group: Emotional Control, Interpersonal Trust, Supportive of Others, and Take Leadership. A discussion of each of these scales, including the study results, has already been presented. It was appropriate, however, to briefly examine these scales as a pattern of behavioral styles required for effective student assistant job performance.

The literature emphasized that the primary job function of the student assistant is to promote individual students' personal development. This has required the student assistant to be accessible, to interact with students, to be a role-model for interpersonal actions, to be empathic and supportive; and, thereby, to establish a rapport which would encourage students to seek his assistance and which would permit him to intervene if he felt his guidance was needed. If the preceding were accepted as descriptive requirements for successful student assistant job performance, then behavioral styles reflective of Emotional Control, Interpersonal Trust, and Supportive of Others would be essential. That the JAIM measured significant differences between the superior performing student assistant group and the weak performing student assistant group on these particular

scales was of major importance. Job success as defined by student personnel administrators has been contingent upon these three factors.

The Take Leadership scale was noteworthy in that it differentiated between the superior performing student assistant group and the weak performing student assistant group on the initial test as well as on the retest. Responses of the superior performing student assistant group to Take Leadership, viewed in concert with the group's responses to Group Participation and Directive Leadership, has established that the behavioral style characterized was that of persuasive leadership. According to Walther, "This style is most effective for situations where it is important that the individual personally influence the behavior of others" (Walther, 1964, pp. 14-15).

The residence hall group environment has established certain job functions for student assistants which include the fostering of social interaction and the facilitating, planning, and implementing of programs. An institution which has placed high importance on this would be concerned with selecting applicants with behavioral styles indicative of Take Leadership.

Usefulness of the JAIM to Selection Procedures

The research design of this study was oriented to assess the usefulness of the JAIM-albeit the 32 behavioral

styles measured by this instrument--relative to selecting student assistants with behavioral styles indicative of successful job performance. A theoretical framework has been described which identified three steps necessitated by the applicant selection process: (1) the establishment of minimum job entrance requirements; (2) the development and use of instruments and procedures focused on gathering relevant data on each applicant; and (3) selection of the applicant determined to be best qualified.

Behavioral Style Data Generated by the JAIM

The importance of behavioral styles to the student assistant job has been documented by the literature. However, there has been a noticeable absence of the collection and use of behavioral style information in the selection process. The JAIM has proven to be a valuable instrument for establishing a baseline description of behavioral styles indicative of successful job performance. The JAIM's ability to establish such a baseline for the student assistant job category has been indicated by this study. Concurrent administration of the JAIM and assessment of student assistant job performance by an institution's employee evaluation criteria would produce baseline descriptions which might differentiate the superior performing student assistant group from the weak performing student assistant group. The test-retest format and the statistical

analysis suggested by this study would offer a refinement of the behavioral style data, and also might indicate predictive capabilities of the JAIM.

Use of JAIM Generated Data

The job description has been the employer's statement of established job entrance requirements. A well constructed job description would enumerate position responsibilities and would detail minimum qualification requirements. Use of the JAIM would promote a more thorough description of desired behavioral style job requirements and associated employee qualifications.

Traditional instruments and procedures utilized to gather relevant data on each applicant have included the application form, references, and the personal interview. JAIM generated data would be useful in improving each of these by facilitating planned emphasis of those behavioral styles determined by the institution to be most important to the student assistant job. An institution which determined that the behavioral style of Take Leadership was important would be able to (1) construct the application form to include a list of all groups in which the applicant had been active and all offices which he had held; (2) design recommendation forms to list significant JAIM scale definitions followed by a five-point Likert scale for use by the reference person in evaluating the applicant's behavioral style abilities; and (3) structure personal interviews

to elicit oral responses to questions excerpted from the JAIM in order to reflect the applicant's behavioral style orientations.

The JAIM behavioral style baseline descriptions might suggest other appropriate applicant data collection or data evaluation methods. This study has established that, during the time period described at Oklahoma State University, the behavioral styles of Emotional Control, Interpersonal Trust, and Supportive of Others discriminated between superior performing and weak performing student assistants. An institution with this pattern would want to consider the involvement of applicant peers on a recommendation or selection committee.

The JAIM itself has been identified as a data gathering tool useful to the selection process. The value of the JAIM has increased in direct proportion to its ability to discriminate between superior performing and weak performing student assistant groups prior to employment, as described by this study. It has not been recommended that the JAIM be the sole criterion for selection. However, used in conjunction with other applicant data collection and data evaluation instruments and procedures it would be a useful adjunct.

The JAIM-derived behavioral style baseline descriptions would be useful in specifying applicant qualifications and in ranking these according to their perceived importance to successful job performance. Once desired behavioral styles have been specified, the JAIM has suggested ways of focusing

applicant data collection instruments and procedures. The continuing objective has been to obtain a more complete picture of each applicant, to improve the prediction of how well he will perform in the given job, and thereby, to improve the student assistant selection procedures.

Summary

Study results showed JAIM scale scores to be of acceptable stability over time. The Take Leadership scale was found to significantly differentiate between the superior performing student assistant group and the weak performing student assistant group on both the initial test and the retest. Interpersonal Trust, Emotional Control and Supportive of Others were the three scales which significantly differentiated between high and low performers after six months of job experience.

JAIM data established a baseline description of desired student assistant behavioral styles at the institution studied. Most predominate characteristics desired were high behavioral style expressions of social service and supportive of others; and low behavioral style expressions of status attainment, directive leadership, independent action relative to authority, and perseverance.

A discussion of the useful application of JAIM generated data to the student assistant selection process was presented. This emphasized the ability of the JAIM to improve the selection process tools including the job

description, the application form, the reference form, and the personal interview. The JAIM was cited as a valuable aid in establishing criteria and evaluating applicants against these criteria.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was concerned with the identification and description of behavioral styles indicative of successful student assistant job performance as recorded by the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement. It was hypothesized that if the JAIM significantly discriminated between superior performing and weak performing student assistant groups, then this instrument would be able to establish baseline behavioral style descriptions of use to the applicant selection process. Furthermore, if significant differences between the two groups was identified prior to job placement, then a potential predictive value of the JAIM could be cited.

The JAIM was administered to all student assistants at one institution prior to job placement and again after six months of job experience. Concurrent with the second testing, resident hall directors with staffs of eight or more were asked to identify the 25 percent superior performing student assistants and the 25 percent weak performing student assistants under their immediate supervision. Subject mortality and unusable test response sheets reduced the subject population from 60 to 44 student assistants.

The study analyzed JAIM data generated by a 21 member superior performing student assistant group and a 23 member weak performing student group.

Responses to JAIM Form 669, a 154 item self-report questionnaire, yielded superior performing group and weak performing group standard scores for each of 32 behavioral styles. All scores recorded within-group test-retest stability in excess of the .05 level, as measured by the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test. The Mann-Whitney U test identified four scales which discriminated between the superior performing and the weak performing groups. The behavioral style of Take Leadership was significant at the .04 level on both test dates. Emotional Control, Interpersonal Trust, and Supportive of Others (with significance levels of .04, .03, and .004 respectively) discriminated between high and low performers after subjects had completed six months of job experience.

Further data analysis ascertained that the superior performing student assistant group was more characterized by the behavioral styles of Social Service and Supportive of Others; the group was least characterized by the behavioral styles of Status Attainment, Directive Leadership, Act Independently, and Perseverance. These same behavioral styles have been found to describe social workers.

This study ascertained the JAIM's ability to establish baseline descriptions of behavioral styles associated with successful student assistant job performance. This has

direct application to the student assistant selection process by aiding in the establishment of behavioral style selection criteria. Analysis of components of the identified behavioral styles would suggest methods of improving collection of applicant behavioral style data.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn as a result of this study:

(1) Behavioral styles, per se, are important indicators of successful job performance.

(2) The JAIM is useful in describing the behavioral style requirements of the student assistant job.

(3) Concurrent administration of the JAIM and assessment of student assistant job performance by an institution's employee evaluation criteria will produce baseline behavioral style descriptions which may differentiate high and low performers.

(4) The value of the JAIM increases in direct proportion to its ability to discriminate between high and low performers prior to employment.

(5) Baseline behavioral style descriptions indicative of successful job performance are appropriate statements of minimum job requirements and as such are useful criteria for assessment and screening of job applicants.

(6) JAIM scale definitions and scale test items suggest methods and procedures for focusing and systematizing

the collection of applicant data relative to behavioral styles.

(7) While this study establishes the JAIM's usefulness in focusing an institution's staff selection procedures on behavioral style job performance indicators, the JAIM's inclusion in the selection process as a predictive instrument is not firmly substantiated.

Recommendations

As a result of this study it is recommended that student personnel administrators at Oklahoma State University, the institution at which the study was conducted, utilize the JAIM-generated data to improve the selection of student assistants. Specific actions suggested include:

(1) Incorporate into the student assistant job description precise statements of the behavioral styles identified as important to job performance, and therefore required of staff.

(2) Construct the application form to include information on all groups in which the applicant has been active and to include an indication of the offices which he has held. Utilize this to assess applicants relative to the Take Leadership behavioral style.

(3) Redesign the reference form to include the important JAIM scale definitions, followed by a five-point Likert scale, for use by the reference person in evaluating the applicant's behavioral style abilities. Request

respondents to furnish additional comments on the applicant's expression of these.

(4) Structure personal interviews to elicit oral responses to questions excerpted from the identified JAIM scales in order to further define the applicant's behavioral styles.

(5) Establish a student committee from each residence hall to interview, screen, and recommend selection of applicants who reside in their respective residence halls.

(6) Institute a systematic method for evaluating the applicant behavioral style data as part of the total assessment and final selection process.

(7) Update and further refine JAIM-generated baseline data on behavioral styles. Replicate this study if the nature of the student assistant job changes, or if the method for evaluating superior and weak performance changes.

Study findings have suggested applications and implications of interest to planners and practitioners in the specific field of student personnel administration and in the general field of personnel administration. The following recommendations have been indicated:

(1) Review this research, and other JAIM research, in view of the focus on use of behavioral style indicators and a behavioral style test as criteria for staff selection.

(2) Replicate the methodology and design of this study if administrative dissatisfaction with employee retention rates and/or with employee job performance

appear to result, in part, from inadequate selection procedures.

Finally, this study had several implications which recommend further research.

(1) Data analysis reveals support for the theory that the student assistant job category is a paraprofessional equivalent to the social worker job category. This suggests the need for study of innovative and/or successful social worker selection procedures used within the public sector and the private sector; and an assessment of the potential application of these social worker selection procedures to the student assistant selection process.

(2) An area in need of additional study is the identification and evaluation of instruments and techniques for determining applicant behavioral styles. Particular attention should be given to the use of tests and the use of simulated experiences.

(3) A new occupational category, the residence hall student assistant, has been established for JAIM research. It is recommended that the JAIM data storage and analysis capabilities of the George Washington University Computer Center be utilized for extended inter-institutional research on the student assistant job category.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aceto, Thomas D. "Students in Pre-Professional Staff Roles." The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 4 (October, 1962), pp. 23-27.

Allen, Edmund E. "Paraprofessionals in a Large-Scale University Program." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 4 (December, 1974), pp. 276-280.

"AMS Survey Shows New Trends in Employment Testing." Administrative Management, Vol. 26 (July, 1965), pp. 44-46.

Archer, J. "Undergraduates as Paraprofessional Leaders of Interpersonal Communication Skills Training Groups." Dissertation Abstracts. Vol. 19 (August, 1972), p. 4932.

Baird, Leonard. "The Effects of College Residence Groups on Students' Self-Concepts, Goals and Achievements." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 47 (June, 1969), pp. 1015-1021

Banta, T. W. "Selecting Student Orientation Assistants: A Comparison of Approaches." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 10 (July, 1969), pp. 240-243.

Banta, T. W., and J. E. McMormick. "Using the Leaderless Group Discussion Technique for the Selection of Residence Hall Counselors." National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Vol. 33 (Fall, 1969), pp. 30-33.

Beder, H. W., and S. T. Richard. "Residence Hall Regulations and Staff Roles: A Substitute Model for In Loco Parentis." National Association for Student Personnel Administrators Journal, Vol. 9 (July, 1971), pp. 57-61.

Biggs, D. Z. "Selecting Residence Counselors-Job Viewpoints and Interpersonal Attitudes." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 12 (January, 1971), pp. 111-115.

Bishop, John R., and Richard J. Sharf. "A Helping Relationship Course for Residence Hall Advisers." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 13 (September, 1972), p. 462.

Blalock, Hubert M. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1960.

Brayfield, Arthur H., and Walter H. Crockett. "Employee Attitudes and Employee Performances." Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 52 (September, 1955), pp. 296-424.

Brown, William F. "Effectiveness of Paraprofessionals: The Evidence." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 4 (December, 1974), pp. 257-263.

Brown, William F. Student-to-Student Counseling. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1972.

Brown, William F., and Vernon G. Zunker. "Student Counselor Utilization at Four-Year Institutions of Higher Learning." The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 7 (January, 1966), pp. 41-46.

Campbell, Murla, and Rosanda Richards. "The Residence Hall as an Integral Part of the Educational Process." Journal of National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Vol. 28 (Fall, 1964), pp. 37-39.

Carkhuff, R. R. "Principals of Social Action in Training for New Careers in Human Services." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 18 (February, 1971), pp. 147-151.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Governance of Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Champion, Dean J. Basic Statistics for Social Research. Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1970.

Chickering, Arthur W. Commuting Versus Resident Students. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishing Company, 1974.

Colorado State University. Student Services Philosophy and Goals. Fort Collins, Colorado: Office of Student Residence Education and Housing, 1972.

Crane, William J. "Administrative Practices in Men's Housing." The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 3 (December, 1961), pp. 70-76.

Cunningham, Margaret Louis. "Dormitory Counseling Programs in Selected Colleges and Universities Which Utilize Undergraduate Women Counselors." (Unpublished report, Ph.D. Project, Columbia University, 1958.)

Danish, Steven J., and Gregory Brock. "The Current Status of Paraprofessional Training." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 4 (December, 1974), pp. 299-303.

Delworth, Ursula. "Paraprofessionals as Guerillas: Recommendations for System Change." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 4 (December, 1974), pp. 335-338.

DeMoss, Robert T. "The Paraprofessional as Administrator: An Innovative Role." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 4 (December, 1974), pp. 315-318.

"Dimensions of Accountability." Daytona Beach, Fla.: Daytona Beach Community College, 1974. Mimeographed.

Dixon, Greta Marie. "Undergraduate Resident Assistant Programs in Small Private Colleges." The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 11 (March, 1970), pp. 135-140.

Dolan, Frances Anne. "Personal Qualities and Characteristics Important in the Selection of Undergraduate Staff Members for Women's Residence Halls." Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 26 (December, 1965), p. 3124.

Dramer, Howard C., Florence Berger, and George Miller. "Student Concerns and Sources of Assistance." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 15 (September, 1974), pp. 389-393.

Dressel, Paul L., and Irvin J. Lehmann. "The Impact of Higher Education on Student Attitudes, Values, and Critical Thinking Abilities." Educational Record, Vol. 46 (Summer, 1965), pp. 248-258.

Dunlop, R. S. "Employment and Compensation Practices for Counselors." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 47 (June, 1969), pp. 944-950.

Duvall, William H. "Student Staff Evaluation of Residence Hall Environments." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 10 (January, 1969), pp. 52-58.

Ellovich, E. M. "Beware of Too Much Emphasis on Tests." Administrative Management, Vol. 29 (April, 1968), pp. 63-64.

Favela, Frank, and Zoltan Fuzessery. "The New Professional Emerges." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 4 (December, 1974), pp. 319-323.

Forman, M. "The Alienated Resident and the Alienating Institition: A Case for Peer Group Interventions." Social Work, Vol. 16 (April, 1971), pp. 47-54.

Fossett, Katherine. "Student Personnel Internship Programs in Residence Halls." (Unpublished report, Ed.D. project, Advanced School of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1957.)

French, Wendell L. "Psychological Testing: Some Problems and Solutions." Personnel Administration, Vol. 29 (March-April, 1966), pp. 19-25.

Frey, David H., and Bruce Shertzer. "Life History Correlates of a Career Commitment to School Counseling." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 47 (June, 1969), pp. 951-957.

Frye, Donald Lee. "A Study of the Number and Types of Problems Voluntarily Brought by Male Students to Undergraduate Residence Hall Counselors and Dean of Men in Ten Selected Midwestern Colleges and Universities." (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, 1961.)

Gardner, Burleigh B. "What Makes Successful and Unsuccessful Executives?" Advanced Management, Vol. 13 (September, 1948), pp. 116-125.

Gartner, Alan, and Frank Riessman. "The Paraprofessional Movement in Perspective." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 4 (December, 1974), pp. 253-256.

Gordon, Jesse E. "The Development of Paraprofessionals' Employment Work." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 4 (December, 1974), pp. 289-293.

Grant, Harold. "Behavior and the Influence of Environment." Proceedings of the 1968 ACUHO Conference, Vol. 12 (1968), pp. 82-87.

Greenleaf, Elizabeth (ed.). Undergraduate Students As Members of Residence Hall Staff. Bloomington: Bloomcraft Central Printing, 1967.

Hartzfeld, Freeda Odessa. "The College Residence: A Laboratory for Living." (Unpublished Ed.D. project, Advanced School of Education, Teacher's College, Columbia University, New York, 1947.)

Hayes, P. L. "A Study of the Relationship of a Measure of Self-Actualization to Resident Counselor Effectiveness." Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 31 (April, 1972), p. 439 A.

Hoelting, Floyd B. "Interest Group Programming and Budgeting in Residence Halls." National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, Vol. 11 (July, 1973), pp. 52-55.

Hood, Albert B. "An Experiment Utilizing Residence Counselors to Teach Educational Skills." The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 4 (October, 1962), pp. 35-40.

Horle, Reid F., and George M. Gazda. "Qualifications, Training, and Duties of Directors and Staff of Men's Residence Halls." The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 4 (June, 1963), pp. 231-234.

Hoyt, Donald P., and Alexander Davidson. "Evaluating Residence Hall Advisers." The Journal of College Personnel, Vol. 8 (July, 1967), pp. 251-256.

Hubbell, Robert N., and Grant P. Sherwood. "A Model For Developing New Residence Hall Environments." National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, Vol. 10 (January, 1973), pp. 243-254.

Jencks, Christopher, and David Reissman. "Patterns of Residential Education: A Case Study of Harvard." The American College. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962, pp. 731-749.

Johnson, Jo Anne. "Problems Voluntarily Taken by Students to Residence Hall Counselors." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 47 (December, 1958), pp. 296-298.

Karman, A. "Student Expectations of College: Some Implications for Student Personnel Administrators." National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, Vol. 11 (Spring, 1974), pp. 52-59.

Kidd, John W. "Improving Morale In College Residence Halls." College and University Business, Vol. 12 (February, 1952), pp. 45-46.

Kidd, John W. Residence Hall Guidance. Dubuque: William C. Brown Company, 1956.

Kirchner, Wayne K. "Job Attitudes and Performance." Personnel Administration, Vol. 30 (January-February, 1967), pp. 43-45.

Lawler, Edward E., III. "Attitude Surveys and Job Performance." Personnel Administration, Vol. 30 (September-October, 1967), pp. 3-5, 22-24.

Lawshe, C. H. "Employee Selection." Personnel Psychology, Vol. 5 (Spring, 1952), pp. 31-34.

Lipsetz, Alvin H. "Student Personnel Work and Organization Development." National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, Vol. 11 (October, 1973), pp. 36-40.

Lipstreu, Otis. "On the Validity of Employment Interviewing." Personnel Journal, Vol. 45 (December, 1966), p. 692.

Littlefield, L. Richard, and Edward F. Spencer. "A Variety of Approaches to Living-Learning." National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, Vol. 11 (July, 1973), pp. 43-51.

Mandel, M. "Employment Interviewing." Personnel Methods Series, No. 5. Washington: U.S. Civil Service Commission, June, 1956.

McClure, O. J. "Solving Problems With Aptitude Survey Data." Administrative Management, Vol. 27 (October, 1966), pp. 65-66.

McNemar, Quinn. "Opinion-Attitude Methodology." Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 43 (July, 1946), pp. 289-345.

Miller, Delbert C. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. New York: David McKay Company, 1964.

Mitchell, K. M. "Effects of Short-Term Training on Residence Hall Assistants." Counselor Education and Supervision, Vol. 4 (1971), pp. 310-318.

Moffatt, Thomas. "Interviewing Job Applicants: Hazards and Hangups." Management Review, Vol. 56 (January, 1967), pp. 70-73.

Moore, Marv. "Training Professionals To Work With Para-Professionals." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 4 (December, 1974), pp. 308-312.

Moore, M., and U. Delworth. "Initiation and Implementation of Outreach Programs." Technical Report No. 2. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Mental Health, 1972.

Morgan, J. D. "Training the Resident Hall Advisor: A Workshop on Expectations." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 13 (January, 1972), pp. 76-77.

Morris, Sidney. "Getting Qualified Help Through Careful Testing." The Office, Vol. 66 (December, 1967), pp. 46, 48.

Morstain, Barry. "The Importance of Student Interaction in the Freshman Year: Some Bases of an Experimental Living Learning Program." National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, Vol. 9 (April, 1972), pp. 283-287.

Murphy, Raymond O. "Administrative Practices In Utilizing Students As Staff In Residence Halls." The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 6 (December, 1964), pp. 109-113.

Murphy, Raymond O., and Angelo Ortanzi. "Use of Standardized Measurements in the Selection of Residence Hall Staffs." The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 7 (November, 1966), pp. 360-363.

Newton, Fred B. "The Effect of Systematic Communication Skills Training on Residence Hall Paraprofessionals." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 15 (September, 1974), pp. 366-369.

Nickerson, Don L., and Janette T. Harrington. The College Student As Counselor. Washington: NEFF Printing Company, 1971.

Nicoletti, John, and Lottie Flater-Benz. "Volunteers in a Community Mental Health Agency." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 4 (December, 1974), pp. 281-284.

O'Leary, S. G. "Counselor Activity as a Predictor of Outcome." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 8 (October, 1969), pp. 135-139.

Orme, Rhoda. Counseling in Residence Halls. New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1960.

Ortenzi, Angelo. "Establishment and Cross-Validation of Selection Criteria For Resident Counselors at the Pennsylvania State University." Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 26 (May, 1966), p. 6451.

"Paraprofessionals Speak Out: What It's All About." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 4 (December, 1974), pp. 324-332.

Pearl, Arthur. "Paraprofessional and Social Change." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 4 (December, 1974), pp. 264-268.

Peterson, William D., and Susan E. Spooner. "Psychoecology and Student Development: Dynamic Duo." National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, Vol. 11 (October, 1973), pp. 46-51.

Plank, C. C. "It's Not Alone For Knowledge." Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 8 (May, 1937), pp. 245-252.

Powell, John R., Samuel A. Plyer, Barbara A. Dickson, and Stephen D. McClellan. The Personnel Assistant in College Residence Halls. Boston: Houghton Miflin Company, 1969.

Pyle, R. R., and F. A. Snyder. "Students as Paraprofessional Counselors at Community Colleges." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 12 (June, 1971), pp. 259-269.

Rabourn, C. N., J. H. Schilz, and C. W. Holland. "A Successful Selection Technique." Personnel Journal, Vol. 46 (April, 1967), pp. 211-213.

Riker, Harold C. College Housing As Learning Centers. Washington: American College Personnel Association, Student Personnel Services, Number 3, 1965.

Rudow, Edward H. "Paraprofessionals in a Drug Education Program." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 4 (December, 1974), pp. 294-297.

Sagedahl, Sherwood, David Lesar, and Frederick Markwardt, Jr. "Criteria Administrators Use in the Selection of Counselors." The School Counselor, Vol. 17 (September, 1969), pp. 63-65.

Schroeder, Pearl, and Eunice Dowse. "Selection, Function, and Assessment of Residence Hall Counselors." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 47 (October, 1968), pp. 151-156.

Sedlucek, William E., and Joseph L. Horowitz. "Changing Perceptions: An Individual or Environmental Approach." National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, Vol. 11 (Spring, 1974), pp. 48-51.

Shaffer, Robert H., and Daniel A. Ferber. "The Residential College Concept: Campus Organizational Patterns for Quality and Quantity." Bulletin of the School of Education, Vol. 41 (May, 1965), pp. 68-72.

Shaffer, Robert H., and Elizabeth A. Greenleaf. "Recruiting Residence Hall Staff." National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, Vol. 2 (1965), pp. 25-28.

Shay, John E., Jr. "The Evolution of the Campus Residence Halls, Part I." Journal of National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Vol. 27 (Summer, 1964a), pp. 179-185.

Shay, John E., Jr. "The Evolution of the Campus Residence Halls, Part II." Journal of National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Vol. 28 (Fall, 1964b), pp. 25-33.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics For The Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Simons, Wesley Stanley. "The Personality Characteristics of The Residence Hall Assistant As Related To Job Performance." Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 18 (January, 1968), pp. 135-136.

Spurrier, Jack L., and Pamella C. Collins. "Developing A Resident Assistant Training Program." National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, Vol. 10 (January, 1973), pp. 259-262.

Stark, Matthew. An Annotated Bibliography on Residence Counseling. A Report by ACUHO. Minneapolis: Gilbert Publishing Company, 1964.

Thomas, Lucinda E., and Richard I. Yates. "Paraprofessionals in Minority Programs." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 4 (December, 1974), pp. 285-288.

True, John E., and Carl E. Young. "Associate Degree Programs for Human Services Workers." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 4 (December, 1974), pp. 304-307.

Tucker, B. J., D. Mengenity, and L. Vigil. "Anatomy of a Campus Crisis Center." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 48 (July, 1970), pp. 343-348.

"Two Authorities Put Psychological Testing On The Couch." Business Management, Vol. 33 (November, 1967), pp. 36-44.

Varenhorst, Barbara B. "Training Adolescents as Peer Counselors." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 4 (December, 1974), pp. 271-275.

Wagner, Edwin E. "Predicting Success for Young Executives From Objective Test Scores and Personal Data." Personnel Psychology, Vol. 13 (1960), pp. 181-186.

Walther, Regis H. Job Analysis and Interest Measurement Manual. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1964.

Walther, Regis H. "The Psychological Dimensions of Work." Social Research Group. Washington, D. C.: The George Washington University, 1972. (Mimeographed.)

Walther, Regis H., Shirley D. McCune, and Peter B. Petersen. "The Shaping of Professional Subcultures: A Study of Student Groups from Five Professions." Social Relations Group. Washington, D. C.: The George Washington University, 1972. (Mimeographed.)

Wedell, Carl, and Karl U. Smith. "Consistency of Interview Methods in Appraisal of Attitudes." Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 35 (December, 1951), pp. 392-396.

Wrenn, R. L., and R. Mencke. "Students Who Counsel Students." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 50 (December, 1972), pp. 687-689.

Wyrick, T. J., and K. M. Mitchell. "Relationships Between Resident Assistants' Empathy and Warmth and Their Effectiveness." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 12 (January, 1971), pp. 36-40.

Zirkle, Kenneth E., and George Hudson. "The Effects of Residence Hall Staff Members on Maturity Development for Male Students." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 16 (January, 1975), pp. 30-34.

Zunker, Vernon G., and William F. Brown. "Comparative Effectiveness of Student and Professional Counselors." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 44 (March, 1966), pp. 738-743.

APPENDIX A

STUDENT ASSISTANT JOB DESCRIPTIONS

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

JOB TITLE: Student Assistants

JOB DESCRIPTION: A primary function is to provide information and individual assistance to the residents. Being students, the student assistants can represent the student opinion to the University officials, while at the same time they represent the University.

RESPONSIBLE TO: The Head Resident and through him to the Assistant Director of Single Student Housing for Men.

DUTIES:

1. Identify students with problems and assist them directly with counseling or refer them to other counselors or personnel agencies. These problem areas include adjustment, family relations, physical health, vocational orientation.

2. Consult with staff members of appropriate referral agencies and follow-up students referred.

3. Orienting students to the structure and functions of University and residential facilities and familiarize students with University policies and regulations.

4. Supervising the organization and planning of group activities, social events, special events and activities, judiciaries, and all aspects of student government.

5. Fostering leadership ability and development of student responsibility. Work closely and cooperatively with the student government and student leaders.

6. Cultivate high morals and understanding of the Residence Counseling Program. Set an example through good behavior, dress, academic progress, and ethics.

7. Communicate and consult with students, co-workers, supervisors, other staff members, professional agencies, and with members of the Office of the Dean of Students.

8. Maintain records and make written and verbal reports.

9. Prepare for and attend training sessions and staff meetings.

10. Stimulate and maintain an atmosphere in the residence unit which will promote scholastic attainment by aiding students in the development of good study skills and habits.

11. Aid the Head Resident in maintaining good health standards in the apartments by helping keep them clean and inspecting them regularly.

12. Assume responsibility during emergency situations.

13. They should report misuse of facilities, encourage respect for private and public property, and encourage respect for visitors in the students residence living area.

14. Other specific duties as the occasions require.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

RESIDENT ASSISTANT PROGRAM FOR MEN

Resident Assistants are members of the staff of the Office of the Dean of Men and of the hall in which they reside. There is one Resident Assistant for every 45 residents in each of the undergraduate halls. In addition, there is a Resident Director, Assistant Director and Administrative Assistant in the halls for administration and supervision. The staff members work together to develop a program that meets the needs of the residents, is intellectually stimulating and that gives a maximum of responsibility to the student residents.

Duties

1. The Resident Assistant's primary responsibility is that of a counselor to the residents on his floor. To fulfill this responsibility the Resident Assistant must be available on his floor a sufficient period of time; he should periodically engage in an evaluation session with each resident. The Resident Assistant should spend a certain amount of time each week actually counseling the residents on his floor. He should be available at most times.

2. The Resident Assistant should work closely with the floor representative to the Council. This will keep the Resident Assistant informed of hall activity and better insure floor awareness and participation.

3. The Resident Assistant should organize and lead several floor meetings that will acquaint the residents with services available at the University.

4. The Resident Assistant should contribute to the administration of the hall by working in the office. He will handle regular hall business and be available for any problems or emergencies. This duty will consume approximately four hours per week.

5. Resident Assistants participate in a week-long orientation program prior to the opening of the halls in September. Weekly group meetings are held as well as individual meetings when necessary.

6. Resident Assistants assume responsibility for the halls on specified nights and weekends, the details of which are arranged during the orientation period. They must also arrange certain hours in their schedules when they will be available for individual student contacts and general activities.

7. The halls will remain open during all holiday periods. During the Thanksgiving holidays, semester break, and the spring recess, Resident Assistants have some responsibility for administrative coverage of their halls. (This is arranged on an alternating basis). Resident Assistants remain in their halls one day after classes end for the Christmas holiday and must return by the day prior to the beginning of classes after the holidays.

COURSE WORK

Resident Assistants may assume a full-time course load.

APPOINTMENTS

Resident Assistants receive an official letter of appointment from the Office of the Dean of Men. Appointments are for two semesters (September-June). Six positions are available for the summer sessions; the stipends vary according to the duties. Applications for summer positions should be made in March.

OUTSIDE WORK

Resident Assistants may assume outside employment up to 15 hours per week.

REQUIREMENTS

Academic status of senior or graduate student.

One year of prior experience in residence hall work.

REMUNERATION

One furnished room, rent-free. One-half tuition (up to six hours per semester).

APPENDIX B

JOB ANALYSIS AND INTEREST MEASUREMENT FORM 669

SOCIAL RESEARCH GROUP
The George Washington University

Form 669

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS BOOKLET

JOB ANALYSIS AND INTEREST MEASUREMENT (JAIM)
FORM 669

This booklet contains a number of questions about your background, interests, and work preferences. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers to any of the questions. The JAIM was designed as a method for examining the "behavioral styles" of different occupational and professional groups. To date, it has been used for studying more than thirty occupational groups including engineers, lawyers, foreign service officers, ambassadors, judges, social workers, policemen, physicists, and secretaries. It has been found to be highly effective in differentiating among occupational groups.

Directions

You will find an answer sheet enclosed in the questionnaire booklet. Please read the following instructions before answering the questions:

1. Fill in the identifying information at the top of the answer sheet.

2. Read each question carefully, select your answer, and enter it on the answer sheet. If you make a mistake, erase the wrong answer and enter the right one. There is no time limit, but do not spend a great deal of time considering your answers. You should work steadily and as rapidly as possible, and where interpretation is required, use your best judgment. You can expect that for some of the questions you will see little if any differences among the items, but it is important that you make a choice for each question. It is important that you make a choice for each question. It is the pattern of your choices which is important and not the answer to any specific question.

3. When you have finished, you should check over the answer sheet to be sure you have answered every question.

BOTH THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND THE ANSWER SHEET SHOULD BE RETURNED

Copyrighted, 1969
Regis H. Walther

Form 669

JOB ANALYSIS AND INTEREST MEASUREMENT (JAIM)

Part I

This questionnaire is divided into three parts, with different instructions for each part. Questions 1-105 should be answered by entering on the answer sheet the number of the one option in each of the following questions which best applies to you. Answer every question.

1. What kind of games do you enjoy most?
   1. Games requiring a great deal of reasoning and thinking
   2. Games requiring some reasoning but also some luck
   3. Games of chance which you can play without too much thinking

2. How often do you take time out to think over what you have done and to plan what you will do next?
   1. Frequently
   2. Sometimes
   3. Seldom
   4. Almost never

3. How well do you keep track of your possessions?
   1. Everything is almost always in its place
   2. Most everything is in its place
   3. Sometimes things get misplaced
   4. Frequently things get misplaced
   5. You have great difficulty keeping track of things

4. When you have something to do that doesn't interest you, you
   1. Nearly always do it without delay
   2. Do it after a little delay
   3. Do it after considerable delay
   4. Do it only after pressure is put on you
   5. Seldom get around to doing it

5. You consider yourself to be
   1. Unusually orderly
   2. More orderly than average
   3. About average in orderliness
   4. Somewhat below average in orderliness
   5. Considerably below average in orderliness

6. When you have an appointment or have to be somewhere, you are
   1. Almost always there ahead of time
   2. Almost always on time
   3. Sometimes a little late
   4. Frequently late
   5. Almost always late

7. Which of the following describes you best whenever you have a choice?
   1. You get up at about the same time and do not like to stay in bed later than your getting up time
   2. You usually get off to a slow start in the morning
   3. You have no fixed pattern and sometimes get up early and sometimes sleep late

8. How effective are you at finding lost objects?
   1. Other people seldom find something after you have tried and given up
   2. You are usually able to find things
   3. You sometimes have difficulty finding things
   4. You often have difficulty finding things

9. The thing you like best in playing cards or similar competitive games is
   1. The competition
   2. The sociability
   3. You do not like competitive games

10. When working in your spare time on a hobby or something that interests you, do you
    1. Concentrate for long periods of time and complete each project you start
    2. Complete most projects that you start
    3. Finish those things that continue to interest you and forget about the rest
    4. Finish only a few things you start in your spare time

11. Do you take the initiative in planning a party?
    1. Frequently
    2. Sometimes
    3. Seldom
    4. Almost never

12. You lose your temper
    1. Frequently
    2. Sometimes
    3. Seldom
    4. Almost never

13. You look to other people for comfort and emotional support
    1. Frequently
    2. Sometimes
    3. Seldom
    4. Almost never

14. How often do you find yourself taking a position of leadership in a group you are with
    1. Almost always
    2. Frequently
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

15. How difficult do you find it to give a speech or to recite before a large group?
    1. You have almost no difficulty
    2. You are a little nervous at first, but have little difficulty after getting started
    3. You do not enjoy it, but are able to do it adequately when required
    4. You avoid public speaking or reciting whenever possible.

16. It bothers you to have to give orders to other people.
    1. Very much
    2. A little
    3. Not at all

17. What was your academic standing in high school?
    1. An honor student and awarded commendation
    2. Above the average of your class
    3. About the average of your class
    4. Below the average of your class
    5. You did not go to high school

18. Are you at your best during a written examination?
    1. Yes
    2. Don't know
    3. No

19. How often do you feel like smashing things?
    1. Frequently
    2. Sometimes
    3. Seldom
    4. Almost never

20. How often do you do things that you later regret?
    1. More often than most people
    2. About the same as other people
    3. Less often than most other people
    4. Almost never

21. You go out of your way to support or comfort other people.
    1. Frequently
    2. Sometimes
    3. Seldom
    4. Almost never

22. You are striving to reach some goal you have established for yourself.
    1. Almost always
    2. Usually
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

23. If you were asked to be an officer of an organization would you prefer to be
    1. President
    2. Vice President
    3. Secretary
    4. Treasurer
    5. You would prefer to hold no office

24. Which of these describes your attitude toward athletic games?
    1. You are strongly competitive
    2. You are moderately competitive
    3. You do not like and generally avoid athletic games

25. You tell people off when they bug you, even if it means getting into trouble.
    1. Almost always
    2. Frequently
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

26. It bothers you to leave a task unfinished.
    1. Almost always
    2. Usually
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

27. You undertake more than you can accomplish.
    1. Frequently
    2. Sometimes
    3. Seldom
    4. Almost never

28. Your supervisors or teachers for the most part have
    1. Shown lack of sympathy and understanding in dealing with you
    2. Been for the most part indifferent
    3. Been friendly, but not particularly helpful
    4. Usually been helpful and understanding
    5. Almost always been helpful and understanding

29. When engaged in athletics or physical activities
    1. You perform better under competition or stress
    2. Competition or stress does not affect your performance
    3. You perform better when there is no competition or stress

30. You are
    1. Very careful about details
    2. Moderately careful about details
    3. Somewhat careless about details
    4. Very careless about details

31. You get even with people who wrong you as soon as you can.
    1. Almost always
    2. Usually
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

32. What is your ability to fix things aroung the house?
    1. You are a reasonably skilled craftsman
    2. You are able to make most minor repairs
    3. You are able to make a few minor repairs
    4. You are almost never able to fix anything

33. Do you feel that laws and social conventions are useless and hamper an individual's personal freedom?
    1. Frequently
    2. Sometimes
    3. Seldom
    4. Almost never

34. How many enemies do you feel you have?
    1. Many
    2. Some
    3. Very few
    4. Almost none

35. You have been double crossed by people
    1. Often
    2. Sometimes
    3. Seldom
    4. Almost never

36. You have found that people break promises which they have made to you
    1. Frequently
    2. Sometimes
    3. Seldom
    4. Almost never

37. During your spare time, you have trouble finding something to do that you enjoy.
    1. Frequently
    2. Sometimes
    3. Seldom
    4. Almost never

38. In your life so far you feel you have been
    1. Almost always lucky
    2. Usually lucky
    3. Neither lucky or unlucky
    4. Somewhat unlucky
    5. Very unlucky

39. You feel happy
    1. Almost always
    2. Usually
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

40. You like best in a job
    1. To decide for yourself how work will be done
    2. To have clearcut instructions so you know exactly what is expected of you

41. Which do you prefer?
    1. Almost always to be where there is something going on
    2. Almost always to get away by yourself

42. You like
    1. To have a supervisor you can respect and admire
    2. Your personal relationship with your supervisor does not particularly matter as long as you are able to do your work

43. In your work you like
    1. Definite procedures and instructions which you can follow
    2. Freedom in working out your own methods for doing the work

44. You like best a supervisor who
    1. Insists on high performance standards for himself and his subordinates
    2. Is considerate and understanding

45. Which of the following is most important to you in a job?
    1. Congenial co-workers
    2. Competent co-workers

46. You are most likely to
    1. Take a chance
    2. Play it safe

47. It is most important to you
    1. To have steady permanent work
    2. To have interesting work even though it may be temporary

48. An effective supervisor
    1. Shows employees that he is interested in them as persons and concerned about their welfare
    2. Does not get involved with the personal problems of his subordinates

49. When procedural changes need to be made, an effective supervisor
    1. Makes definite decisions himself as to what is to be done and how it is to be done
    2. Consults with his subordinates and, if possible, permits them to decide what changes need to be made and how they should be put into effect.

50. You believe that
    1. One should follow the established moral laws regardless of the consequences
    2. The moral person should judge acts as right or wrong in terms of their consequences.

51. You believe that each individual should
    1. Devote significant time and effort improving social conditions
    2. Should take care of his own responsibilities and avoid "do good" activities

52. You prefer to be considered
    1. Conventional
    2. Original

53. You prefer to deal with
    1. Concrete situations
    2. Abstract ideas

54. You get along best when you
    1. Know what you want and work to get it
    2. Do what seems to be appropriate in each situation

55. You
    1. Feel that when you are doing the best you can, there is little point in worrying about your mistakes
    2. Spend considerable time thinking over past mistakes and trying to figure out how you can avoid them in the future

56. You
    1. Do not enjoy having to adapt yourself to a new and unusual situation
    2. Enjoy discarding the old and accepting the new

57. You believe you get along best when you
    1. Do what has to be done even if it doesn't please everyone
    2. Respect the feelings of others

58. You
    1. Almost always have a plan for reaching some future goal
    2. Prefer to decide as you go along what you should do next

59. You feel that you are at your best
    1. When dealing with the unusual or unexpected
    2. When following a routing or a carefully worked out procedure

60. You like best
    1. A supervisor who makes use of your ability
    2. A supervisor who is friendly and sympathetic

61. When a person is weak he
    1. Needs sympathy and understanding
    2. Should be made to help himself and to try to do better

62. You like to consider yourself
    1. A person who has both feet on the ground
    2. A person with a lot of novel ideas

63. You would describe yourself as
    1. Spontaneous
    2. Systematic

64. You usually depend on
    1. Overall impressions
    2. Systematic analysis

65. When you are walking somewhere you are more likely
    1. To concentrate on your own thoughts
    2. To notice the things around you

66. You prefer to have a supervisor who
    1. Tells you clearly what to do and how to do it
    2. Expects you to make your own decisions on how to do your work

67. You find that you can express yourself best
    1. In writing
    2. Orally

68. You believe that moral principles
    1. Come from outside powers higher than man
    2. Are not absolute and unchanging, but depend upon circumstances

69. You
    1. Do not like to be different from other people
    2. Do not mind doing things which are not customary

70. When you have a difficult decision to make and feel that you have enough facts, you find it best
    1. To come to a quick decision rather than to mull it over
    2. To spend considerable time reviewing all possible interpretations of the facts before making a decision

71. You like
    1. To be where there is always something going on
    2. To work steadily without any interruption

72. You like to
    1. Finish one task before starting another
    2. Work on several things at once

73. You believe that most people
    1. Can be trusted
    2. Would cheat if they thought they wouldn't get caught

74. You prefer to
    1. Think things through step by step
    2. Seek a broad general view of the situation

75. You like to
    1. Observe concrete facts
    2. Speculate about the reasons things happen

76. You like
    1. To solve difficult problems on your own through use of ingenuity
    2. To do work which requires little study or thought once it is learned

77. You
    1. Like to do things at the last minute
    2. Try to plan your work so you won't need to work under pressure

78. You
    1. Greatly enjoy competition
    2. Avoid competition whenever you can

79. You like
    1. To work closely with other people
    2. To work by yourself away from other people

80. You consider yourself as
    1. Cautious
    2. Daring

81. You
    1. Like to follow a schedule
    2. Do not like schedules and avoid them whenever possible

82. You feel that having a daily routine
    1. Is a good way of getting things done
    2. Is too limiting and mechanical

83. You believe most people are
    1. More inclined to help others
    2. More inclined to look out for themselves

84. An effective supervisor
    1. Avoids social interaction with his subordinates during leisure hours
    2. Tries to create a friendly work group

85. You like best
    1. Routine
    2. Constant change

86. You prefer a job in which
    1. You are constantly with other people
    2. You work by yourself away from other people

87. An effective supervisor
    1. Organizes and directs the work so that he gets the most from each employee
    2. Helps employees do their work without close supervision

88. You like to consider yourself
    1. A person with common sense
    2. A person with imaginative ideas

89. You like
    1. To theorize about things
    2. To stay with the facts

90. You like to consider yourself
    1. A sensible person
    2. An ingenious person

91. You
    1. Like to work steadily and be busy all the time
    2. Do not mind uneven work loads and irregular hours

92. You like to consider yourself
    1. A practical person
    2. A person with vision

93. It is important for you
    1. To have the freedom to work out your own methods for doing the work
    2. To know just how your supervisor expects the work to be done

94. You consider yourself as
    1. Self confident
    2. Unsure of yourself

95. It is most important to
    1. Have faith in something
    2. Be intelligent and resourceful

96. You prefer
    1. Scheduled activities
    2. Unplanned activities

97. You find you get along best when you
    1. Establish long range plans and goals and are guided by them as much as possible
    2. Adapt yourself to the current situation and do what seems to be appropriate

98. You would rather be
    1. A steady, dependable worker
    2. A brilliant, but unstable worker

99. You are more
    1. A theorist than a practical person
    2. A practical person than a theorist

100. When watching sports or competitive activities you are more likely to support
    1. The champion or skillful performer
    2. The "underdog" or the one who is losing

101. You are most likely to be annoyed when people
   1. Do too much theorizing
   2. Show too little imagination

102. Most employees prefer
   1. A supervisor who tells them clearly what to do
   2. The freedom to do things on their own

103. People respond better to
   1. Encouragement
   2. Criticism

104. An effective supervisor
   1. Avoids being too friendly with his subordinates
   2. Avoids being too distant or impersonal with his subordinates

105. An effective supervisor
   1. Trusts his subordinates to do a good job and gives them considerable freedom of action
   2. Makes a point always to know everything that is going on in his work unit, and to check the work carefully to prevent mistakes

Part II

Questions 106-131 ask how much you agree or disagree with various statements. Circle on the answer sheet the number which best describes your opinion as follows:

1 - Agree strongly
2 - Agree somewhat
3 - Neutral - neither agree or disagree
4 - Disagree somewhat
5 - Disagree strongly

Circle only one number for each statement. Rate every statement.

106. You are thorough in any work you undertake.

107. You expect to do well in the things you try to do.

108. You do your worst work if unreasonable pressure is put on you.

109. You feel you have little influence over the things that happen to you.

110. It is usually best to do things in a conventional way.

111. Most people have confidence in your ability.

112. You believe that orderliness is a very important personality characteristic.

113. No matter what a superior officer says, he should always be obeyed.

114. You get a great deal of enjoyment out of overcoming obstacles or resistance.

115. It is usually best to change things slowly.

116. You feel that obedience and respect for authority are among the most important virtues children should learn.

117. The wise person lives for today and lets tomorrow take care of itself.

118. Most people are crooked when they have the chance.

119. You believe that promptness is a very important personality characteristic.

120. When things are going well, it is best not to make changes that will disrupt things.

121. You are careful about your manner of dress.

122. You find it easy to stick to a schedule once you have started it.

123. You like to keep going until you have finished a job.

124. If you try hard enough, you have a good chance of succeeding in whatever you want to do.

125. It is hard to get ahead without breaking the law now and then.

126. You get a great deal of fun out of life.

127. You feel you are as smart and capable as most other people.

128. You like making things with tools.

129. You are relatively unconcerned about what other people think of your actions.

130. You work best under a great deal of pressure and tight deadlines.

131. You have no difficulty maintaining your position when other people disagree with you.

Part III

Questions 132-154 contain from three to five statements or adjectives. You should rank them on the answer sheet in the order in which they appeal to you, putting a "1" next to the Letter for the option you like best, and "2" next to the option you like second best, and so on. Be sure and assign a rank number to every option.

132. You believe that
   a. The best defense is a good offense.
   b. A gentle answer turns away wrath.
   c. It is best to avoid conflict whenever possible.

133. You like
   a. Working as a member of a group
   b. Working by yourself
   c. Helping your supervisor with whatever needs to be done
   d. Directing and coordinating the work of other people

134. You would prefer to be
   a. Conscientious
   b. Understanding
   c. Imaginative
   d. Attractive
   e. Prominent

135. You would prefer to be
   a. Trustworthy
   b. Considerate
   c. Influential
   d. Ingenious
   e. Popular

136. If a person behaves toward you in a dictatorial or domineering fashion, you
   a. Keep away from him if you can
   b. Have it out with him
   c. Try to win him over

137. When people are nasty toward you, are you most likely to
   a. Have nothing further to do with them, at least temporarily
   b. Teach them a lesson so they won't do it again
   c. Try to understand them and get them to behave more reasonably

138. You would prefer to be
   a. A recognized success
   b. Well liked
   c. Socially useful
   d. Intelligent
   e. Reliable

139. You would prefer to be
   a. Brilliant
   b. Helpful
   c. Dependable
   d. Gracious
   e. Important

140. You like
   a. Working closely with and being of assistance to a supervisor doing important and interesting work
   b. Doing important and interesting work which you can do by yourself
   c. Being a member of a group doing important and interesting work
   d. Organizing and directing the carrying out of an interesting and important task

141. The ideal job for you would
   a. Enable you to look forward to a stable, secure future
   b. Provide you with excitement and variety
   c. Enable you to develop new ideas and approaches to problems and situations
   d. Enable you to work with people on some interesting activity
   e. Permit you to use skill with tools to make something

142. When you are troubled you like to
   a. Talk it over with someone
   b. Get busy and active
   c. Get away by yourself

143. Parents get the best results from their children, if they
   a. Praise and encourage them
   b. Praise them sometimes, but also maintain strict discipline
   c. Give them freedom and opportunity to learn from their own experience

144. You believe that
   a. You should never let anyone get away with being beligerant toward you
   b. Regardless of how belligerantly a person may behave toward you, you can usually get him to stop by behaving diplomatically

c. The best thing to do when things get unpleasant is to get away as soon as you can.

145. An effective supervisor
a. Takes every opportunity to praise employees on their performance
b. Only praises employees occasionally or for unusual work since employees usually know when they are doing well
c. Praises employees occasionally, but also keeps a careful watch for deficient performance to discipline those who fall below standard.

146. A supervisor gets the best results from his work group when he
a. Makes it clear to employees that they must produce
b. Rewards loyalty and good performance
c. Gives employees a chance to accomplish something on their own.

147. It is most important for parents to teach their children
a. To be resourceful
b. To be kind and considerate
c. To be obedient and to respect authority.

148. Employees work best when they are given
a. Praise and encouragement
b. The chance to accomplish something
c. Appropriate penalties when their performance is below standard.

149. You prefer
a. Work which results in social improvement
b. Work requiring intelligence and resourcefulness
c. Work which is appreciated by others
d. A top level position with high pay
e. Doing your share of the work which needs to be done.

150. When dealing with other people, you should
a. Avoid unpleasant controversial situations
b. Avoid hurting the feeling of others
c. Avoid being pushed around by other people.

151. You prefer to have a supervisor who
a. Expects and permits you to work on your own
b. Uses you as his assistant and works closely with you
c. Works with the group as a whole.

152. You believe the best strategy to use when someone acts aggressively toward you is
   a. To be diplomatic and try to quiet things down
   b. To keep away from him
   c. To fight back.

153. When you become involved in an unpleasant controversy or quarrel, you are most likely to
   a. Try to "pour oil on troubled waters"
   b. Take forceable action to stop it
   c. Get out of the situation as soon as you can.

154. You like
   a. Work which permits you to be helpful to others
   b. Work which permits you to be creative and original
   c. Work through which you can please and be appreciated by others
   d. Work which shows that you are a success and have achieved high status and prestige
   e. Work which permits you to meet your responsibilities and do what is expected of you.

Look over your answer sheet and be sure you have answered every question. The number of your choice should be written next to the number of the question for questions 1-105. You should circle a number for each question from 106-131. You should rate each option within questions 132-154.

Copyrighted, 1969
Regis H. Walther

APPENDIX C

JOB ANALYSIS AND INTEREST MEASUREMENT

RESPONSE SHEET

Job Analysis and Interest Measurement (JAIM)

Name . . . . . Date . . . . . .

Current Position . . . . . Sex . . . . . Age . . .

PART I

Questions 1-105 require your choosing only ONE option. Please circle the number of your choice. Answer EVERY question.

1. 1 2 3
2. 1 2 3 4
3. 1 2 3 4 5
4. 1 2 3 4 5
5. 1 2 3 4 5
6. 1 2 3 4 5
7. 1 2 3
8. 1 2 3 4
9. 1 2 3
10. 1 2 3 4
11. 1 2 3 4
12. 1 2 3 4
13. 1 2 3 4
14. 1 2 3 4 5
15. 1 2 3 4
16. 1 2 3
17. 1 2 3 4 5
18. 1 2 3
19. 1 2 3 4 5
20. 1 2 3 4
21. 1 2 3 4
22. 1 2 3 4 5
23. 1 2 3 4 5
24. 1 2 3
25. 1 2 3 4 5
26. 1 2 3 4 5
27. 1 2 3 4
28. 1 2 3 4 5
29. 1 2 3
30. 1 2 3 4
31. 1 2 3 4 5
32. 1 2 3 4
33. 1 2 3 4
34. 1 2 3 4
35. 1 2 3 4
36. 1 2 3 4

I.D. NUMBER

FORM 669

37. 1 2 3 4

38. 1 2 3 4 5

39. 1 2 3 4 5

40. 1 2

41. 1 2

42. 1 2

43. 1 2

44. 1 2

45. 1 2

46. 1 2

47. 1 2

48. 1 2

49. 1 2

50. 1 2

51. 1 2

52. 1 2

53. 1 2

54. 1 2

55. 1 2

56. 1 2

57. 1 2

58. 1 2

59. 1 2

60. 1 2

61. 1 2

62. 1 2

63. 1 2

64. 1 2

65. 1 2

66. 1 2

67. 1 2

68. 1 2

69. 1 2

70. 1 2

71. 1 2

72. 1 2

73. 1 2

74. 1 2

75. 1 2

76. 1 2

77. 1 2

78. 1 2

79. 1 2

80. 1 2

81. 1 2

82. 1 2

83. 1 2

84. 1 2

85. 1 2

86. 1 2

87. 1 2

88. 1 2

89. 1 2

90. 1 2

91. 1 2

92. 1 2

93. 1 2

94. 1 2

95. 1 2

96. 1 2

97. 1 2

98. 1 2

99. 1 2

100. 1 2

101. 1 2

102. 1 2

103. 1 2

104. 1 2

105. 1 2

PART II

Circle ONE number in questions 106-131, depending on the degree to which you agree or disagree. Answer EVERY question.

	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
106.	1	2	3	4	5
107.	1	2	3	4	5
108.	1	2	3	4	5
109.	1	2	3	4	5
110.	1	2	3	4	5
111.	1	2	3	4	5
112.	1	2	3	4	5
113.	1	2	3	4	5
114.	1	2	3	4	5
115.	1	2	3	4	5
116.	1	2	3	4	5
117.	1	2	3	4	5
118.	1	2	3	4	5
119.	1	2	3	4	5
120.	1	2	3	4	5
121.	1	2	3	4	5
122.	1	2	3	4	5
123.	1	2	3	4	5
124.	1	2	3	4	5
125.	1	2	3	4	5
126.	1	2	3	4	5
127.	1	2	3	4	5
128.	1	2	3	4	5
129.	1	2	3	4	5
130.	1	2	3	4	5
131.	1	2	3	4	5

PART III

For questions 132-154, you should rank the options in the order in which they appeal to you, giving the rank of "1" to the option which appeals to you most. For example, if you like football games most, reading next and movies least, you would answer the question by placing a "1" next to the b, a "2" next to the c, and a "3" next to the a.

QUESTION: You like--
a. Movies
b. Football games
c. Reading

ANSWER:
a. 3
b. 1
c. 2

132. a___
b___
c___

133. a___
b___
c___
d___

134. a___
b___
c___
d___
e___

135. a___
b___
c___
d___
e___

136. a___
b___
c___

137. a___
b___
c___

138. a___
b___
c___
d___
e___

139. a___
b___
c___
d___
e___

140. a___
b___
c___
d___

141. a___
b___
c___
d___
e___

142. a___
b___
c___

143. a___
b___
c___

144. a___
b___
c___

145. a___
b___
c___

146. a___
b___
c___

147. a___
b___
c___

148. a___
b___
c___

149. a___
b___
c___
d___
e___

150. a___
b___
c___

151. a___
b___
c___

152. a___
b___
c___

153. a___
b___
c___

154. a___
b___
c___
d___
e___

LOOK OVER YOUR ANSWER SHEET AND BE SURE YOU HAVE ANSWERED EVERY QUESTION

APPENDIX D

JOB ANALYSIS AND INTEREST MEASUREMENT SCORING KEY

SCORING KEY
JAIM Form 669
August 3, 1970

333

Orientations

1. Optimism

37	-38
	-39
	-126

2. Self Confidence

108	-94
	-107
	-111
	-124
	-127
	-131

3. Interpersonal Trust

28	-73
34	-83
35	
36	
118	
125	

4. Conservative-Conventional

33	-50
	-52
	-56
	-68
	-69
	-110
	-120
	-95

Self Management

5. Plan Ahead

	-22
	-54
	-58
	-97

6. Orderliness

	-3
	-5
	-30
	-121

7. Perseverance

	-4
	-7
	-10
	-26
	-106
	-123

8. Emotional Control

12	
19	
20	
25	
31	

9. Schedule Activities

-81
-82
-85
-96
-115
-98
-112

Interpersonal Style

10. Self Assertive

-9
-24
-29
-78
-114

11. Supportive of Others

57 -21
129 -61
132A -132B
150C -150B

12. Take Leadership

16 -14
-15
-23
-133D
-140D

13. Move Toward Aggressor

-136C
-137C
-144B
-152A
-153A

14. Move Away From Agressor

-136A
-137A
-144C
-150A
-152B
-153C

15. Move Against Aggressor

-136B
-137B
-144A
-152C
-153B

Cognitive Style

16. Concrete-Practical

89 -53
99 -62
-88
-90
-92

17. Systematic-Methodical

64 -74
70 -2

Relation to Authority

18. Act Independently

43
66
-40
-93
-151A

19. Work as an Assistant

-133C
-140A
-151B

Supervisory Style

20. Directive Leadership

105
-49
-87
-113
-116
-143B
-145C
-146A
-147C
-148C

21. Motivate by Rewards

-143A
-145A
-146B
-147B
-148A

22. Motivate by Results

-143C
-145B
-146C
-147A
-148B

Work Preferences

23. Social Interaction

133B
140B
-79
-86
-141D

24. Mechanical Activities

-32
-128
-141E

25. Group Participation

-133A
-140C
-151C

26. Stable Secure Work

63
46
59
130
-47
-80
-141A

27. Job Challenge

45
91
101
-1
-44
-59
-60
-76
-141C

Values

28. Status Attainment

-134E
-135C
-138A
-139E
-149D
-154D

29. Social Service

-134B
-135B
-138C
-139B
-149A
-154A

30. Approval from Others

-134D
-138B
-135E
-149C
-154C

31. Intellectual Achievement

-134C
-135D
-138D
-139A
-149B
-154B

32. Role Conformity

-134A
-135A
-138E
-139C
-149E
-154E

APPENDIX E

JOB ANALYSIS AND INTEREST MEASUREMENT

DEFINITION OF SCALES

DEFINITIONS OF JAIM SCALES (Form 669)

Orientations

1. Optimism - The degree to which the individual assumes that satisfactions can be expected in the natural course of events, and states that he gets a lot of fun out of life.

2. Self-Confidence - The degree to which the individual believes that he can, by his own actions, influence future events, expects to do well in the things he tries to do, and feels that he is as smart and capable as most other people.

3. Interpersonal Trust - The degree to which the individual trusts other people and has confidence in their good intentions toward him.

4. Open System - The degree to which the individual is willing to experiment and try new things as opposed to preferring the established and conventional way of doing things.

Self Management

5. Plan Ahead - The degree to which the individual establishes long-range goals and attempts to achieve them.

6. Orderliness - The degree to which the individual is orderly, attends to details, and keeps things in their place.

7. Perseverence - The degree to which the individual keeps at something even when he is not particularly interested in it, does not like to leave a task unfinished, and is thorough in anything he undertakes.

8. Emotional Control - The degree to which the individual keeps control of his temper, does not do things which he later regrets and does not tell people off when they bug him.

9. Schedule Activities - The degree to which the individual likes to follow a schedule or a daily routine.

Interpersonal Style

10. Self-Assertive - The degree to which the individual likes competition and tends to pursue his own goals when they are in competition with others.

11. Supportive of Others - The degree to which the individual is concerned about the feelings of other people, goes out of his way to support or comfort them, as opposed to doing what has to be done even if it doesn't please everyone.

12. Take Leadership - The degree to which the individual assumes a leadership role and likes to direct and supervise the work of others.

13. Move Toward Aggressor - The degree to which the individual tries to behave diplomatically when someone acts toward him in a belligerent or aggressive manner.

14. Move Away From Aggressor - The degree to which the individual withdraws when someone acts toward him in a belligerent or aggressive manner.

15. Move Against Aggressor - The degree to which the individual counter-attacks when someone acts toward him in a belligerent or aggressive manner.

Cognitive Style

16. Concrete-Practical - The degree to which the individual considers himself as practical, sensible with both feet on the ground in contrast to being imaginative, ingenious, and having novel ideas.

17. Systematic-Methodical - The degree to which the individual uses step-by-step methods for processing information and reaching decisions.

Relation to Authority

18. Act Independently - The degree to which the individual likes to have freedom in working out his own methods for doing the work rather than having definite procedures and instructions which he can follow.

19. Work as an Assistant - The degree to which the individual likes to work closely with his supervisor rather than working by himself.

Supervisory Style

20. Directive Leadership - The degree to which the individual believes that an effective supervisor makes the decisions himself rather than consulting with subordinates and delegating as much as possible to them; and keeps a careful watch for deficient performance to discipline those who fall below standard.

21. Motivate by Rewards - The degree to which the individual believes that people are best motivated by praise and rewards (extrinsic motivation).

22. Motivate by Results - The degree to which the individual believes that people are best motivated by the chance to accomplish something (intrinsic motivation).

Work Preferences

23. Social Interaction - The degree to which the individual likes work involving interaction with other people.

24. Mechanical Activities - The degree to which the individual likes mechanical activities.

25. Group Participation - The degree to which the individual likes to work as a member of a group.

26. Activity-Frequent Change - The degree to which the individual likes to be engaged in work providing a lot of excitement and a great deal of variety as opposed to work providing a stable secure future.

27. Job Challenge - The degree to which the individual likes activities providing a challenge with high performance standards.

Values

28. Status Attainment - The degree to which the individual values himself by his achievement of the status symbols established by his culture.

29. Social Service - The degree to which the individual values himself by contributing to social improvement.

30. Approval From Others - The degree to which the individual values himself by obtaining the approval of others.

31. Intellectual Achievement - The degree to which the individual values himself through his intellectual attainments.

32. Role Conformity - The degree to which the individual values himself according to how successfully he has conformed to the role requirements of the society.

APPENDIX F

RANK SCORES ON JAIM SCALES

TABLE V

RANK SCORES ON OPTIMISM SCALE BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
7.5		37.5	37.0		29.5
37.5		42.0	22.0		43.0
21.5		30.5	6.5		22.0
30.5		4.0	12.5		22.0
42.0		30.5	37.0		37.0
42.0		30.5	37.0		22.0
42.0		13.5	43.0		12.5
4.0		37.5	12.5		29.5
21.5		13.5	12.5		3.5
30.5		30.5	37.0		37.0
21.5		21.5	22.0		12.5
42.0		7.5	37.0		3.5
30.5		21.5	37.0		22.0
7.5		13.5	3.5		12.5
21.5		37.5	12.5		22.0
21.5		13.5	29.5		29.5
30.5		13.5	12.5		43.0
2.0		4.0	3.5		12.5
7.5		13.5	6.5		29.5
30.5		13.5	29.5		22.0
30.5		13.5	12.5		22.0
		21.5			37.0
		1.0			1.0

TABLE VI

RANK SCORES ON SELF CONFIDENCE SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
18.5		31.0	32.5		21.0
18.5		25.5	15.5		32.5
5.5		25.5	2.5		21.0
11.0		11.0	10.0		26.5
39.5		18.5	42.5		37.0
31.0		31.0	32.5		32.5
25.5		2.0	15.5		1.0
35.0		11.0	10.0		15.5
18.5		11.0	2.5		15.5
39.5		18.5	32.5		32.5
3.0		18.5	21.0		5.5
39.5		3.0	21.0		5.5
18.5		25.5	5.5		40.0
11.0		5.5	15.5		10.0
35.0		42.5	40.0		37.0
25.5		25.5	26.5		10.0
5.5		42.5	15.5		42.5
5.5		1.0	10.0		26.5
11.0		31.0	26.5		21.0
39.5		18.5	26.5		37.0
35.0		37.0	26.5		40.0
		44.0			44.0
		11.0			5.5

TABLE VII

RANK SCORES ON INTERPERSONAL TRUST SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
23.5		27.5	39.0		32.5
27.5		42.5	27.0		39.0
8.5		38.5	7.0		32.5
32.0		2.0	27.0		1.0
32.0		27.5	18.0		27.0
42.5		3.5	39.0		32.5
36.0		23.5	32.5		14.5
8.5		38.5	22.0		32.5
16.5		16.5	27.0		14.5
8.5		16.5	39.0		7.0
8.5		23.5	14.5		10.5
42.5		16.5	44.0		4.5
16.5		16.5	39.0		3.0
4.5		27.5	22.0		10.5
8.5		8.5	39.0		22.0
3.0		4.5	18.0		4.5
32.0		38.5	10.5		43.0
23.5		1.0	22.0		10.5
16.5		16.5	7.0		18.0
42.5		32.0	27.0		22.0
16.5		38.5	39.0		14.5
		32.0			32.5
		16.5			2.0

TABLE VIII

RANK SCORES ON OPEN SYSTEM SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
17.5		13.0	20.0		8.5
29.0		34.5	41.0		37.0
17.5		13.0	13.0		8.5
25.5		44.0	20.0		32.0
29.0		40.0	25.5		32.0
8.0		34.5	20.0		37.0
3.0		13.0	4.5		25.5
40.0		3.0	32.0		13.0
29.0		17.5	32.0		13.0
34.5		8.0	37.0		13.0
3.0		40.0	20.0		37.0
8.0		8.0	13.0		4.5
22.0		22.0	28.0		8.5
34.5		34.5	28.0		20.0
40.0		25.5	28.0		37.0
40.0		29.0	41.0		20.0
22.0		17.5	20.0		20.0
22.0		13.0	4.5		2.0
3.0		34.5	1.0		32.0
43.0		3.0	43.0		4.5
29.0		8.0	41.0		8.5
		22.0			44.0
		13.0			20.0

TABLE IX

RANK SCORES ON PLAN AHEAD SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
10.0		39.5	40.0		29.0
20.0		20.0	18.5		29.0
39.5		20.0	40.0		29.0
2.5		39.5	18.5		29.0
30.5		2.5	40.0		5.5
20.0		20.0	18.5		29.0
39.5		10.0	29.0		18.5
10.0		30.5	11.5		29.0
30.5		10.0	18.5		5.5
20.0		39.5	11.5		40.0
20.0		5.5	29.0		18.5
30.5		10.0	18.5		5.5
30.5		39.5	29.0		29.0
2.5		20.0	1.0		5.5
2.5		10.0	2.0		29.0
5.5		20.0	5.5		11.5
30.5		39.5	40.0		29.0
10.0		30.5	5.5		11.5
30.5		20.0	11.5		29.0
39.5		39.5	40.0		40.0
20.0		39.5	40.0		40.0
		20.0			11.5
		20.0			18.5

TABLE X

RANK SCORES ON ORDERLINESS SCALE BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
41.5		41.5	42.0		32.5
9.0		2.0	21.5		1.0
9.0		34.0	11.5		37.0
1.0		19.5	2.0		11.5
41.5		13.5	42.0		5.0
19.5		34.0	11.5		29.0
26.0		13.5	21.5		21.5
6.0		13.5	5.0		11.5
34.0		13.5	29.0		11.5
34.0		41.5	37.0		37.0
41.5		13.5	42.0		21.5
19.5		26.0	37.0		11.5
34.0		34.0	21.5		42.0
19.5		26.0	21.5		21.5
13.5		26.0	11.5		11.5
6.0		26.0	21.5		21.5
34.0		9.0	37.0		29.0
19.5		3.0	21.5		7.0
34.0		19.5	32.5		21.5
41.5		26.0	42.0		21.5
26.0		34.0	32.5		32.5
		6.0			5.0
		4.0			3.0

TABLE XI

RANK SCORES ON PERSEVERANCE SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
33.0		37.0	43.0		36.0
1.0		20.0	14.0		5.5
7.0		20.0	10.0		23.5
2.5		20.0	1.5		10.0
42.0		7.0	36.0		23.5
37.0		33.0	36.0		3.0
28.5		20.0	29.0		29.0
20.0		33.0	10.0		10.0
20.0		20.0	18.5		18.5
42.0		28.5	29.0		40.5
10.5		7.0	40.5		23.5
42.0		20.0	36.0		5.5
20.0		28.5	14.0		43.0
10.5		28.5	18.5		29.0
7.0		37.0	5.5		36.0
4.0		13.0	10.0		23.5
42.0		13.0	18.5		18.5
37.0		2.5	5.5		1.5
28.5		20.0	29.0		18.5
13.0		7.0	36.0		29.0
20.0		42.0	29.0		43.0
		37.0			36.0
		28.5			14.0

TABLE XII

RANK SCORES ON EMOTIONAL CONTROL SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
31.5		31.5	41.5		30.5
31.5		37.5	41.5		30.5
12.5		31.5	24.5		19.5
18.5		1.0	6.0		1.0
4.5		31.5	2.0		39.0
41.0		31.5	39.0		3.5
43.0		8.0	43.5		6.0
12.5		4.5	19.5		6.0
25.0		12.5	24.5		10.5
18.5		31.5	30.5		30.5
8.0		18.5	10.5		19.5
44.0		8.0	43.5		10.5
41.0		8.0	39.0		15.0
18.5		18.5	19.5		36.0
25.0		37.5	24.5		30.5
12.5		25.0	15.0		10.5
25.0		37.5	30.5		24.5
25.0		2.0	19.5		3.5
31.5		41.0	36.0		30.0
18.5		8.0	30.5		10.5
18.5		37.5	15.0		19.5
		18.5			36.0
		3.0			10.5

TABLE XIII

RANK SCORES ON SCHEDULE ACTIVITIES SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
25.5		35.0	27.5		32.0
25.5		1.0	7.0		1.5
25.5		35.0	42.0		37.0
8.0		8.0	7.0		3.5
25.5		3.5	27.5		11.0
17.5		25.5	27.5		15.5
25.5		14.0	27.5		15.5
8.0		25.5	15.5		21.5
35.0		25.5	37.0		37.0
40.0		43.0	21.5		44.0
35.0		40.0	32.0		37.0
35.0		43.0	42.0		21.5
17.5		35.0	21.5		11.0
8.0		25.5	7.0		37.0
11.5		3.5	11.0		3.5
3.5		35.0	21.5		15.5
43.0		25.5	42.0		37.0
14.0		8.0	7.0		15.5
11.5		25.5	15.5		27.5
14.0		40.0	21.5		37.0
17.5		25.5	7.0		32.0
		3.5			1.5
		17.5			27.5

TABLE XIV

RANK SCORES ON SELF ASSERTIVE SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
38.5		12.5	30.5		17.0
1.0		2.0	1.0		7.5
20.0		29.0	22.0		17.0
12.5		5.5	30.5		30.5
38.5		12.5	40.0		17.0
20.0		5.5	22.0		7.5
38.5		5.5	40.0		12.5
8.5		29.0	3.0		22.0
12.5		12.5	7.5		7.5
3.0		8.5	7.5		12.5
5.5		29.0	12.5		30.5
20.0		20.0	22.0		3.0
29.0		38.5	40.0		44.0
29.0		29.0	30.5		30.5
20.0		38.5	17.0		30.5
38.5		29.0	30.5		7.5
38.5		44.0	30.5		40.0
20.0		29.0	12.5		40.0
20.0		38.5	17.0		40.0
29.0		20.0	3.0		30.5
38.5		20.0	40.0		30.5
		38.5			30.5
		12.5			22.0

TABLE XV

RANK SCORES ON SUPPORTIVE OF OTHERS SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
16.5		16.5	33.0		14.5
23.5		23.5	27.5		27.5
10.0		38.5	14.5		40.5
42.5		29.0	14.5		1.0
33.5		29.0	21.5		33.0
33.5		10.0	33.0		21.5
44.0		10.0	40.5		3.0
42.5		38.5	40.5		14.5
16.5		6.0	9.5		6.0
33.5		16.5	40.5		6.0
10.0		16.5	33.0		37.0
38.5		16.5	33.0		9.5
38.5		33.5	21.5		21.5
3.0		10.0	40.5		14.5
23.5		29.0	33.0		21.5
23.5		3.0	14.5		27.5
38.5		3.0	40.5		3.0
23.5		23.5	27.5		21.5
6.0		16.5	9.5		9.5
6.0		1.0	44.0		3.0
38.5		29.0	21.5		6.0
		16.5			21.5
		29.0			33.0

TABLE XVI

RANK SCORES ON TAKE EADERSHIP SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
14.5		29.0	4.0		15.0
2.0		21.5	2.0		30.0
9.5		9.5	9.0		4.0
14.5		26.0	15.0		15.0
29.0		5.5	30.0		9.0
21.5		32.0	24.0		15.0
40.0		2.0	42.0		1.0
14.5		26.0	15.0		24.0
32.0		5.5	42.0		19.5
35.5		14.5	30.0		24.0
21.5		2.0	9.0		6.0
32.0		9.5	21.0		9.0
35.5		35.5	36.5		36.5
5.5		14.5	30.0		24.0
35.5		40.0	19.5		36.5
40.5		5.5	42.0		4.0
43.5		40.0	36.5		36.5
26.0		14.5	36.5		15.0
21.5		29.0	30.0		30.0
43.5		21.5	42.0		30.0
40.0		18.0	42.0		24.0
		21.5			15.0
		9.5			9.0

TABLE XVII

RANK SCORES ON MOVE TOWARD AGGRESSOR SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
27.5		27.5	16.5		28.0
27.5		27.5	28.0		16.5
6.5		16.0	28.0		8.0
6.5		2.5	16.5		2.5
10.5		40.0	4.0		39.5
40.0		4.0	28.0		8.0
10.5		40.0	39.5		16.5
6.5		10.5	8.0		39.5
27.5		27.5	28.0		16.5
40.0		27.5	39.5		16.5
6.5		16.0	2.5		8.0
40.0		27.5	39.5		8.0
10.5		40.0	16.5		16.5
27.5		27.5	28.0		39.5
40.0		40.0	39.5		39.5
16.0		27.5	28.0		28.0
27.5		27.5	39.5		8.0
27.5		2.5	16.5		1.0
1.0		16.0	28.0		39.5
40.0		27.5	28.0		28.0
27.5		16.0	28.0		16.5
		16.0			28.0
		16.0			8.0

TABLE XVIII

RANK SCORES ON MOVE AWAY FROM AGGRESSOR SCALE BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
8.0		4.5	41.5		17.0
14.5		25.5	35.0		35.0
25.5		14.5	12.0		24.0
40.5		42.5	24.0		3.0
8.0		33.5	12.5		12.5
33.5		14.5	35.0		17.0
25.5		14.5	24.0		35.0
42.5		40.5	24.0		12.5
4.5		25.5	1.5		24.0
14.5		25.5	4.5		35.0
37.5		37.5	43.0		41.5
14.5		33.5	7.5		35.0
37.5		4.5	24.0		1.5
14.5		14.5	7.5		17.0
4.5		14.5	24.0		12.5
33.5		25.5	24.0		35.0
37.5		2.0	24.0		7.5
8.0		25.5	7.5		44.0
44.0		25.5	35.0		4.5
14.5		25.5	24.0		35.0
1.0		25.5	12.5		24.0
		25.5			35.0
		25.5			35.0

TABLE XIX

RANK SCORES ON MOVE AGAINST AGGRESSOR SCALE BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
32.5		32.5	15.5		15.5
16.5		8.0	6.0		15.5
38.5		32.5	25.5		33.5
16.5		38.5	25.5		44.0
42.0		2.0	24.5		25.5
2.0		42.0	6.0		33.5
32.5		8.0	6.0		25.5
8.0		8.0	33.5		25.5
32.5		24.5	41.0		15.5
24.5		8.0	37.5		6.0
16.5		16.5	25.5		15.5
16.5		8.0	25.5		15.5
16.5		32.5	37.5		42.5
32.5		16.5	6.0		15.5
32.5		16.5	6.0		25.5
8.0		8.0	6.0		6.0
2.0		38.5	37.5		40.0
24.5		44.0	6.0		37.5
38.5		24.5	15.5		33.5
8.0		24.5	25.5		6.0
42.0		24.5	15.5		23.5
		24.5			6.0
		24.5			25.5

TABLE XX

RANK SCORES ON CONCRETE PRACTICAL SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
41.0		17.5	40.0		33.5
8.5		3.0	3.0		3.0
23.5		41.0	27.5		40.0
12.0		6.5	16.0		3.0
12.0		6.5	27.5		12.0
32.0		23.5	33.5		21.0
23.5		32.0	27.5		21.0
32.0		3.0	40.0		16.0
32.0		32.0	33.5		40.0
32.5		32.0	21.0		27.5
32.0		17.5	27.5		8.0
41.0		41.0	33.5		21.0
23.5		17.5	27.5		12.0
12.0		23.5	8.0		8.0
32.0		3.0	40.0		8.0
3.0		32.0	3.0		27.5
41.0		8.5	40.0		16.0
17.5		17.5	21.0		12.0
41.0		12.0	40.0		16.0
3.0		32.0	3.0		40.0
41.0		17.5	16.0		27.5
		12.0			8.0
		32.0			40.0

TABLE XXI

RANK SCORES ON SYSTEMATIC METHODICAL SCALE BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
23.0		11.5	33.0		21.5
11.5		23.0	21.5		33.0
32.0		32.0	21.5		21.5
11.5		32.0	3.0		21.5
23.0		11.5	33.0		10.0
40.0		40.0	41.0		21.5
40.0		3.0	41.0		3.0
32.0		40.0	33.0		41.0
23.0		23.0	21.5		10.0
32.0		40.0	21.5		33.0
23.0		23.0	33.0		3.0
11.5		11.5	10.0		10.0
23.0		32.0	33.0		21.5
11.5		3.0	10.0		3.0
3.0		11.5	10.0		21.5
23.0		11.5	21.5		21.5
40.0		11.5	41.0		10.0
23.0		3.0	10.0		3.0
11.5		40.0	21.5		41.0
40.0		23.0	33.0		41.0
40.0		32.0	41.0		33.0
		11.5			21.5
		3.0			10.0

TABLE XXII

RANK SCORES ON ACT INDEPENDENTLY SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
38.5		24.5	34.0		18.0
24.5		24.5	34.0		34.0
24.5		24.5	2.5		2.5
24.5		24.5	18.0		34.0
12.5		12.5	10.0		34.0
24.5		24.5	18.0		10.0
12.5		1.0	34.0		2.5
12.5		6.5	7.0		34.0
38.5		12.5	34.0		18.0
24.5		2.5	10.0		18.0
24.5		24.5	5.5		34.0
12.5		28.5	34.0		18.0
12.5		6.5	34.0		18.0
6.5		24.5	34.0		18.0
38.5		38.5	34.0		34.0
38.5		24.5	34.0		34.0
38.5		38.5	34.0		34.0
4.0		2.5	10.0		2.5
38.5		24.5	18.0		18.0
38.5		24.5	34.0		18.0
38.5		12.5	10.0		34.0
		38.5			34.0
		6.5			5.5

TABLE XXIII

RANK SCORES ON WORK AS AN ASSISTANT SCALE BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
17.0		4.5	24.0		10.5
34.5		25.0	42.0		32.5
34.5		34.5	29.5		39.5
17.0		10.5	32.5		32.5
17.0		4.5	32.5		4.5
34.5		34.5	24.0		43.5
25.0		41.5	10.5		17.5
44.0		34.5	32.5		10.5
34.5		25.0	10.5		17.5
17.0		34.5	32.5		17.5
10.5		25.0	39.5		24.0
25.0		34.5	39.5		32.5
7.0		41.5	1.5		17.5
10.5		41.5	10.5		10.5
25.0		25.0	24.0		32.5
17.0		1.5	10.5		17.5
17.0		23.0	32.5		32.5
34.5		1.5	4.5		1.5
10.5		10.5	24.0		10.5
4.5		10.5	4.5		4.5
25.0		17.0	17.5		24.0
		4.5			24.0
		41.5			43.5

TABLE XXIV

RANK SCORES ON DIRECTIVE LEADERSHIP SCALE BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
41.0		16.5	35.5		16.5
1.5		4.5	6.0		8.5
36.0		24.0	26.0		42.5
20.5		3.0	16.5		6.0
36.0		41.0	40.5		26.0
12.0		12.0	20.5		1.5
36.0		12.0	35.5		20.5
1.5		12.0	3.5		8.5
16.3		27.0	26.0		35.5
43.5		41.0	20.5		31.0
30.5		24.0	16.5		20.5
36.0		30.5	31.0		26.0
27.0		43.5	26.0		39.0
16.5		30.5	12.0		16.5
7.5		7.5	26.0		6.0
12.0		27.0	3.5		35.5
36.0		16.5	42.5		1.5
20.5		36.0	35.5		40.5
20.5		30.5	35.5		26.0
7.5		24.0	12.0		31.0
7.5		36.0	12.0		44.0
		4.5			12.0
		20.5			12.0

TABLE XXV

RANK SCORES ON MOTIVATE BY REWARDS SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
6.0		32.5	17.5		31.0
32.5		32.5	17.5		24.5
23.5		38.5	31.0		17.5
13.5		32.5	3.0		17.5
23.5		13.5	3.0		17.5
38.5		38.5	8.5		31.0
42.0		32.5	42.5		31.0
32.5		42.0	42.5		38.5
23.5		23.5	17.5		17.5
23.5		6.0	31.0		31.0
3.0		1.5	31.0		8.5
13.5		13.5	8.5		31.0
32.5		1.5	17.5		8.5
6.0		13.5	3.0		17.5
13.5		13.5	8.5		38.5
23.5		23.5	38.5		17.5
38.5		13.5	24.5		31.0
23.5		13.5	3.0		38.5
13.5		6.0	31.0		17.5
42.0		23.5	42.5		31.0
23.5		6.0	17.5		3.0
		32.5			8.5
		44.0			42.5

TABLE XXVI

RANK SCORES ON MOTIVATE BY RESULTS SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
12.5		39.0	7.5		34.0
31.5		23.0	34.0		34.0
23.0		4.5	7.5		3.5
12.5		23.0	24.0		40.0
1.5		12.5	34.0		34.0
23.0		23.0	24.0		34.0
1.5		12.5	3.5		13.5
39.0		12.5	13.5		24.0
39.0		12.5	24.0		13.5
4.5		23.0	24.0		7.5
23.0		31.5	24.0		24.0
31.5		12.5	40.0		13.5
4.5		31.5	24.0		13.5
39.0		23.0	44.0		40.0
44.0		39.0	40.0		24.0
31.5		31.5	24.0		24.0
12.5		23.0	3.5		34.0
39.0		12.5	40.0		3.5
31.5		39.0	1.0		13.5
12.5		12.5	13.5		7.5
43.0		31.5	43.0		24.0
		12.5			24.0
		4.5			13.5

TABLE XXVII

RANK SCORES ON SOCIAL INTERACTION SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
40.0		40.0	3.5		36.0
32.5		25.0	18.5		36.0
32.5		32.5	14.0		36.0
43.5		2.5	36.0		1.5
14.0		2.5	27.0		3.5
8.0		40.0	36.0		10.0
14.0		25.0	27.0		10.0
5.5		40.0	18.5		6.0
19.5		14.0	6.0		14.0
25.0		32.5	36.0		18.5
19.5		19.5	6.0		27.0
32.5		10.5	27.0		43.5
32.5		19.5	14.0		36.0
19.5		32.5	22.5		27.0
43.5		32.5	36.0		22.5
32.5		4.0	22.5		1.5
40.0		8.0	36.0		36.0
5.5		19.5	18.5		16.0
32.5		25.0	36.0		36.0
8.0		1.0	10.0		10.0
15.0		14.0	43.5		36.0
		14.0			10.0
		10.5			22.5

TABLE XXVIII

RANK SCORES ON MECHANICAL ACTIVITIES SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
6.0		32.5	10.5		30.5
3.0		41.0	3.0		36.0
41.0		6.0	42.5		6.0
1.0		10.0	1.0		10.5
23.0		32.5	42.5		23.0
23.0		10.0	16.0		30.5
14.5		23.0	23.0		10.5
10.0		23.0	10.5		16.0
14.5		14.5	23.0		16.0
32.5		14.5	36.0		23.0
23.0		23.0	30.5		10.5
32.5		32.5	30.5		36.0
37.5		37.5	39.5		30.5
37.5		23.0	39.5		23.0
10.0		41.0	16.0		36.0
10.0		23.0	3.0		23.0
23.0		23.0	23.0		10.5
6.0		3.0	6.0		6.0
43.0		23.0	36.0		23.0
32.5		37.5	42.5		42.5
32.0		44.0	16.0		30.5
		3.0			3.0
		23.0			23.0

TABLE XXIX

RANK SCORES ON GROUP PARTICIPATION SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
42.0		35.0	15.5		43.0
28.0		17.5	23.5		10.0
17.5		28.0	34.5		34.5
35.0		2.0	34.5		5.0
17.5		35.0	23.5		23.5
5.5		24.5	23.5		5.0
5.5		35.0	15.5		43.0
17.5		28.0	40.0		5.0
17.5		35.0	5.0		5.0
17.5		42.0	23.5		15.5
17.5		35.0	15.5		40.0
24.5		9.5	15.5		23.5
35.0		17.5	23.5		34.5
42.0		28.0	29.0		43.0
17.5		5.5	40.0		1.0
17.5		28.0	29.0		5.0
17.5		2.0	10.0		5.0
9.5		35.0	34.5		34.5
42.0		17.5	23.5		34.5
9.5		5.5	15.5		15.5
9.5		35.0	34.5		15.5
		42.0			10.0
		2.0			29.0

TABLE XXX

RANK SCORES ON ACTIVITY-FREQUENT CHANGE SCALE BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
7.5		31.5	2.5		10.5
27.5		31.5	26.0		26.0
20.5		1.5	13.5		2.5
43.5		38.0	26.0		42.0
20.5		41.0	38.5		34.0
4.5		13.0	7.0		18.5
7.5		9.5	10.5		2.5
35.0		20.5	18.5		26.0
13.0		4.5	7.0		13.5
20.5		4.5	18.5		7.0
9.5		20.5	13.5		26.0
20.5		13.0	7.0		34.0
41.0		27.5	38.5		42.0
31.5		27.5	18.5		34.0
41.0		43.5	26.0		42.0
38.0		20.5	26.0		13.5
20.5		35.0	26.0		38.5
13.0		13.0	7.0		34.0
20.5		13.5	26.0		26.0
35.0		1.5	38.5		26.0
27.5		20.5	34.0		16.0
		38.0			44.0
		4.5			2.5

TABLE XXXI

RANK SCORES ON JOB CHALLENGE SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
12.0		16.5	9.5		24.5
23.5		32.5	32.0		32.0
4.5		2.5	9.5		1.0
16.5		32.5	18.5		39.0
23.5		43.0	32.0		42.5
12.0		40.5	9.5		39.0
32.5		32.5	9.5		14.5
23.5		12.0	18.5		24.5
23.5		16.5	24.5		9.5
32.5		8.5	24.5		4.5
8.5		6.0	9.5		4.5
32.5		1.0	32.0		2.5
16.5		32.5	32.0		32.0
32.5		23.5	18.5		24.5
23.5		40.5	14.5		44.0
38.5		38.5	18.5		29.5
32.5		43.0	18.5		42.5
8.5		2.5	9.5		2.5
8.5		43.0	18.5		39.0
16.5		23.5	32.0		32.0
16.5		32.5	32.0		39.0
		23.5			39.0
		4.5			9.5

TABLE XXXII

RANK SCORES ON STATUS ATTAINMENT SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
1.5		16.0	3.0		9.5
6.5		16.0	9.5		3.0
27.5		22.5	24.5		9.5
22.5		16.0	24.5		33.0
43.0		27.5	44.0		21.0
27.5		6.5	36.5		9.5
16.0		16.0	16.5		16.5
6.5		11.5	3.0		21.0
6.5		6.5	9.5		16.5
22.5		22.5	30.0		35.0
1.5		22.5	24.5		9.5
16.0		6.5	30.0		16.5
36.0		39.0	16.5		38.0
6.5		38.0	9.5		33.0
33.5		30.5	27.5		3.0
40.5		16.0	41.0		27.5
27.5		42.0	24.5		42.0
40.5		44.0	40.0		43.0
36.0		6.5	30.0		3.0
30.5		22.5	33.0		36.5
11.5		33.5	16.5		39.0
		32.0			9.5
		36.0			21.0

TABLE XXXIII

RANK SCORES ON SOCIAL SERVICE SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
12.5		40.0	19.5		36.5
31.0		35.0	30.5		30.5
31.0		16.0	24.0		24.0
40.0		20.0	30.5		24.0
10.5		35.0	6.0		43.5
25.5		25.5	36.5		16.0
35.0		8.5	11.0		13.0
35.0		44.0	35.0		16.0
35.0		25.5	30.5		41.0
16.0		6.5	19.5		6.0
25.5		40.0	30.5		38.5
25.5		40.0	24.0		43.5
25.5		10.5	30.5		13.0
3.0		20.0	9.5		19.5
12.5		6.5	30.5		19.5
2.0		16.0	3.5		3.5
25.5		1.0	9.5		1.0
4.5		4.5	6.0		8.0
25.5		16.0	38.5		13.0
31.0		8.5	16.0		2.0
40.0		20.0	41.0		30.5
		43.0			41.0
		16.0			24.0

TABLE XXXIV

RANK SCORES ON APPROVAL FROM OTHERS SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
14.5		24.0	8.5		2.5
14.5		18.0	8.5		34.0
14.5		24.0	8.5		34.0
24.0		4.5	15.5		8.5
9.5		35.5	1.0		25.5
37.5		24.0	40.0		8.5
24.0		24.0	19.5		3.0
30.5		9.5	19.5		15.5
18.0		4.5	15.5		19.5
4.5		44.0	8.5		42.5
30.5		9.5	25.5		8.5
24.0		39.5	19.5		25.5
37.5		24.0	40.0		42.5
42.0		33.5	25.5		8.5
35.5		2.0	38.0		15.5
9.5		9.5	36.5		25.5
14.5		24.0	40.0		25.5
42.0		42.0	36.5		44.0
33.5		4.5	31.0		8.5
30.5		30.5	25.5		31.0
18.0		9.5	25.5		8.5
		1.0			2.5
		39.5			34.0

TABLE XXXV

RANK SCORES ON INTELLECTUAL ACHIEVEMENT SCALE BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
34.5		6.5	34.0		13.0
34.5		32.5	37.0		29.5
25.0		25.0	37.0		8.5
10.0		39.5	15.0		33.0
25.0		17.5	21.0		18.5
1.0		25.0	1.0		29.5
17.5		23.0	18.5		15.0
25.0		17.5	27.0		37.0
31.0		25.0	29.5		21.0
13.0		6.5	8.5		8.5
17.5		13.0	24.5		15.0
10.0		3.5	2.5		11.5
30.0		3.5	24.5		5.5
42.5		17.5	42.5		42.5
25.0		41.0	11.5		40.5
42.5		37.0	40.5		37.0
25.0		37.0	24.5		15.0
13.0		17.5	29.5		8.5
3.5		44.0	2.5		37.0
39.5		32.5	44.0		32.0
10.0		8.0	5.5		24.5
		37.0			21.0
		3.5			4.0

TABLE XXXVI

RANK SCORES ON ROLE CONFORMITY SCALE
BY SUPERIOR PERFORMING AND WEAK
PERFORMING STUDENT ASSISTANTS

S1	and	W1	S2	and	W2
40.5		33.0	32.0		39.5
16.5		16.5	16.0		16.0
24.5		33.0	14.0		36.5
20.5		12.5	36.5		5.0
5.5		5.5	8.5		12.5
28.5		33.0	12.5		39.5
20.5		42.0	39.5		42.5
12.5		20.5	24.5		8.5
20.5		43.5	28.5		20.0
43.5		40.5	39.5		20.0
28.5		28.5	16.0		35.0
37.5		24.5	44.0		20.0
3.0		24.5	8.5		8.5
12.5		9.0	24.5		4.0
12.5		33.0	20.0		20.0
8.0		28.5	2.0		28.5
33.0		5.5	28.5		24.5
5.5		1.0	8.5		1.0
24.5		16.5	24.5		34.0
2.0		37.5	3.0		32.0
37.5		37.5	32.0		8.5
		10.0			28.5
		16.5			42.5

VITA

Jeffrey Herbert Ledewitz

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE RELATIONSHIP OF BEHAVIORAL STYLES TO JOB PERFORMANCE OF RESIDENCE HALL STUDENT ASSISTANTS

Major Field: Student Personnel and Guidance

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in New York City, New York, August 20, 1946, the son of Mr. Nathan Ledewitz and Mrs. Shirley Blumin.

Education: Graduated from James Hillhouse High School, New Haven, Connecticut, in June, 1964; received Bachelor of Arts degree in Elementary Education from Stetson University, DeLand, Florida, in 1968; received Master of Arts in Education degree from The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., in 1969; enrolled in doctoral program at Oklahoma State University, 1970; and completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in July, 1975.

Professional Experience: Residence Hall Adviser, The George Washington University, 1968-1969; Residence Hall Director, The George Washington University, 1969-1970; Director of Counseling and Guidance, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, 1972-1974; Associate Dean of Students, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, 1974-1975.

Professional Membership: Member of American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1969-1975; member of American College Personnel Association; 1969-1975; member of Volusia County Personnel and Guidance Association, 1973-1975; member of Board of Directors, Volusia County Mental Health Association, 1974-1975; and Treasurer of Board of Directors, Guidance Center, Incorporated, 1975.