THE IMPACT OF MYERS-BRIGGS PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE ON RESIDENT ASSISTANT JOB EFFECTIVENESS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE

A SEMINAR PAPER

Presented to

The Graduate Faculty

University of Wisconsin-La Crosse

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science in Education:

College Student Personnel

By

Linda A. Mulroy

December, 1987

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Candidate: Linda A. Mulroy

I recommend acceptance of this seminar paper in partial fulfillment of this candidate's requirements for the degree Master of Science in Education.

Larry J. Ringgenberg — Seminar Paper Advisor — 12/10/87 — Date

This seminar paper is approved for the College of Education.

Jay C. Gramley — Dean, Graduate Studies — 12/15/87 — Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with much gratitude that I acknowledge Larry Ringgenberg for all of his patience with me and time spent on this paper. I also acknowledge Ron May for his efforts as well. A special thanks to Dick Koehler, Ruth Kurinsky, Carol Bassuener, and Paul Rifkin for all of their support and encouragement. Thank you to Sharon Aalseth for her flexibility and positive words. Finally, thanks to the 1986-87 Coate Hall staff and 1987-88 Wentz Hall staff for their support and concern as I completed this paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Linda Mulroy: "The Impact of Myers-Briggs Psychological Type on Resident Assistant Job Effectiveness at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse"

The purpose of this study was to test if Myers-Briggs type impacted on Resident Assistant effectiveness at UW-La Crosse. This study used a Resident Assistant evaluation completed by the residents of each residence hall and the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory taken by each Resident Assistant. Both of these instruments were administered during the fall semester of the 1986-1987 academic year.

There were 94 possible participants for this study. The study sample was composed of 84 Resident Assistants, 35 men and 49 women. Results indicated that Myers-Briggs type impacted on two aspects of Resident Assistant effectiveness. Sensing types were found to be more effective than intuitive types in the area of helping/advising. In the area of programming, feeling types were found to be more effective than thinking types.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

> The foundation of nearly every residence hall program across the country is the Resident Assistant position (Bimling, Mittenberg, 1981)

According to the job description for a University of Wisconsin-La Crosse Resident Assistant, the position is a commitment of talents, time, and effort. This position should be regarded as an educational opportunity (UW-La Crosse, 1987). Because the position demands are high, the Housing Office at UW-La Crosse spends much time and energy on the training and selection of what they view are the best of the best students on campus. Resident Assistants (RAs) are trained by the housing operation to work directly with students and to promote a community atmosphere on their floor. The Housing Office at UW-La Crosse views these responsibilities as essential to the success of the operation. Therefore, they are continually challenging this diverse group of RA's to achieve their highest potential to best serve the residents and experience personal growth in the process.

Purpose of Study

This study examined the relationship between RA effectiveness and the psychological types of RAs as measured by the Myers Briggs Type Indicator. The study investigated

psychological types by effectiveness in overall and specific functions of the RA position. Several measuremets of effectiveness were utilized in this study. Residents at UW-La Crosse completed an evaluation on their RA at the end of the first semester. This evaluation and a ranking of most effective RAs to least effective RAs as perceived by Hall Directors made up the measures of effectiveness used in this study.

Need for Study

A study examining RA effectiveness based on Myers Briggs psychological type will be useful in a variety of ways. One particular way is during the RA selection process. RAs can be selected on the basis of how well their particular type would combine with other members of the staff team. The Hall Director would be able to select staff that would compliment each other. Each Myers Briggs psychological type has its own characteristics and consequently its own strengths and weaknesses, therefore, this study could be a useful tool in balancing these strengths and weaknesses among staff.

The results of this study can also be applied to staff training. The various aspects of the RA position require different abilities. Each RA, because of the uniqueness of psychological type, may not be particularly effective in all aspects of the position. By utilizing the information

in this study, the Hall Director can then target training at the areas of possible ineffectiveness. RAs once aware of the strengths and weaknesses of their type, can then challenge themselves to be more effective in areas of concern. Use of the Myers Briggs Type Inventory can present tools for the RAs to utilize as they strive to become more effective in these areas of concern.

Selected Related Literature

Psychological Types

Jung's work with personality types forms the base for Myers work with the Myers Briggs Type Inventory. Jung believed that each person utilized an attitude that was either extraverted or introverted. The extraverted attitude oriented a person toward the external and objective world. The introverted attitude oriented one to the internal and subjective world. Jung noted also that each person utilizes both attitudes, however, one is dominant and influences a person's behavior.

As well as the introverted and extraverted attitudes, Jung also utilized four psychological functions in his theory. The thinking function is logical and meets situations in a cool, rational manner. The feeling type emphasises subjective aspects and values. The sensation type is able to perceive everything given directly to the senses. Finally, the intuitive type is alive to all possibilities in a situation

and is able to get to the essence of reality (Corey, 1982). Jung did not incorporate the judging and perceiving preferences in his theory as Meyers did in hers. Jung's theory elicits 8 possible personality types.

There are four preferences represented in the Myers Briggs Type Inventory. They are: introversion versus extraversion, sensing versus intuition, thinking versus feeling, and judging versus perceiving. The Myers Briggs Type Inventory elicits 16 possible types based on combinations of the above preferences. The letters in each type, ESFP for example, represent the dominant preference for that particular type. It is important to note, however, that both aspects of the particular preferences are present, one is simply stronger and therefore utilized more often.

Extraversion/Introversion

The concepts of extraversion and introversion define one's relative interest in their outer and inner worlds. Person's with a strong tendency towards extraversion have more interest and relate more easily to the outer world of people and things. Introverts have more interest and relate more easily to the inner world of ideas. Listed below are characteristics of introverted and extraverted types as described by Lawerence (1979).

Extraversion	Introversion
likes action and variety	likes quiet and time to consider things
likes to do mental work by talking with people	likes to do mental work privately before talking
acts quickly, sometimes without much reflection	may be slow to try something without understanding it first
likes to see how others do a job and see results	likes to understand the idea of how and to work alone or with just a few people
wants to know what others expect of him/her	wants to set his own standards

Sensing/Intuition

Sensing and intuition define how one takes in information. Persons with a dominant preference for sensing take in information with their five senses. These people would rather work with known facts. Persons with a strong preference for intuition take in information by way of the unconscious. They incorporate ideas and associations to gather information. These people would rather look for possibilities and relationships. Listed below are characteristics of sensing and intuitive types as described by Lawerence (1979).

Sensing	Intuition
pays attention to experience as it is	pays more attention to the meaning of facts and how they fit together
likes to use eyes and ears and other senses to find out what is happening	likes to use imagination to come up with new ways to do things, new possibilities

dislikes new problems unless there are standard ways to solve them

enjoys using skills already learned more than learning new ones

is patient with details but impatient when details get complicated

likes solving new problems and dislikes doing the same thing over

likes using new skills more than practicing old

is impatient with details but doesn't mind complicated situations

Thinking/Feeling

Thinking and feeling define how persons formulate judgements and make decisions. Those with a dominant thinking preference would base judgements on impersonal logic. They would make decisions more objectively. Those with a dominant feeling preference would base judgements on personal values and would make decisions more subjectively. Listed below are characteristics of thinking and feeling types as described by Lawerence (1979).

Thinking

likes to decide things logically

wants to be treated with justice and fair play

may neglect and hurt other people's feelings without knowing

doesn't need harmony

Feeling

likes to decide things with personal values and human values, even if they aren't logical

likes praise, and likes to please people, even in unimportant things

can predict how others feel

gets upset by arguements and conflict

Judgement/Perception

Judgement and perception define attitudes and a lifestyle preference. People with a tendency towards judgement like a planned, orderly way of life. People with a tendency towards perception prefer a flexible spontaneous way of life. Listed below are characteristics of judging and perceiving types as described by Lawerence (1979).

Judgement	Perception
likes to have a plan, to have things settled and decided ahead of time	likes to stay flexible and avoid fixed plans
tries to make things come out the way they ought to be	deals easily with unplanned and unexpected happenings
likes to finish one project before stating another	likes to start many projects but may have trouble finishing them all
may decide things too quickly	usually is looking for new information
wants to be right	may decide things too slowly
lives by standards that are not easily changed	wants to miss nothing
	lives by making changes to deal with problems as they come along

Use of the Myers Briggs Type Indicator with Helping Relationsips

Teamwork

Myers (1962) stated: "Any team should include a sufficient variety of types to perform the required jobs effectively and with satisfaction" (p. 32). Effectiveness, Myers believed, seemes contingent upon good teamwork. If the differing

personality types each demonstrate unique strengths and weaknesses in managerial styles it follows that a person preferring one type may prove more effective while performing one aspect of a job over another. Myers (1962) proposed that opposite types need each other to create an effective team:

Intuitive needs a Sensing type:	Sensing needs an Intuitive type:
-to bring up pertinent facts	-to bring up new possibilities
-to apply experience to problems	-to supply ingenuity on problems
-to read the fine print in a contract	-to read the signs of coming change
-to notice what needs attention now	-to see how to prepare for the future
-to face difficulties with realism	-to have enthusiasm
-to remind that the joys of the present are important	-to watch for new essentials
	-to tackle difficulties with zest
	-to show that the joys of the future are worth working for

Feeling types need a Thinker:	Thinker needs a Feeling type:
-to analyze	-to persuade
-to organize	-to conciliate
-to find flaws in advance	-to forecast how others will feel
-to reform what needs reforming	-to arouse enthusiasm
-to hold consistently to a policy	-to teach
-to weight the "law and the evidence"	-to sell
-to fire people when necessary	-to advertise
	-to appreciate the thinker

Leadership Styles

Keirsey and Bates (1984) targeted strengths and weaknesses in leadership style for each type. Considered the "troubleshooters", Sensing, Perceiving (SP) types prove practical, cooperative, flexible, welcome and seek change,

and have a strong sense of reality. These characteristics describe the leadership strengths of the SP type. Lack of attention to theory, dislike of the unfamiliar, and a tendency toward rigidity appear to be the managerial limitations of the SP type.

Sensers, Judgers (SJs) are considered "traditional" in their leading style. SJs lean toward decisiveness, create stability, weigh consequences, prove superdependable, and follow through on commitments. On the other hand, SJs may appear impatient with projects, decide too quickly, exagerate negatives, and may be highly competitive.

Intuitive, Thinkers (NT) types, considered "visionaries" in their leading style, create change, plan well, look for possibilities, and are intellectually ingenious. However, NTs have problems following through, sometimes prove unaware of feelings, can be cold and distant, and may communicate a lack of value for subordinates.

The Intuitive, Feelers (NF) types represent the "catalysts" in leadership styles. They utilize personal charisma, excel in comminication, allow for contributions of others, and give the best appreciation. NFs avoid unpleasant confrontations, base decisions on personal likes and dislikes, and may overextend themselves in relationships. These are the drawbacks in leading for the NF types.

Teaching Styles

Keirsey and Bates (1984) applied their findings in a

study of teachers and effective teaching styles. The authors noted that some teachers stay in the profession for only a short time, despite their level of effectiveness.

SP (Sensing, Perception) teachers, it seems, teach for the shortest number of years. SP types value variety and independence and may feel limited in the teaching profession. Action oriented and unfettered, SP teachers allow time for play, entertain while teaching, prove unpredictable, and teach students to take risks. While the SP teacher is the nonconformist (on the teaching team) who does things his or her way, he or she seldom makes waves.

SJ (Sensing, Judging) teachers make up the largest portion of teachers who continue teaching for a long period of time. SJ teachers prove responsible, dependable, promote harmony, and often seem less patient than other types. SJ teachers value firm, but fair disciplinary measures. While generally respected and liked by their students, SJ teachers may place psychological distance between the student and themselves.

The teachers who especially enjoy teaching the more advanced classes and value the high achieving students are the NT (Intuitive, Thinking) types. NT teachers value conceptual relationships and the complexity of ideas. This teacher enjoys interacting with students, likes designing but not implementing, values high performance, and seems

very aware of a student's competence level. NT teachers work hard to create a positive attitude in the classroom. Students of an NT teacher usually know exactly where they stand in discipline situations.

NF (Intuitive, Feeling) teachers employ personal charisma in their teaching method. They seem committed to, and genuinely concerned about their students. Democratic and empathetic, the NF teacher believes students need to feel cared for. In addition, NF teachers are good at allowing students to fail, viewing such times as teaching moments.

Discipline

Williams and Nelson (1986) used the Myers Briggs at Baylor University to test RA effectiveness in discipline situations. In order to discern if certain personality types seem to respond more assertively in discipline situations the authors studied the correlation between type and RA response in discipline situations.

The RAs were given the MBTI as well as a survey including differing confronting options. The survey question responses varied in degree from hostile to nonassertive to assertive.

The authors found no significant correlation between the Extraverted and Introverted dimensions and categories of discipline response. Consequently, each participant's preference for Thinking, Feeling, Sensing, and Intuition was looked at independently with his or her tendency towards Extraversion and Introversion.

When considering the Sensing preference with the Extraverted preference, Williams and Nelson noted a high number of nonassertive responses. The Myers Briggs manual describes ES types as those who look for a satisfying solution instead of trying to impose any shoulds or musts of their own (Myers, 1980). The authors state this as a possible reason for the large number of nonassertive responses given by the ES types. ES types, the authors report, love a good time and would seemingly be more tolerant of misbehavior of others.

On the other hand, the EN preference (Myers, 1980) reportedly trys to understand people rather than change them. EN types demonstrate uncanny knowledge of what makes a given person work and often use their insight to win support. In summary, this study unveiled a high use of assertive responses by the EN type. The ENF types consistently indicated higher number of assertive responses as well. According to the authors, no correlation between the judging, perception, and introverted types and effectiveness in discipline resulted.

Counseling

Lester (1971) completed a study that investigated the use of the Myers Briggs as a predictor of counselor success. Counselor effectiveness was measured by assessing the empathy responses of the subjects in a simulated counseling situation.

It was found that those counselors who scored higher in empathy were those who consistently utilized the judging

preference rather than the perceiving preference. To be empathetic, persons with a preference for judging did not need as much information as those with a perceiving preference. The judger who assessed the information presented by the client appeared empathetic almost immediately. The perceiver, on the other hand, may continue to gather information instead of giving immediate empathetic feedback. Lester (1971) summized the perceptive approach, in which judgement is delayed, does not provide enough feedback for the client, whereas the judging approach provides immediate feedback. It seems the counselor who continually employed the judging preference appeared the more empathethic and, according to this study, the more successful counselor.

Factors That Impact RA Effectiveness

Social Support and Health

There have been several studies examining specific factors which seem to facilitate RA effectiveness. Nowack (1985) completed such a study at the University of California at Los Angeles. He posed three questions in this study. First, what is the relationship between health habits and social support and the psychological distress and burnout of the RA? Second, do health habits and social support predict psychological distress and RA burnout? Third, what is the relationship among burnout, psychological distress, and evaluations of job performance?

The study, completed in 1985, utilized several measures including an RA questionnaire to test perceptions of RA stress and effectiveness, a social support questionnaire to test what types of social supports RA's use, the Maslach Burnout Checklist to test degree of burnout,and the Hopkins Symptom Checklist investigating health habits of RAs.

Nowack (1985) found that RAs ranked less effective by residents sought the least amount of social support other than that provided by other staff members. Nowack also found that health habits played a large role in the effectiveness of an RA. Although many aspects of good health are genetic, the RAs who said they practiced good nutrition and had healthy sleep patterns were consistently ranked more effective. Nowack (1985) stated that RA burnout may cause poor health rather than poor health being the result of burnout.

This study revealed that social support and health habits played a significant role in RA effectiveness. Nowack (1985) concluded that intervention is necessary and can take the form of educational programming for RAs. Topics for training may include stress, time management, and wellness. Supervisors can also promote awareness of the benefits of good health.

Myers (1962) stated that sensing types prove more self accepting than other types and intuitive types less

self accepting. This could mean that sensing types may be stressed less easily depending upon the amount of social support utilized.

Burnout

A complementary study completed by Hornak (1983) of Central Michigan University describes RA burnout as a self defeating behavior, much of which can be avoided. Hornak (1983) stated that RAs experience many pressures that may cause burnout and consequently low effectiveness. RAs experience a "fishbowl" existence and often function under constant peer scrutiny. This constant observation may lead to a feeling that mistakes by oneself are inexcusable and that personal effectiveness is mandatory, no matter what.

Hornak (1983) cited several behaviors which lead to burnout and consequently, low effectiveness. These behaviors include: blaming, comparing, meeting expectations of others, labeling, and distorting feedback. She continued by saying that the prices paid for these negative behaviors prove great; noticable decline in the RA's health as well as unneeded mental anxiety and possible depression, to name a few. Hornak (1983) also noted an increased inability to give of oneself in a relationship as well as an erosion of self confidence resulting in lower effectiveness in the RA position.

The author believed that RAs must take several steps to counteract burnout and remain effective. They must first

face personal fears of burnout and examine reasons behind the fears. They must take responsibility for their actions and realize the price paid for professional overextension. Finally, they must take action which may include blocking off personal time and practicing saying no.

Housing Characteristics

Dickson (1981) conducted a national study to look at the impact of housing characteristics and the level of effectiveness as perceived by RAs. The 1975-1979 study was entitled the Resident Assistant Stress Inventory. Such characteristics as type of residence hall, RA experience, and RA/student ratio were considered as factors in examining effectiveness.

The RAs in this study took the Resident Assistant Stress Inventory. A self report instrument designed to measure RA anxiety, the Inventory tests several factors. These factors include stress in values judgement, emotional resiliency, counseling skills, and facilitative leadership. The RAs also completed a self questionnaire rating personal job effectiveness.

While no relationship was found between the size of the residence hall and stress, the type of hall did prove significant in influencing RA stress and effectiveness. RAs in women's halls proved more emotionally resilient (handeling many situations without becoming overwhelmed)

followed respectively by RAs in coed halls by wings and floors, men's halls, and finally, RAs in coed halls by suites and rooms. RAs in coed halls by suites and rooms proved to be more confident in their leadership abilities followed respectively by RAs in men's halls, RAs in coed halls by wings and floors, and RAs in women's halls. Dickson stated that the tendency for women to experience less stress in emotional resiliency is consistent with previous research.

RAs with 60 or more residents revealed a tendency toward lower stress in confrontation skills and higher stress in values development, counseling skills, and emotional resiliency as compared to RAs with less residents. Dickson (1981) hypothesized that RAs with 60 or more residents accept the realities of confrontation as necessary for community organization. However, Dickson (1981) continues, the number of residents contribute to a magnification of values conflicts, counseling needs, and nonsupport situations.

Inexperienced RAs felt more stress in confrontation skills and less stress in facilitative leadership. Dickson (1981) concludes that experience with confrontation promotes less anxiety. He believed this to be the reason why new RAs felt more stress in confrontation.

In conclusion, the author stated that stress levels of RAs exist for such variables as type of hall, staff to student ratio, size of housing, and experience of RA. Again the

size of the hall did not prove a significant influencer of RA stress.

Stress

Blimling and Mittenberger (1981) in the book, The Resident Assistant, suggested stress as the main factor in low RA effectiveness. They suggested several alternatives to alleviate the stress RAs may feel. One suggestion was to increase an RAs awareness of what upsets them and consequently what relaxes them. An RA can then utilize such knowledge to help alleviate future stress. The authors pointed out the necessity of an RA to understand his/her coping skills and of employing these self-help skills on the job.

Blimling and Mittenberger (1981) point out the fact that being effective and being liked may not necessarily go hand-in-hand. Of critical importance, the authors believe, is for an RA to like him/herself and be able to treat residents fairly as adults. The authors profess the RA's need to stop believing that one must be liked by all and therefore become more effective. This understanding in itself leads to higher RA effectiveness.

Assumptions

1. The Myers Briggs Type Inventory offered sufficient reliability for studying the relationship between residents perceptions of effectiveness of RAs and Myers Briggs types.

2. The test was given in a controlled environment with the participants from individual staffs taking the test

at the same time and in the same environment.

3. The person's involved in the study responded to the items honestly and accurately.

Hypotheses

1. There will be no significant difference in effectiveness in discipline as perceived by residents between extraverted types and introverted types.

2. There will be no significant difference in effectiveness in discipline as perceived by residents between intuitive and sensing types.

3. There will be no significant difference in effectiveness in discipline as perceived by residents between thinking and feeling types.

4. There will be no significant difference in effectiveness in discipline as perceived by residents between perceiving and judging types.

5. There will be no significant difference in effectiveness in helping as perceived by residents between thinking and feeling types.

6. There will be no significant difference in effectiveness in helping as perceived by residents between sensing and intuitive types.

7. There will be no significant difference in effectiveness in helping as perceived by residents between extraverted and introverted types.

8. There will be no significant difference in effectiveness

in helping as perceived by residents between perceiving and judging types.

9. There will be no significant difference in effectiveness in programming as perceived by residents between sensing and intuitive types.

10. There will be no significant difference in effectiveness in programming as perceived by residents between extraverted and introverted types.

11. There will be no significant difference in effectiveness in programming as perceived by residents between thinking and feeling types.

12. There will be no significant difference in effectiveness in programming as perceived by residents between perceiving and judging types.

13. There will be no significant difference in effectiveness in approachability as perceived by residents between extraverted and introverted types.

14. There will be no significant difference in effectiveness in approachability as perceived by residents between thinking and feeling types.

15. There will be no significant difference in effectiveness in approachability as perceived by residents between sensing and intuitive types.

16. There will be no significant difference in effectiveness in approachability as perceived by residents between perceiving and judging types.

CHAPTER TWO

SAMPLE AND SETTING

This study involved Resident Assistants (RAs) on the UW-La Crosse campus during the fall semester of the 1986-87 academic year. The subjects were either sophomores, juniors, or seniors.

UW-La Crosse is a four year public institution initially designed as a normal school for educating potential teachers. Currently, UW-La Crosse is most well known for its outstanding Physical Therapy Program as well as its Physical Education Program. The student population is approximately 9,500. UW-La Crosse draws its students mostly from the state of Wisconsin and from middle income backgrounds.

The UW-La Crosse Housing operation serves 2,800 students and strives to provide each student with as many opportunities for individual development as possible. The residence halls are staffed by 11 Hall Directors, three Assistant Hall Directors, 94 Resident Assistants, and 11 Desk Managers.

The RAs at UW-La Crosse are selected the spring semester for the following academic year. During the selection process the RA's are evaluated on a written application, a group interaction session and individual interviews with Hall Directors and in hall selection committees. Criteria for evaluation consists of awareness of the position,

communication skills, programming skills, openness to learning, and experience in residence halls. The RAs at UW-La Crosse must achieve and maintain at least a cummulative grade point of 2.30 on a 4.00 scale. RAs may also apply to return to their position after their first year as an RA. Each RA can reapply by submitting a written application and 3 recommendations from people aware of the RAs job performance.

The RAs undergo a one week training session in the fall before the students return for the year. This training program consists of team building, communication skills, and an overall training in the basic responsibilities of the position. Hall Directors continue training for their staffs throughout the academic year.

The UW-La Crosse Housing program consists of ten coeducational halls and one women's hall. These halls range in size from 210 residents to 370 residents and are staffed by four to 12 RAs depending on hall size. The student to staff ratio is, on an average, 30 students to one RA.

Research Design

Isaac (1976) states that casual comparitive research is used when the data for research is collected after all the events of interest have occurred. The investigator then takes one or more of the dependent variables being researched and examines the data by going back through time, seeking out causes, relationships, and their meaning.

In this study, the concept of RA effectiveness was examined. The RAs were ranked by Hall Directors and residents based on their performance in different aspects of the RA position. These rankings of effectiveness were then used to find consistencies among Myers Briggs types. The RA's performance occurred obviously before it was evaluated and then was used as data to investigate relationships between effectiveness and Myers Briggs type. Therefore, this study is of casual comparitive research desgin.

The questions in the evaluation used in this study tested effectiveness in four aspects of the RA position; helping/advising, programming, discipline, and approachability. This study determined the relationship between performance in these four categories (independent variables) and Myers Briggs personality type (dependent variable).

There are several threats to external validity in this study. This study may not be generalized to other housing operations in that other operations may use different criteria to evaluate RAs. The expectations of RAs are also not consistent from school to school. UW-La Crosse expects RAs to program with residents, whereas the emphasis may be on discipline at another school. Consequently, RAs at each school will be trained differently to fit their specific job functions.

Residents at UW-La Crosse live on campus by choice, therefore, the RAs will not be ranked less effective because

residents are forced to live on campus. Residents may choose to move off campus as long as there is a waiting list for others to move into the halls. Consequently, if there are problems among residents and RAs, the residents have the option of moving off campus as well as not returning to the halls the following year. Other universities require students to live on campus for at least the freshman year.

There are several threats to internal validity in this study. The evaluations may not be representative of the performance of a particular RA. Residents may rank an RA as more or less effective because of unknown biases. The resident may have heard something negative about the RA or may simply not get along with the RA because of a personality conflict.

This can also be true of the Hall Director perceptions of effectiveness. Hall Directors may perceive the RA as more or less effective because he/she is the same personality type as the RA. There may be other unknown biases involved as well, such as a personality conflict. A first year Hall Director does not have the option of choosing his/her staff and may treat the "inherited" RAs differently because of this.

Another threat to internal validity could be that individual Hall Directors may train their staffs differently. They may place emphasis on one aspect of the RA position, possibly allowing opportunity for their staff to be more effective than others in that area.

Lastly, the RA may have become more or less effective in a particular area between the time he/she was evaluated and the time he/she took the Myers Briggs Type Inventory.

Instrumentation

The instrumentation used in this study consisted of the MBTI, and RA evaluation.

The Myers Briggs Type Inventory is a personality test based on Carl Jung's theory of personality type. The instrument was developed by Isabel Myers.

The Myers Briggs Type Inventory consists of four sub scales: Extraversion/Introversion, Sensing/Intuition, Thinking/Feeling, and Judgement/Perception. Each of these scales concerns one mental process. The goal of the Myers Briggs Type Inventory is to elicit a personality type; a preference for each of those mental processes (McCaulley, 1977).

The Myers Briggs is a forced choice instrument containing 126 questions. Parts one and two of the instrument consist of phrases that reflect opposite ways of reacting to everyday situations. Part three consists of word pairs to which the test taker responds by choosing the word pairs to which the test taker respononds by choosing the word that most appeals th him/her (McCaulley, 1977). Each question addresses one of the four scales to elicit a preference for each scale.

Myers (1962) states that the problem of ascertaining the reliability of the Myers Briggs Type Indicator is a thorny one. She goes on to say that the experimentor is faced with determining how much the results of the test are due to the reliability of the Indicator or the reliability of the person taking the test. Some people may have developed the processes he/she prefers more fully than others have developed them. With this in mind, Myers (1962) discusses split half reliability obtained by applying the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula to obtain correlations between halves. Myers tested several groups of people including junior high school students, senior high school students and college students to obtain this split half correlation. Listed below are the results of the correlations (Myers, 1969, p. 20).

Males:		EI	SN	TF	JP
Jr. High School					
Gifted 7th-9th	34	.85	.84	.81	.82
Under-achieving 8th	30	.80	.75	.44	.71
Sr. High School					
Mass. Non-prep 12th	100	.77	.70	.60	.79
Mass. Academic 12th	100	.79	.84	.76	.87
National Merit Finalists	100	.85	.86	.82	.89
College					
Brown	100	.81	.87	.86	.80

Females:		EI	SN	TF	JP
Jr. High School					
Gifted 7th-9th	26	.81	.76	.84	.75
Sr. High School					
Mass. Academic 12th	100	.82	.80	.77	.88
Advanced 12th	37	.87	.85	.84	.94
College					
Pembroke	100	.82	.87	.83	.84

Myers (1969) states that these reliabilities appear credible for an instrument of the Myers Briggs Type Inventory sort, representing in general the upper range of coefficients found in self-report instruments of similar length. She also noted that while a wide range of age, intellectual ability, and socio-economic status was included in these numbers, the only coefficient below .75 were for the underachieving 8th grade and the non-prep 12th grade. The lowest value for these groups was on TF.

The RA evaluation consisted of 46 questions that addressed not only RA performance, but Hall Director performance, appearance of residence hall, and hall council participation. There were nine questions from the evaluation that were applicable to the four aspects of the RA position used in this study (helping/advising, programming, discipline, and approachability). The questions that addressed helping/ advising were: "Is your RA helpful in getting answers to your questions?" and "Has your RA kept problems confidential

when you appraoched him/her?" The questions that addressed programming were: "Are you satisfied with your RA's efforts to facilitate programs and activities on the floor/cube?" and "Has your RA made an effort to have a variety of activities?" The questions that addressed approachability were: "Do you feel comfortable communicating your concerns, personal and hall, with your RA?" and "Have you made an attempt to get to know your RA?" The questions that addressed discipline were "Do you think your RA handles situations on the floor/cube maturely and maintains a satisfactory amount of control?" "Is your RA fair and consistent in enforcing rules on the floor/cube?" and "Does your RA communicate the rules and policies of the hall to you in a clear and effective manner during floor/cube meetings?" The scores from each of these questions for each category were combined and a mean calculated.

The evaluation was developed by the Housing Staff to assist Hall Directors and their RAs in assessing RA job performance as perceived by residents. Reliability and validity of this instrument have not been determined.

Procedure

Eighty four out of 94 RAs (89%) participated in this study. Ten RAs did not participate because they left their position before this study was completed. The 84 participating RAs consisted of 49 women and 35 men.

This study consisted of two steps. In the first step,

the RAs at UW-La Crosse were evaluated by their residents during December of the 1986-87 academic year. The RAs gave the evaluation to the residents during a cube/floor meeting and collected them upon completion. The results of this evaluation as well as the identification numbers of each RA were utilized in this study. The return rate for the RA evaluation ranged from 15 to 32 evaluations returned for each RA.

The second step in this study was the administration of the Myers Briggs Type Inventory. The test was administered by each Hall Director during a staff meeting. The Hall Directors were asked to allow enough time for each staff member to complete the test during the staff meeting and to return the test upon completion. The completed tests were returned and hand scored by the author. All but ten of the tests were returned to the author.

Data Analysis

The hypotheses is this study were formed by combining the four aspects of the RA position (helping/advising, programming, discipline and approachability) and the eight preferences of the Myers Briggs Type Inventory (extroversion, introversion, sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling, judging, and perception). Sixteen hypotheses resulted and were analyzed.

When scoring the Myers Briggs Type Inventory, the test used in this study to find personality types, points

are given for choices for each of the eight preferences. The preference with the most points becomes a part of the personality type of the individual, ESFP for example. The Myers Briggs Type Inventory also includes a tie breaking formula for each of the four subscales if each preference scores the same amount of points.

Myers, in the book, Gifts Differing, states that the number on the score sheet or graph is an indication of the strength of one's preference to the Function or Attitude. She continues, the MBTI is a self-report instrument. It only tells back what it has been told. The test taker is the final judge of his/her preferences and his/her type (1984).

When analyzing the results of this study, the above was taken into consideration. Although some people may be more extraverted, for example, than others based on the points scored, the characteristics attributed to the extraverted types indicate preferences (Myers, 1987). The analysis of this study divides the Resident Assistants into eight preference groups; extraverted, introverted, sensing, intuitive, thinking, feeling, perceiving, and judging. This particular study does not take into consideration the degree of these preferences. It only tests for consistencies among each preference.

According to Jerry Macdaid, the head researcher at CAPT (Center for Psychological Type at Gainsville, Florida)

(Macdaid, J., Personal Communication, September 14, 1987) the analysis of this study is viable and valid. He stated that many studies utilyzing the Myers Briggs Type Inventory break the population being examined into preference groups without indicating the degree of preference. He continued by adding that this analysis is valid because the test reveals preferences while considering that not all subjects will utilize every characteristic of his/her preferences.

Williams and Innman (1986) completed a study testing the impact of Myers Briggs type on RA effectiveness in discipline. In this study, the subjects were divided into preference groups (extraverted, introverted, sensing, intuitive, thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving) and the results were tabulated based on each of these preferences. In this particular study, 21 subjects were identified as Extrovert and 27 as Introvert, 29 as Sensing and 19 as Intuitive, 20 as Thinking and 28 as Feeling, 39 as Judging and 9 as Perceiving (1986). The degree of these preferences is not indicated and conclusions were drawn based on preference alone. The results of this particular study revealed that Extraverted Sensing Thinking types (and to a lesser degree Extraverted Sensing Feeling types) chose more nonassertive responses to discipline than did other types (1986). The authors state that Extraverted Sensing types generally "love a good time" and would surely be more tolerant of others, including their misbehavior (1986). Once again,

this particular study based its results on generalizations made about each preference. This study did not take into consideration the degree of preference, only that there was one.

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between Myers Briggs personality types and perceived Resident Assistant effectiveness. To determine this relationship, Wilcoxins Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test was administered.

Howell (1982, p. 504) states that the Wilcoxin test is the distribution-fee analogue of the T-test for matched scores. The Wilcoxin tests the null hypothesis that two matched samples were drawn from identical populations or else from symetric populations with the same mean.

Using SAS, the procedure for calculating the scores from this study was the NPAR1WAY procedure. The NPAR1WAY procedure performes analysis of variance on ranks and certain rank scores of response variable across a one was classification. () Almost all nonparametric tests are derived by examining the distribution of rank scores of the response variable. The rank scores are functions of the ranks of the response variable, where the values are ranked from low to high.

The NPAR1WAY procedure calculates these scores:

--Wilcoxin scores are the ranks

$Zj = Rj$

and are locally most powerful for location shifts of logistic

distribution.

--Median scores are 1 for points above the median 0 or otherwise:

$$Zj = (Rj) > (n+1) / z)$$

and are locally most powerful for double exponential distributions.

In this study, the NPAR1WAY reported the smallest sum of scores as X. The ratio (s expected) std was reported as Z, which is approximately normally distributed under the null hypothesis. The NPAR1WAY also reported the probability of a greater Z value (PROB > |Z|) and the significance level for the T-test approximation (T-test APPROX).

Delimitations

The following delimitations must be considered by the reader:

1. The study did not represent all 16 Myers Briggs personality types. The INFJ and INTJ types are not represented. Other types were represented by only a small number of RAs.

2. There are 70 extraverted types and only 18 introverted types. Therefore, this study may not compare introverted types reliably.

3. Since the evaluation process at UW-La Crosse is not consistent from year to year, this study may apply only to RAs at UW-La Crose during the academic year of 1986-1987.

4. The RA evaluations may have been administered and collected differently by each staff on campus.

5. Although criteria was given by the author to the Hall Directors to utilize in their rankings of RAs, Hall Directors may have ranked based on their individual criteria.

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Chapter three consists of the results of this study as well as a discussion of the results. Each hypothesis has been analyzed for signficance and a table consisting of scores has been constructed for them. Also included in chapter three are recommendations for future research.

There were 84 out of 94 (89%) RAs who participated in this study. The sample included 49 men and 35 women all of whom were either Sophomores, Juniors or Seniors. Each of these RAs was administered the Myers Briggs Personality Test during the Fall semester of 1986. Below are the distribution totals for each of the preferences.

Preference	Distribution
Extraverted	69
Introverted	15
Sensing	39
Intuitive	45
Thinking	27
Feeling	57
Judging	32
Perceiving	52

For this study, the RA position was divided into four categories; discipline, helping/advising, programming,

and approachability. Using these categories as well as the preferences listed above, sixteen null hypotheses were elicited and tested for significance.

In the area of discipline, there were no hypotheses that attained significance. No significant scores were elicited, therefore, in this study, Myers Briggs type did not impact effectiveness of RAs in discipline.

In the area of helping/advising there were several scores that attained significance. Sensing types were found to be more effective than Intuitive types in helping/advising. Although the score did not attain significance, extraverted types revealed a score approaching significance. This means that extraverted types could be more effective than introverted types in helping/advising. The scores did not attain significance so it is difficult to say conclusively.

In the area of programming, feeling types were found to be more effective than thinking types. This was the only score in the area of programming that attained significance.

In the area of approachability, there were no scores that attained significance. It can be concluded that Myers Briggs personality type does not impact on approachability efectiveness in this study.

Below are tables to better note scores that attained significance.

Hypothesis One. Hypothesis number one stated that there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in discipline as perceived by residents between extraverted types and introverted types. Using the Wilcoxin-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test, no significant difference was found between the two groups. There were 69 extraverted types and 15 introverted types involved in this aspect of the study. The probability of a greater Z score for this hypothesis was 0.9395 which does not attain significance. Hypothesis number one is retained indicating there is no significant difference in effectiveness in discipline as perceived by residents between extraverted and introverted types.

TABLE 1

Extraverted/Introverted Differences
In Discipline Effectiveness

Level	N	Sum Of Scores	Expected Under HO	Std. Dev. Under HO	Mean Score
Extravert	69	2939.50	2932.50	85.60	42.60
Introvert	15	630.50	637.50	85.60	42.03

Z = 0.0759
Prob > |Z| = 0.9395

Hypothesis Two. Hypothesis number two states that there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in discipline as perceived by residents between intuitive and sensing types. There were 39 sensing types and 45 intuitive types studied. The probability of a greater Z score for

this hypothesis was 0.5607. This score failed to attain significance. Hypothesis number 2 is retained indicating there is no significant difference in effectiveness in discipline as perceived by residents between intuitive and sensing types.

TABLE 2

Intuitive/Sensing Differences in Discipline Effectiveness

Level	N	Sum Of Scores	Expected Under HO	Std. Dev. Under HO	Mean Score
Sensing	39	1594.50	1657.50	111.47	40.88
Intuition	45	1975.50	1912.50	111.47	43.90

Z = -0.5607
Prob > |Z| = 0.5750

Hypothesis Three. Hypothesis number three states that there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in discipline as perceived by residents between thinking and feeling types. The Wilcoxin test was utilized. There were 57 feeling types and 27 thinking types involved in this study. The probability of a greater Z score was 0.5398, which does not attain significance. Hypothesis number 3 is retained indicating there is no significant difference in effectiveness in discipline as perceived by residents between thinking and feeling types.

TABLE 3

Thinking/Feeling Differences in Discipline Effectiveness

Level	N	Sum Of Scores	Expected Under HO	Std. Dev. Under HO	Mean Score
Feeling	57	2358.00	2422.50	104.39	41.37
Thinking	27	1212.00	1147.50	104.39	44.89

Z = 0.6131
Prob > |Z| = 0.5398

Hypothesis Four. Hypothesis number four states that there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in discipline as perceived by residents between perceiving and judging types. There were 32 judging types and 52 perceiving types studied. The probability of a greater Z score was 0.5648 which does not attain significance. Hypothesis number one is retained indicating that there is no significant difference in efectiveness in discipline as perceived by residents between judging and perceiving types.

TABLE 4

Judging/Perceiving Differences in Discipline Effectiveness

Level	N	Sum Of Scores	Expected Under HO	Std. Dev. Under HO	Mean Score
Judging	32	1297.00	1360.00	108.55	40.53
Perceiving	52	2273.00	2210.00	108.55	43.71

Z = -0.5758
Prob > |Z| = 0.5648

Hypothesis Five. Hypothesis number five states that there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in helping and advising as perceived by residents between thinking and feeling types. Using the Wilcoxin test, 57 feeling types and 27 thinking types were examined. The probability of a greater Z score for this hypothesis was 0.4952 which does not attain significance. Hypothesis number 5 is retained indicating there is no significant difference in effectiveness in helping and advising as perceived by residents between thinking and feeling types.

TABLE 5

Thinking/Feeling Differences in Helping/Advising Effectiveness

Level	N	Sum Of Scores	Expected Under HO	Std. Dev. Under HO	Mean Score
Feeling	57	2493.50	2422.50	103.36	43.75
Thinking	27	1076.50	1146.50	103.36	39.87

Z = -0.6821
Prob > |Z| = 0.4952

Hypothesis Six. Hypothesis number six stated that there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in helping and advising as perceived by residents between sensing and intuitive types. There were 39 sensing types and 45 intuitive types in this study. The probability of a greater Z score was 0.0318 which is within the range

of significance. This study revealed that sensing types were perceived by residents as more effective in helping and advising. Hypothesis number 6 is rejected indicating that there is a significant difference in effectiveness in helping and advising as perceived by residents between sensing and intuitive types.

TABLE 6

Sensing/Intuition Differences in Helping/Advising

Level	N	Sum Of Scores	Expected Under HO	Std. Dev. Under HO	Mean Score
Sensing	39	1420.00	1657.50	110.38	36.41
Intuition	45	2150.00	1912.50	110.38	47.78

Z = -2.1472
Prob > |Z| = 0.0318

Hypothesis Seven. Hypothesis number seven stated that there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in helping/advising as perceived by residents between extraverted and introverted types. There were 69 extraverted types and 15 introverted types who were studied. The probability of a greater Z score was 0.0720 which was not in the range of significance however, this score was approaching significance. The approaching significance score indicates that extraverted types are more effective in helping and advising than introverted types. Hypothesis number 7 is retained, however, indicating that there is no significant difference in

effectiveness in helping and advising as perceived by residents between extraverted and introverted types.

TABLE 7

Extraverted/Introverted Differences in Helping Advising

Level	N	Sum Of Scores	Expected Under HO	Std. Dev. Under HO	Mean Score
Extraverted	69	2779.50	2932.50	84.76	40.28
Introverted	15	790.50	637.50	84.76	52.70

Z = 1.7991
Prob > |Z| = 0.0720

Hypothesis Eight. Hypothesis number eight states that there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in helping and advising as perceived by residents between judging and perceiving types. Thirty two judging and 52 perceiving types were examined. The probability of a greater Z score was 0.5640, which is not in the range of significance. The hypothesis is retained indicating that there is no significant difference in effectiveness in helping and advising as perceived by residents between judging and perceiving types.

TABLE 8

Judging/Perceiving Differences
in Helping/Advising

Level	N	Sum Of Scores	Expected Under HO	Std. Dev. Under HO	Mean Score
Judging	32	1297.50	1360.00	107.48	40.55
Perceiving	52	2272.50	2210.00	107.48	43.70

Z = -0.5769
Prob > |Z| = 0.5640

In effectiveness in helping and advising, sensing types were perceived as more effective. This was the only hypothesis that was retained. Extraverted types revealed a score appraoching significance, however, not a score significant enough for use with this study.

Hypothesis Nine. Hypothesis number nine stated that there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in programming as perceived by residents between sensing and intuitive types. Using the Wilcoxin-Ranked Pairs Signed-Ranks test, 39 sensing types and 45 intuitive types were tested. The probability of a greater Z score was 0.5389 which was not within the range of significance. Hypothesis number 9 is retained indicating that there is no significant difference in effectiveness in programming as perceived by residents between sensing and intuitive types.

TABLE 9

Sensing/Intuitive Differences
in Programming Effectiveness

Level	N	Sum Of Scores	Expected Under HO	Std. Dev. Under HO	Mean Score
Sensing	39	1588.00	1657.50	111.48	40.73
Intuition	45	1981.50	1912.50	111.48	44.03

Z = -0.6145
Prob > |Z| = 0.5389

Hypothesis Ten. Hypothesis number ten states there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in programming as perceived by residents between extraverted and introverted types. Of the 69 extraverted and 15 introverted RAs tested, no significant difference was noted. The probability of a greater Z score was 0.3920 which is not within the range of effectiveness. Hypothesis number ten is retained indicating there is no significant difference in effectiveness in programming as perceived by residents between extraverted and introverted types.

TABLE 10

Level	N	Sum Of Scores	Expected Under HO	Std. Dev. Under HO	Mean Score
Extraverted	69	2755.50	2932.50	85.61	39.93
Introverted	15	814.50	637.50	85.61	54.30

Z = 2.0617
Prob > |Z| = 0.392

Hypothesis Eleven. Hypothesis number eleven states that there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in programming as perceived by residents between thinking and feeling types. As with the other hypotheses, the Wilcoxin Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test was administered. There were 57 feeling types and 27 thinking types involved in this aspect of the study. The probability of a greater Z score was 0.0399, which is within the range of significance. It was found that feeling types were perceived by residents as more effective in programming than thinking types. This hypothesis is rejected indicating that there is a significant difference in effectiveness in programming as perceived by residents between thinking and feeling types.

TABLE 11

Feeling/Thinking Differences in Programming Effectiveness

Level	N	Sum Of Scores	Expected Under HO	Std. Dev. Under HO	Mean Score
Feeling	57	2207.50	2422.50	104.39	38.73
Thinking	27	1362.50	1147.50	104.39	50.46

Z = 2.0548
Prob > |Z| = 0.0399

Hypothesis Twelve. Hypothesis number twelve states that there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in programming as perceived by residents between perceiving and judging types. There were 32 judging types and 52

perceiving types tested. The probability of a greater Z score indicated no significant difference with a score of 0.5648. The hypothesis is retained indicating there is no significant difference in effectiveness in discipline as perceived by residents between perceiving and judging types.

TABLE 12

Perceiving/Judging Differences in Programming Effectiveness

Level	N	Sum Of Scores	Expected Under HO	Std. Dev. Under HO	Mean Score
Judging	32	1297.00	1360.00	108.55	40.53
Perceiving	52	2273.00	2210.00	108.55	43.71

Z = -1.5648
Prob > |Z| = 0.5648

In programming the only score that attained significance were those score for effectiveness in programming between thinking and feeling types. Feeling types were found to be perceived as more effective. The other Myers Briggs types revealed no significant scores.

Hypothesis Thirteen. Hypothesis number thirteen states that there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in approachability as perceived by residents between extraverted and introverted types. A score of 0.5204 in the probability of a greater Z score indicates no significant difference. There were 69 extraverted and 15 introverted types tested.

Hypothesis number 13 is retained indicating there is no significant difference in effectiveness in discipline as perceived by residents between extraverted and introverted types.

TABLE 13

Extraversion/Introversion Differences in Approachability Effectiveness

Level	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Under HO	Std. Dev. Under HO	Mean Score
Extraversion	69	2877.00	2932.50	85.56	41.70
Introversion	15	693.50	637.50	85.56	46.20

Z = 0.6428
Prob > 0.5204

Hypothesis Fourteen. Hypothesis number fourteen states that there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in approachability as perceived by residents between thinking and feeling types. There were 57 feeling types and 27 thinking types tested. The probability of a greater Z score was 0.6628 indicating no significant difference. The hypothesis is retained indicating there is no significant difference in effectiveness in approachability as perceived by residents between thinking and feeling types.

TABLE 14

Thinking/Feeling Differences in Approachability Effectiveness

Level	N	Sum Of Scores	Expected Under HO	Std. Dev. Under HO	Mean Score
Feeling	57	2468.50	2422.50	104.34	43.31
Thinking	27	1101.50	1147.50	104.34	40.80

Z = -0.4361
Prob > |Z| = 0.6628

Hypothesis Fifteen. Hypothesis number fifteen states that there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in approachability as perceived by residents between sensing and intuitive types. No significant difference was noted among the 39 sensing types and 45 intuitive types tested. The probability of a greater Z score was 0.5718, not within the range of significance. Hypothesis number 15 is retained indicating there is no significant difference in approachability as perceived by residents between sensing types and intuitive types.

TABLE 15

Sensing/Intuitive Differences in Approachability Effectiveness

Level	N	Sum Of Scores	Expected Under HO	Std. Dev. Under HO	Mean Score
Sensing	32	1323.00	1360.00	108.49	41.34
Intuition	52	2247.00	2210.00	108.49	43.21

Z = -0.3364
Prob > |Z| = 0.7365

Hypothesis Sixteen. Hypothesis number sixteen states that there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in approachability as perceived by residents between perceiving and judging types. There were 32 judging types and 52 perceiving types tested. The probability of a greater Z score was 0.7365, not within the range of significance. Hypothesis 16 is retained indicating there is no significant difference in effectiveness in approachability as perceived by residents between perceiving and judging types.

TABLE 16

Judging/Perceiving Differences in Approachability Effectiveness

Level	N	Sum Of Scores	Expected Under HO	Std. Dev. Under HO	Mean Score
Judging	32	1323.00	1360.00	108.49	41.34
Perceiving	52	2247.00	2210.00	108.49	43.21

Z = -0.3364
Prob > |Z| = 0.7365

Discussion of Results

Of the sixteen hypotheses specified in this study, two revealed a significant score and one a score approaching significance.

The first hypothesis that revealed a significant score was, there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in helping and advising as perceived by residents between

sensing and intuitive types. The probability of a greater Z score indicated a score of 0.0318. In this study the criteria for a significant score was .05 or less, so the score for this hypothesis fell well within the range of significance. The results of this hypothesis show that according to this study, sensing types are more effective than perceiving types as perceived by residents in the area of helping and advising.

Keirsey (1984) states that sensors are realistic, actual, practical and sensible whereas intuitors are imaginative, speculative, and future oriented. When in the helping advising capacity an RA is many times expected to give immediate answers. Perhaps the reason sensors were viewed as more effective is they are realistic and practical and may provide advice that can be immediately implemented. Intuitors may be future oriented and imaginative and may not provide advice that can be used right away. Their advice may be just as sound, however, the student may prefer to take suggestions where the results are immediate rather than in the future.

It is interesting to note that Williams and Innmon(1986) found sensors to be less effective than other types in discipline. Their study found sensors to be less assertive in their discipline responses. According to the study, sensors are much more accepting of people, including their poor behavior. This can be extended to this study in that

sensors may be viewed as more accepting and less apt to criticize. Perhaps this characteristic makes sensors more effective counselors in the eyes of residents.

The other hypothesis that revealed a significant score was there will be no significant difference in effectiveness in programming as perceived by residents between thinking and feeling types. The probability of a greater Z score was 0.0399, once again well within the significant score range. According to this study residents perceived feeling types to be more effective in the area of programming than thinking types were.

Lawerence (1979) found thinking types to decide things logically, possibly negligent of other people's feelings, and giving of attention to ideas and things rather than human relationships. Lawerence (1979) found feeling types prefering to decide things with personal feelings and human values, liking praise and pleasing people, very aware of others feelings and good predictors of how others will feel.

Feeling types, because of their ability to be aware of others feelings, may be able to adjust their programming to meet the needs of their residents more easily than thinking types. Thinking types may be too caught up in the actual idea of a program and may not pay enough attention to see that people's needs are not being met. Feeling types also value harmony and therefore may be more attuned to people who are upset or not enjoying the programs provided. Thinking

types do not need harmony like feeling types and therefore may be less likely to see if residents are displeased. Feeling types like praise and pleasing people and consequently may work extra hard to see that everyone is happy with the programming being provided.

This study revealed one hypothesis with a score approaching significance. The hypothesis stated that there would be no significant difference in effectiveness in helping and advising as perceived by residents between extraverted and introverted types. The probability of a greater Z score was 0.0720, a score just above the score used to measure significance.

Extraverted people tend to be more outgoing and like contact with people. They are energized by being with others. Introverted types tend to prefer the world of ideas and become tired after being with a large group. Therefore extraverted types can be seen by others as more approachable which may not actually be the case. Lawerence (1979) found extraverted types to want to know what others expect of him/her. Introverted people, Lawerence (1979) continues, want to set his/her own standards. This may cause extraverted types to appear more approachable in helping/advising situations than introverted types.

Fourteen hypothesis failed to attain significance in this study. The Myers Briggs type was investigated for 4 types of RA effectiveness. The lack of significance

can be from a variety of reasons. Some of these reasons may be:

1. The sample size may be one reason why only two scores showed significance. The thinking and introverted sample was not well distributed (27 and 15 consequetively).

2. The RA evaluation may not have addressed one aspect of the RA positon as well as another aspect. The questions may not have represented approachability, for example, as well as discipline. If the evaluation instrument had been more reliable in this aspect, perhaps more significant scores would have been elicited.

3. Each staff is also trained by each Hall Director, consequently, there is no way of controlling what is presented. One staff may experience a training that concentrates on discipline and another staff on programming. If this is true, the scores in this study may represent individual staff differences and the impact on effectiveness rather than Myers Briggs type and the impact on effectiveness.

4. No significant difference exists. Given that the Myers Briggs is a type indicator and that one type is not perceived as better than another and that people are able to adopt their styles to some situation it is possible that RA effectiveness is not determined by type.

Several conclusions can be drawn from this study. It can be concluded that in Fall of 1986, the RAs who were feeling types were perceived by residents as more effective

in the area of programming than were those who were thinking types. It can also be concluded that the RAs who were sensing types were perceived by residents as more effective in the area of helping/advising than were those who were intuitive types.

It can also be concluded that at UW-La Crosse more extraverted types are hired for RA positions than are introverted types. More feeling types are hired for RA positions than are thinking types also. This could be caused by the hiring process or by the nature of the position. More extraverted/feeling types may be interested in the position than are introverted/thinking types.

Implications

Although this study revealed only two scores that were significant, this study has several implications. The best use for this study, in the opinion of the author, is in awareness of individual differences. Through the Myers Briggs one can see that each person has unique gifts and qualities. These qualities are neither good nor bad. As a staff team, it is important to realize that each member of the team is different. This study can be used with staffs to help them appreciate each other's individual difference and capitalize on them. Use of this study can train RAs to be more accepting of differences.

RAs and Hall Directors can utilize this study in personal development as well. Each type has its strengths and

weaknesses. Awareness of these strengths and weaknesses can challenge a staff member to improve on a weakness and fine tune a strength. Hall Directors can be aware of these strengths and weaknesses and can monitor progress.

This study could be used as a tool for selection. Myers (1962) stated: "Any team should include a sufficient variety of types to perform the required jobs effectively and with satisfaction" (p. 32). It would be benificial to know applicants type before selection so Hall Directors can choose a team that would compliment each other. If anything, this study could be used to understand that it is better to have a variety of personality types on a team rather than all one type.

This study could also be used as a tool to promote awareness of what a Resident Assistant position entails. This study, hopefully, builds an appreciation for the position of RA and the people who undertake it. It is a challenging job. This study could help people understand the many aspects of the position and perhaps encourage students to become RAs.

Recommendations For Future Study

The author recommends that this study be implemented on a sample with a more balanced number of introverted types and thinking types. The results of this study were generated from a small sample of introverts as compared to extraverts and a small number of thinking types as compared

to feeling types. This study may not fairly represent these populations.

A study that investigates combined preferences, (SP types versus NJ types), may also give more specific insight to each preference. Each preference impacts on the whole personality type and it is dificult to draw conclusions on each preference independent of the others.

Utilizing this study with another housing operation would also be a recommendation. The results of such a study may be totally different than the results of this study because of the nature of each housing operation.

CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY

This study examined the relationship between RA effectiveness as perceived by residents and the psychological types of Resident Assistants as measured by the Myers Briggs Type Indicator. There are four preferences represented in the Myers Briggs Type Indicator. They are: introversion versus extraversion, sensing versus intuition, thinking versus feeling and judging versus perceiving.

The Myers Briggs elicits a 16 possible types based on combinations of the above preferences. The letters in each type, ESFP for example, represent the dominant preference for that particular type. This study tested if the dominant preferences of each RA impacted RA effectiveness.

This study involved RAs on the UW-La Crosse campus during the fall semester of the 1986-1987 academic year. There were 84 out of 94 RAs who participated in this study. The sample included 35 men and 49 women all of whom were either Sophomores, Juniors, or Seniors. Each were administered the test during the fall semester of 1986.

For this study, the RA position was divided into four categories: discipline, helping/advising, programming, and approachability. Using these categories as well as the preferences listed above, sixteen null hypothesis were

elicited and tested for significance.

This study is of causal comparitive design. The concept of RA effectiveness was examined. Based on effectiveness ratings by residents consistencies among Myers Briggs types were noted. The RAs performance occurred before it was evaluated and then was used as data, consequently the causal comparative design.

This study consisted of two steps. In the first step the RAs were evaluated by their residents during December of the 1986-1987 academic year. The RAs gave the evaluation to the residents during a floor/cube meeting and collected them upon completion. The return rate for these evaluations ranged from 15 to 32 for each RA.

The second step consisted of the administration of The Myers Briggs Type Inventory. The test was administered by each Hall Director during a staff meeting. The test was to be completed during the meeting. The completed inventories were hand scored by the author.

Using SAS, the procedure for calculating the scores from this study was the NPAR1WAY procedure. This is a nonparametric test. The Wilcoxin score, which are locally most powerful for location shifts of logistic distribution, was used to test for significance.

In the area of discipline, there were no hypothesis that attained significance. No significant scores were elicited, therefore, in this study Myers Briggs type did

not impact effectiveness of RAs in discipline.

In the area of helping/advising there were several scores that attained significance. Sensing types were found to be more effective than intuitive types in helping/advising. Therefore, in this study Myers Briggs type did impact significantly in the area of helping/advising.

In the area of programming, feeling types were found to be more effective than thinking types. This was the only score in the area of programming that attained significance.

In the area of approachability, there were no scores that attained significance. It can be concluded that Myers Briggs personality type does not impact on approachability effectiveness in this study.

It can be concluded that in Fall of 1986, the RAs who were feeling types were perceived by residents as more effective in the area of programming than were those who were thinking types. It can also be concluded that the RAs who were sensing types were perceived by residents as more effective in the area of helping/advising.

There are several implications for this study. In the opinion of the author, the best use for this study is in awareness and appreciation of individual differences. As a staff team, it is important to realize that each member of the team is different. Use of this study can train RAs to be more accepting of the team differences.

This study can be used to impact personal development

as well. Each type has strengths and weaknesses and knowledge of these can be helpful. An RA can challenge themselves to improve upon the weaknesses of his/her type and capitalize on the strengths.

Because it is best to have a variety of types on a team, this study may be used for RA selection. It would be beneficial for Hall Directors to know what type an applicant is so a team can be chosen that would complement each other.

The author recommends that this study be implemented on a sample with a more balanced number of introverted types and thinking types. There was a comparitively small number of these preferences and the study may not fairly represent these preferences.

It may also be benificial to utilize this study with a different Housing Operation. The results of this study may be affected because of the nature of each Housing Operation.

REFERENCES

Bates, M., and Keirsey, D. (1984). Please understand me: character and temperment types. Del Mar: Gnogology Books Ltd.

Blimling, G. S., and Miltenberger, L. J. (1981). The resident assistant. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.

Carskadon, T. G. (1981). Research in psychological type. Mississippi State University.

Corey, G. (1982). Theory and practice of counseling and psychotherapy. Monterey: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

Dickson, G. L. (1981). The resident assistant stress inventory, 1975-1979: a national study. Journal of College Student Personnel, 12, 362-369.

Gay, L. R. (1981). Educational research: competencies for analysis and applicaton. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.

Harrington, J. T., Nickerson, D. L. (1971). The college student as counselor: a guide to residence hall counseling. Moravia: Chronicle Guidance Publications.

Hornak, J. (1983). Resident assistant burnout: a self defeating behavior. Journal of College and University Student Housing, 12, 14-17.

Keith, L. (1985). The relationship between perceived job satisfaction of R.A.'s and selected personality types. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, La Crosse, WI.

Lawerence, G. (1979). People types and tiger stripes. Gainsville: Center for Application of Psychological Type.

Lester, D. (1971). The myers briggs type indicator as a predictor of counselor effectiveness. Crisis Intervention, 3, 44-46.

Mamchur, C. M. (1984). Insights: understanding yourself and others. Ontario: Canadian Cataloguing.

McCaulley, M. H. (1977). Introduction to the MBTI for researchers. Gainsville: Center for Application of Psychological Type.

Myers, I. B. (1983). Gifts differing. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Myers, I. B. (1962). The myers-briggs type indicator. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Nowack, K. M. (1985). Factors affecting burnout and job performance of resident assistants. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26, 137-143.

University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, UW-L RA handbook, 1986.

Williams, C., and Nelson, S. I. (1986). Residence hall discipline as a function of personality type. NASPA Journal, 24, 39-47.

APPENDIX A

List of Types

	SENSING TYPES		INTUITIVE TYPES	
INTROVERTS	**ISTJ** Serious, quiet, earn success by concentration and thoroughness. Practical, orderly, matter-of-fact, logical, realistic and dependable. See to it that everything is well organized. Take responsibility. Make up their own minds as to what should be accomplished and work toward it steadily, regardless of protests or distractions.	**ISFJ** Quiet, friendly, responsible and conscientious. Work devotedly to meet their obligations and serve their friends and school. Thorough, painstaking, accurate. May need time to master technical subjects, as their interests are usually not technical. Patient with detail and routine. Loyal, considerate, concerned with how other people feel.	**INFJ** Succeed by perseverance, originality and desire to do whatever is needed or wanted. Put their best efforts into their work. Quietly forceful, conscientious, concerned for others. Respected for their firm principles. Likely to be honored and followed for their clear convictions as to how best to serve the common good.	**INTJ** Usually have original minds and great drive for their own ideas and purposes. In fields that appeal to them, they have a fine power to organize a job and carry it through with or without help. Skeptical, critical, independent, determined, often stubborn. Must learn to yield less important points in order to win the most important.
	ISTP Cool onlookers—quiet, reserved, observing and analyzing life with detached curiosity and unexpected flashes of original humor. Usually interested in impersonal principles, cause and effect, how and why mechanical things work. Exert themselves no more than they think necessary, because any waste of energy would be inefficient.	**ISFP** Retiring, quietly friendly, sensitive, kind, modest about their abilities. Shun disagreements, do not force their opinions or values on others. Usually do not care to lead but are often loyal followers. Often relaxed about getting things done, because they enjoy the present moment and do not want to spoil it by undue haste or exertion.	**INFP** Full of enthusiasms and loyalties, but seldom talk of these until they know you well. Care about learning, ideas, language, and independent projects of their own. Tend to undertake too much, then somehow get it done. Friendly, but often too absorbed in what they are doing to be sociable. Little concerned with possessions or physical surroundings.	**INTP** Quiet, reserved, brilliant in exams, especially in theoretical or scientific subjects. Logical to the point of hair-splitting. Usually interested mainly in ideas, with little liking for parties or small talk. Tend to have sharply defined interests. Need to choose careers where some strong interest can be used and useful.
EXTRAVERTS	**ESTP** Matter-of-fact, do not worry or hurry, enjoy whatever comes along. Tend to like mechanical things and sports, with friends on the side. May be a bit blunt or insensitive. Can do math or science when they see the need. Dislike long explanations. Are best with real things that can be worked, handled, taken apart or put together.	**ESFP** Outgoing, easygoing, accepting, friendly, enjoy everything and make things more fun for others by their enjoyment. Like sports and making things. Know what's going on and join in eagerly. Find remembering facts easier than mastering theories. Are best in situations that need sound common sense and practical ability with people as well as with things.	**ENFP** Warmly enthusiastic, high-spirited, ingenious, imaginative. Able to do almost anything that interests them. Quick with a solution for any difficulty and ready to help anyone with a problem. Often rely on their ability to improvise instead of preparing in advance. Can usually find compelling reasons for whatever they want.	**ENTP** Quick, ingenious, good at many things. Stimulating company, alert and outspoken. May argue for fun on either side of a question. Resourceful in solving new and challenging problems, but may neglect routine assignments. Apt to turn to one new interest after another. Skillful in finding logical reasons for what they want.
	ESTJ Practical, realistic, matter-of-fact, with a natural head for business or mechanics. Not interested in subjects they see no use for, but can apply themselves when necessary. Like to organize and run activities. May make good administrators, especially if they remember to consider others' feelings and points of view.	**ESFJ** Warm-hearted, talkative, popular, conscientious, born cooperators, active committee members. Need harmony and may be good at creating it. Always doing something nice for someone. Work best with encouragement and praise. Little interest in abstract thinking or technical subjects. Main interest is in things that directly and visibly affect people's lives.	**ENFJ** Responsive and responsible. Generally feel real concern for what others think or want, and try to handle things with due regard for other people's feelings. Can present a proposal or lead a group discussion with ease and tact. Sociable, popular, active in school affairs, but put time enough on their studies to do good work.	**ENTJ** Hearty, frank, able in studies, leaders in activities. Usually good in anything that requires reasoning and intelligent talk, such as public speaking. Are usually well-informed and enjoy adding to their fund of knowledge. May sometimes be more positive and confident than their experience in an area warrants.

INTROVERTS
EXTRAVERTS

APPENDIX B

RA Job Description

University of Wisconsin - La Crosse
University Housing Office

RESIDENT ASSISTANT JOB DESCRIPTION AND RESPONSIBILITIES
Academic Year 1986-87

I. Position

The Resident Assistant is responsible for a floor, wing or cube. She/he is there to help with the personal and academic concerns of the student and to help work out any group conflicts which may arise. The Resident Assistant also serves as a facilitator to encourage a cooperative and considerate group living environment. The RA is expected to help build a feeling of togetherness and community by initiating and helping organize floor/cube or hall activities and programs. She/he serves as an informational resource about the campus and residence hall. Most of all, the RA is expected to be a person who cares about people and attempts to make the residence hall a worthwhile place to live.

Resident Assistants who have the greatest success and who seem to enjoy the position most, share common characteristics of personal warmth, social and emotional maturity, ability to develop meaningful relationships with many types of people, openness to new experiences and learning flexibility and capacity to deal with change, ability to evaluate a situation objectively, the ability to deal with a wide range of human emotions and patience. The Resident Assistant must also have a good sense of humor, the ability to communicate showing no favoritism or prejudice, and treats each person as a worthy human being.

The Resident Assistant position is a commitment of talents, time and effort, therefore, she/he should have demonstrated strength in one's academic pursuits. A Resident Assistant receives the personal benefit from learning and improving human relations skills which will serve one well in present and future everyday living. Therefore, this position should be viewed as an educational opportunity as well as a means of financial assistance.

II. Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Resident Assistant are numerous and varied. The following is a representative (certainly not all inclusive) list of Resident Assistant responsibilities. The Resident Assistant:

1. Participates and contributes to the Resident Assistant Reality Therapy Course or the returning staff class.

2. Maintains a professional attitude and manner while serving as a University employee and representative of the Housing Office Staff.

3. Knows and understands the philosophy of the University Housing program and is familiar with the resource material in the Resident Assistant Handbook.

4. Knows and understands the rationale for University and Residence Hall policies and procedures and is able to interpret them effectively.

5. Supports and participates in the evaluation and implementation of University Residence Hall Policies.

6. Knows and understands the operation of the University and its services such as the Financial Aid Office, Placement and Career Advising Office, University Housing Office, Student Activities and Centers, Counseling and Testing Center and Health Center.

7. Facilitates openness and honesty in the communication between students, Resident Assistants, Hall Directors, University Housing Office Staff, and the entire University community.

8. Helps students adjust to their roommates, floormates, residence hall community and University community.

9. Works cooperatively with students insuring the rights and privacy of all residents through:

a. Encouraging through the community development spirit an appropriate academic environment in the living unit and in the residence hall.

b. Teaching responsibility for one's own actions and consideration of others in the group living situation by abiding by the policies and procedures of the University as outlined in the "Student Handbook" and those of the residence hall as stated in the Residence Hall Handbook, "Livin On."

c. Knows and understands the referral procedure for additional information as well as for assistance with problem situations.

10. Assist in maintaining order in emergency situations.

11. Required to participate in pre-service training, staff orientation, and inservice training sessions throughout the academic year. Advance notification to your Hall Director and the Coordinator of RA Training is required, if unable to attend.

12. Attends and participates at all meetings called by the Hall Director and/or University Housing Office. Advance notification to appropriate person is required, if unable to attend.

13. Develops a working relationship with the Hall Director and with peer staff members.

14. Informs the Hall Director of your living unit situations (happenings, needs, behavioral changes, unknown whereabouts of members) through informal visits/conferences and staff meetings.

15. Works with and supports the maintenance staff and explains their role to students.

16. Supports and participates in the evaluation of Residence Hall Staff personnel.

17. Responsible for certain administrative and clerical tasks as assigned by the Hall Director and/or University Housing Office.

a. Maintenance of records concerning room inventory and damages in students' rooms.

b. Assist in student room check-in and room check-out procedure.

c. Assist in surveys and special projects as requested by the Hall Director and/or University Housing Office.

18. Available to assist students with their personal and group concerns within your limits of training and capability.

19. Shares reponsibility of duty nights and hall security. RA's are expected to be in their respective hall most nights of each week available to meet student needs. Official RA duty guidelines are set at the discretion of the Hall Director. Duty guidelines include: duty rounds, master key use, locking the hall, professional behavior on duty, etc.

20. Assists in additional responsibilities that occur concerning hall function.

21. Becomes acquainted with each student in the living unit as soon as possible, as well as with other residents of the hall.

22. Facilitates students getting to know each other.

23. Facilitates academic, cultural, recreational and social programming, individually, and in cooperation with other Resident Assistants and with residents of the living unit. Specific guidelines and directions concerning programming are arranged with the Hall Director. Each RA is responsible for at least one program per month.

24. Check with the Hall Director, Area Coordinator, or Housing Director when controversial issues surface within their living community.

25. Holds periodic meetings with your living unit for general communication, sharing information, or generating enthusiasm.

26. Encourages and supports students in their involvement in residence hall government, programming and campus activities.

27. Participates in, provides a leadership and facilitator role, and supports and encourages new student participation in the New Student Orientation.

28. Provides an informational floor bulletin board for: academic information, social events, deadline dates, hall government, maintenance, policies and procedures.

29. Supports and makes an effort to participate in University and residence hall special programs such as Campus Previews and Indian Summer Daze.

30. Works with the Hall Director in advising the Hall Council, when necessary.

APPENDIX C

RA Evaluation

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - LA CROSSE

University Housing Office

Wilder Hall

1987-88 Academic Year

Dear Resident:

The purpose of this survey is to obtain information from you regarding the general hall environment as well as your opinions about the job performance of your RA and that of the Hall Director, Desk Manager and Hall Council. This will be the only time that we will be asking you for such feedback this semester. Because of this, it is important that you take the time to fill out this survey honestly and constructively. If you wish to offer any additional thoughts or comments, please use the space provided at the end of the survey. Unless you decide to sign the survey, it will be completely anonymous. The answer sheet has been pre-coded for computer reading. Please use a Number 2 pencil to fill out the answer sheet and be careful to mark only the desired spaces to prevent computer error.

Sincere Thanks,

_____

8. Is your RA/PA fair and consistent in enforcing rules on the floor/cube/wing?

   a) Always
   b) Often
   c) Sometimes
   d) Seldom
   e) Never

9. Does your RA/PA communicate the rules and policies of the hall to you in a clear and effective manner during floor/cube/wing meetings?

   a) Yes
   b) No
   c) No chance to observe

10. Are you satisfied with your RA/PA's effort to facilitate programs and activities on the floor/cube/wing?

    a) Always
    b) Often
    c) Sometimes
    d) Seldom
    e) Never

11. Has your RA/PA made an effort to have a variety of activities ?

    a) Excellent
    b) Good
    c) Sometimes
    d) Seldom
    e) Very Poor

12. Do you feel comfortable communicating your concerns, personal and hall, with your RA/PA?

    a) Yes
    b) No

13. Do you feel your RA/PA has made an attempt to get to know you?

    a) Yes
    b) No

14. Are you satisfied with your contact with your Hall Director?

    a) Yes
    b) No
    c) Little opportunity to evaluate

23. Do you know who your Hall Council Executive Officers are?

a) Yes
b) No

24. Have you attended any Hall Council meetings?

a) Yes
b) No

25. Do you participate in Hall Council activities?

a) Always
b) Often
c) Sometimes
d) Seldom
e) Never

26. Are you aware of the accomplishments of Hall Council?

a) Yes
b) No

27. Do you know who your floor/cube/wing representative to Hall Council is?

a) Yes
b) No

28. Does your floor/cube/wing representative keep you adequately informed about Hall Council and its activities?

a) Always
b) Often
c) Sometimes
d) Rarely
e) Never

29. Do you think that the front desk offers enough services to meet your needs? If no, please specify at the end of the survey.

a) Yes
b) No

30. Do you think the front desk workers are friendly and helpful when you use the front desk services?

a) Yes
b) No

31. Do you know who your Hall's Desk Manager is?

a) Yes
b) No

39. How would you describe your relationship with your roommate?

a) Positive
b) Neutral
c) Negative

40. Have you and your roommate positively solved any conflicts you may have had?

a) Yes
b) No
c) No conflicts

41. Do you think that the majority of your floor/cube/wing residents are considerate of one another?

a) Yes
b) No

42. Do you think that a majority of the hall residents are considerate of one another?

a) Yes
b) No

43. When problems do occur on your floor, what are they usually caused by:

a) Alcohol and intoxicated residents
b) Residents' attitude
c) Staff attitudes
d) Past reputation of the floor

44. Have you made any positive contributions to the hall?

a) Yes
b) No

45. What contributions have you made?

a) Helped with Programming
b) Worked on Hall Improvements
c) Joined a Hall Committee
d) Lived within University and Housing Guidelines to make such contributions

46. Would you be interested in living in a designated "Quiet Area" within your choice of halls for 1988-89?

a) Yes
b) No

APPENDIX D

H.D. Letters

November 28, 1986

TO: Tom Kipp
Janece English

FROM: Linda

Tom and Janece,

Ruth has informed me that you have already administered the Myers Briggs to your staff.

I would greatly appreciate it if you could get me the results. Enclosed please find a list of the numbers used for the evaluations as ID numbers. I am asking that you write these numbers on the appropriate profile before you give them to me.

I would be more than happy to attend your staff meeting for a short time and explain what I am doing and ask for their support. Just let me know when and where. If you would rather explain it yourself, there are a few points I would ask you to discuss.

1. There will be complete confidentiality. I won't know whose MB's is whose. They will be using their evaluation form numbers.
2. They do not have to participate if they do not wish to, however, their support would be greatly appreciated.

I must have your RA's permission before I can utilize their results. Any assistance you can give me with this would be much appreciated. Thanks so much for your continued support as I undertake this "challenge".

Linda

November 28, 1986

TO: Hall Directors

From: Linda

Hi!!

Heres hoping your Thanksgiving break was spectacular. Are you counting down to Christmas?

As we discussed at the November 24 Residence Life meeting, I am asking you to administer the Myers Briggs to your staff for use in my seminar paper.

If you would like for me to attend a part of you staff meeting to explain what I am asking them to take a part in, just let me know when and where, and I'll be there! If you would rather explain it yourself, there are a few points I'd ask you to discuss.

1. There will be complete confidentiality. I won't know whose MB's is whose. They will be using their evaluation form numbers.
2. They do not have to participate if they do not wish to, however, their support would be greatly appreciated.

You will be supplied with the scored profiles for your personal use with your staff for a possible developmental exercise.

Enclosed please find enough MB's for your RA's and DM's, I will not be using the DM's in my study, but you may wish to for your staff devo. Please ask them to leave their ID number blank. Also enclosed is a list of the evaluation numbers to be used as ID numbers for the RA's.

Please return the completed score sheets to me as soon as you finish with them. Thank you so much for your continued support as I work on this project. You are GREAT!

Linda