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INTRODUCTION

Perhaps the oldest and most common vehicle for student development among college students is the residence hall student government (Sprague 1977). Indeed, student self-government in residence has been a part of higher education since the founding of the first universities. As early as the twelfth century, students at the University of Bologna organized themselves into guilds "for protection against the teachers, the townspeople and each other" (Carmichael 1957:27). They hired houses and elected members to manage their affairs. Through group action they "worked for the right of jurisdiction over their own members" (Adelman 1969:16).

Eventually this plan spread throughout medieval Europe. At Oxford and Cambridge Universities in England, students were responsible for the organization of university centers and residences, and consequently for their administration (Lunn 1957). "Student government developed from a genuine economic and social need, rather than from principles of education" (Horner and Horner 1966:61).

For several centuries, the power of the student guilds grew (McGarth 1970). In time, however, student-administered houses gave way to halls of residence endowed by donors who "increasingly claimed the right to administer their benefactions and to supervise the
activities of those who received them" (McGarth 1970:11). Gradually, student administrators were replaced by hired faculty members, and by the fourteenth century most universities had permanently fixed controls over student residences (Cowley 1934).

During the reformation most residential systems on the continent faded in favor of private boarding houses. At Oxford and Cambridge, however, institutional control of residence halls held firm.

When the English colonized North America, they brought with them, "the traditions and concepts of the collegiate residence system" (Blimling and Miltenberger 1981:9). Colonial American colleges continued the idea of strict faculty control and enforced it by the stern Puritan influence of the day. Although attempts at student self-government and leadership were made at the University of Virginia and other institutions immediately after the revolution (Brubacher and Rudy 1958), the "American system of dormitories in the 1700's provided little more than shelter and a place for the university to exercise control" (Blimling and Miltenberger 1981:12).

The control lasted until the early 1800's when student revolt, riot and disciplinary problems increased to monumental proportions. "Dormitories were looked on as places where students gathered to hatch devious crimes against the university and the community" (Rudolph 1962:110). Presidents Wayland of Brown and later, Tappan of Michigan and Barnard of Columbia, also staunch proponents of the non-residential German system currently in vogue at that time (Brubacher and Rudy 1958), led the attack against dormitories and their place in higher education. Throughout the country, money formerly devoted to the construction and maintenance of residence halls was redirected to
instruction and research. Entering the twentieth century, American college residential and campus life was almost totally absent.

Due to the efforts of William Rainey Harper, President of Chicago, Woodrow Wilson of Princeton, and Harvard's Charles Eliot (Cowley 1934), students and administrators alike began to rebel and react against the impersonal German philosophy toward student life. Many administrators began advocating student residential housing, and awareness increased for the need for individual student assistance. Faculty too were becoming concerned with the total development of college students. "At the same time, the unruly conduct of students living in the community also aided a revival of college housing" (Powell et al., 1969:71).

With the change of attitude toward student residence came an increase in the opportunity for students to participate in self-government (Kloph 1950). Strict faculty supervision of dormitories gave way to persons hired for their "scoutlike qualities" (Hardee 1964:9). Students were also enlisted to supervise both on a volunteer and paid basis (Hardee 1964).

Across the United States, interest in student government increased. In the 1920's to 1930's, the National Self Government Committee, Inc. organized by Richard Welling, was followed by the National Student Federation of the U.S.A. (Horner and Horner 1966). By 1950, examples of student councils, women's self-government associations and student courts existed on many college campuses, as did house systems of resident control (Falvey 1952).

In 1954, the National Association of College and University Residence Halls, Inc. was established to "act as a national voice of
residence hall students residing in colleges and universities" (NACURH 1978:17).

Prior to 1960, student residences were simply that - residences; they generally had little or no connection with the institution's academic program. In the United States their major purpose apart from simple housing was supervision of student conduct.

During the late 1950's and early 1960's, many institutions increased their bed spaces by six to seven hundred percent. The emphasis on maximum numbers of beds and minimum construction costs per bed led to the construction of institutional living environments that bore little resemblance to academic communities. In fact, these environments had the unanticipated effect of increasing student feelings of impersonality and anonymity and contributed to attitudes of anti-intellectualism (Riker 1981:673).

Since the 1960's, however, successful efforts have been made at many institutions to link classroom and residential learning. Such efforts have been traceable to the enthusiastic commitment of faculty members and resident staff who saw the potential of residential learning as a means for supporting the academic development of students. Rules and regulations are now replaced by programs, services and activities which promote student development (Upcraft 1982). The results of significant studies by Chickering (1974) and Astin (1973; 1977) support this movement with evidence of the positive impact of residence halls upon educational achievement and personal growth.

The role of the student must be especially considered when discussing the question of how residence halls can best fulfill their developmental function (Greenleaf 1974). Student peer culture, according to Adams, is a powerful influence on the total intellectual
life of the university. In considering influence, housing administrators can arrange a living environment in such a way as to reflect an understanding of the peer culture (1968). The place of students in the success or failure of the developmental goals of residence halls has been recognized by a number of authors (Bowling 1980; Bristow 1971; Dowse and Harrison 1957; Fredericksen 1977; Hoelting 1973; Klopf, Felsted and Hawley 1952; Mable 1968). More specifically, "in the dynamics of residence hall educational programs student government involvement is fundamental" (Murphy 1969:111).

Student governments, particularly residence hall associations, are commonly accepted by college and university housing administrators as important aspects of campus learning environments and the ecology of student development (Blocher 1978). In particular, it is believed that "the residence hall environment can be influenced, described and channeled by both residence hall staff and students to create an optimal climate for personal and academic development" (WICHE 1973:13).

Little study, however, has been focused upon the effectiveness of student associations or, for that matter, any aspect of student participation in residence hall government. A review of the literature, according to Chiles and Pruitt, "will reveal a paucity of research and publications regarding the historical and present role of student government" (1975:21).

This is particularly disturbing in view of the fact that "the need to define the effectiveness of student representative organizations is especially important in these times of educational, social and political change" (Giroux 1975:6) and "in recent years,
student governments have received much criticism with regard to role, duties and scope of authority" (Armstrong 1970:553).

Student government, at present, is a "travesty, characterized by absentee profile, low morale, little support from the student body, and even less support from the faculty and administration" (Chiles and Pruitt 1985:22). Indeed, institutional philosophies have bordered on being non-developmental in response to student associations. The "let the sleeping dog lie approach" regarding students in institutional governance appears to be prevalent (Chiles and Pruitt 1985:22). Limited literature in relation to student government further suggests a lack of emphasis by colleges and universities in regard to this most important endeavor.

To improve the development of resident student government, therefore, higher education needs to begin by assessing role perceptions and characteristics associated with its effectiveness (Chiles and Pruitt 1985).

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was threefold: (1) to determine if the effectiveness of residence hall student government varies according to the perception of its role held by residence hall student staff members, the perception of its role held by residence hall student government officers, the type of residence hall and the size of residence hall; (2) to determine if the perception of the role of residence hall student government held by residence hall student staff varies according to the age, time in position, and gender of the residence hall student staff members; and (3) to determine if the perception of the role of residence hall student government held by
residence hall student government officers varies according to the age, time in office, and gender of the residence hall student government officers.

To eliminate any bias resulting from regional or institutional differences, the study was conducted solely at land-grant universities in the northwest.

Need for the Study

The civil rights struggle, the poverty programs and the peace movement provide a unique opportunity for students to protest the problems of the world, and at the same time communicate their need to play a meaningful role in the decision-making processes that effect the course of their lives. The Free Speech movement at Berkeley, in addition to making the American college student a focus of public attention, has also served to increase the study of student activism. Heist, Katz and others have described student activism in terms which suggest a greater involvement in the learning process (Stanton 1976). If activism means greater participation by students in the determination of those things that are important and meaningful to them, then it is possible that denying them participation in the campus decision-making process represents a denial of an important opportunity to enhance education itself. To quote Nevitt Sanford,

Our goal is to expand both the intellect and the area of motive and feeling, and to bring the two together in a larger whole. To this end we try to mobilize the intellectual strivings, and at the same time try to bring intellect to bear upon the issues the student cares most deeply about. Once the student is aroused by social and political issues he needs not only the support of a sympathetic group, but confidence in his own thought, judgement and decision-making -- a confidence born only of practice (1967:26).
Limiting the student's initiative in making decisions about his or her own actions by imposing the often rigid structure of a college residence hall, inhibits the development of confidence. The college residence hall not only provides a perfect opportunity for mutual cooperation in community administration, but involves a whole host of decisions about aspects of a student's life over which he or she has traditionally had nothing to say. Decision-making is a learned art and student involvement in decision-making is a process in which confidence and ability increase with experience. "If student involvement is to reach meaningful proportions then the whole concept of residence should be scrutinized by students and housing people to determine the depth of its power to stimulate or inhibit growth in the individual" (Saffian 1968:2).

Today, colleges and universities continue to allocate vast amounts of time, energy and resources in support of residence hall student government. Residence hall directors, at one time senior or graduate students, have given way at many institutions to professionals with graduate degrees in counseling, student personnel work or higher education administration, who are better qualified to develop student leaders. Housing budgets, already severely strained by the inflation of utility, service and personnel costs, still reflect a significant percentage of funding in support of student government. Training programs, retreats and workshops, both for student leaders and their advisors, are now also part of most college and university residence life programs.
Numerous benefits of residence hall government, both to the institution and students, are also cited in the literature. These include:

1. building an overall positive residence hall environment (Murphy 1971),
2. design and regulation of residence hall floors (Bristow 1971),
3. individual student growth (Mable 1968),
4. re-evaluation of rules and regulations (Jackson 1971),
5. individual skill in daily interactions (DeCoster and Mable 1974),
7. communication links between residents and administrators (SEMSU 1980, Sifford 1952, Stoner 1974),
8. bringing together residents of all halls (SEMSU 1980),
9. serving as a buffer between housing management and residents (Sifford 1952).

With such emphasis on residence hall student government, a need exists to provide relevant information in regard to factors which may influence the effectiveness of these organizations. In particular, the perceptions of residence hall student staff and leaders related to residence hall student government are important for two reasons: (1) If student government leaders do not accurately perceive their role, then their objectives may be in conflict with the educational mission of the housing program; (2) Student staff play a key role in student leadership development, the establishment and facilitation of
governance structures and the maintenance of a learning environment (Bowling 1980).

Specific characteristics of these students, such as age, gender and time in office or position may relate to the development of perception of the role of residence hall student government and hence to its effectiveness. Likewise, the basic factors of hall population and type may also have an effect.

The results of this study, therefore, could provide a basis for alterations in existing programs and the introduction of new approaches. The findings could also be utilized in developing future staff selection and training processes, student leadership development classes, facilities planning and policy formulation. Further, sharing the results of this study with students should improve their understanding of their role in shaping their living environment and, in turn, provide more effective student development programs.

Finally, it is hoped that this investigation will provide a base for additional hypotheses and questions which will stimulate further research in the area of residence hall student government.

**General Questions of the Study**

1. Is there a relationship between the effectiveness of residence hall student government and
   a. perceptions of the role of residence hall student government held by residence hall student staff members,
   b. perceptions of the role of residence hall student government held by residence hall student officers,
   c. type of hall of residence,
2. Is there a relationship between the perception of the role of residence hall student government held by residence hall student staff and their
   a. age,
   b. time in position,
   c. gender?

3. Is there a relationship between the perception of the role of residence hall student government held by residence hall student government officers and their
   a. age,
   b. time in office,
   c. gender?

**General Procedures**

The procedure followed in this study began with a review of related literature providing the background for the study.

Two questionnaires were administered. The first, the student government section of Murphy's *Residence Hall Attitude Scale* (1971), determined what residence hall student staff members and government officers perceived to be the role of resident hall student government. This questionnaire also collected data about respondent age, gender, time in position or office and type of hall of residence.

The second questionnaire measured perceptions of effectiveness of individual residence hall student governments as determined by professionals in the field of college and university housing. It was administered to residence hall directors who also provided information in regard to hall size.
The questionnaires were delivered to residence hall directors, residence hall student staff members and residence hall student government officers at Idaho State University, Montana State University, Oregon State University, Utah State University and Washington State University.

Limitations

1. The analysis of residence hall student government effectiveness was limited to the relationship of effectiveness and selected perceptions and characteristics of residence hall student staff members and government officers.

2. Any conclusions and recommendations of this study are applicable only to land-grant institutions in Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Utah and Washington.

Delimitations

1. The study included only land-grant universities in Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Utah and Washington.

2. The study involved only residence hall student government. No research was conducted on any other type of campus student government.

Definition of Terms

Dormitory: A term used prior to the 1960's to describe sleeping and eating facilities of students.

Effectiveness: Variations in scores derived from a questionnaire measuring residence hall directors' perceived effectiveness of residence hall student government.

Perception of Role: The understanding, knowledge, idea, concept, impression, awareness or comprehension of residence hall
student government scored on the student government section of the
Residence Hall Attitude Scale (Murphy 1971).

Residence Hall: University owned and operated housing
facilities which provide living quarters for individual students. The
terms hall, residence, housing accommodation and residential setting
are used synonymously with the term residence hall.

Residence Hall Director: A person employed by the university to
supervise student staff and advise on matters of student government,
activities and programs, and administrative matters within the
residence hall. This person is also referred to as Residence Hall
Supervisor or Coordinator.

Residence Hall Program: Programs and activities related to
college and university residence hall management, staffing,
administration and activities which further the intellectual
development and personal growth of students.

Residence Hall Student Government: The organization by which
elected or appointed students participate in residence hall
management, administration or activity development. Such
organizations are separate and distinct from any other form of campus
student government or associated students body. On many college and
university campuses these organizations are referred to as residence
hall associations, student associations or councils.

Residence Hall Student Government Officers: Those residents who
are elected or appointed by other residents to the residence hall
student government. The term residence hall student leader is used
synonymously with the term residence hall student government officer.
Residence Hall Student Staff: Those student members of the housing staff who live in rooms on residence hall floors and advise and assist in student development.

Time in Position/Office: Either of two categories used in this study to describe the number of academic years in position/office of residence hall student staff/officers: (1) one academic year or less, or (2) more than one academic year.

Type of Hall: Any of three types of residence hall defined by gender: (1) male, (2) female, and (3) co-educational.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A search of the literature of higher education revealed that few sources existed which dealt specifically with the problem of this study. As residence hall student government is actually a blend of the subject areas of college and university student government, residence halls and residence halls student staff, studies and reports which related generally to these topics were reviewed in this chapter.

The organization of the material is as follows:

A. History and development
B. Rationale and support for student government
   1. Educational rationale
   2. Institutional support
C. The role of residence halls
D. The role of residence hall staff
E. The role of residence hall student government
F. Summary

History and Development

The first medieval universities, particularly those at Bologna, Oxford and Cambridge, were owned and operated by the students "who hired the faculty, chose the towns in which the universities were set up, formulated the rules by which the schools were governed and dealt directly with municipalities when difficulties arose" (Falvey 1952:23). At the University of Bologna, according to Lunn, "students administered the university through their assemblies of nations and a supreme general assembly. Even the rector had to be a student and could be no more than twenty-five years old" (1957:3).
McGrath writes that the earliest universities were controlled by student guilds termed "univeritas." These posed rigid controls over both the teacher's professional activities and community relationships.

They prescribed the hours when the teacher should meet his classes, the character of the lectures, the scheduling and content of his examinations, the amount of his compensation, and the times when he could be absent not only from the classroom but from the town as well (1970:14).

How and where to house students also became a matter of concern to the universities of the Middle Ages. In the years before, the chief centers of learning were the monasteries, founded upon a communal or residence existence. The living quarters of these societies "were similar to military barracks with as many as two hundred students sleeping together in one large room" (Cowley 1934:711). By the twelfth century, however, Bologna masters were lecturing to almost 10,000 students, Oxford enrollment reached 3,000 and at the University of Paris, students numbered almost 30,000 (Cowley 1934). The influx of these hordes of students created housing problems of considerable magnitude.

At first, students lived anywhere they could find lodging. Some rented rooms, some boarded with masters, others with townsfolk and a few took over houses of their own. Sometime during the twelfth century the students began to withdraw from town and to organize in groups.

The first attempts to develop group living systems, according to Cowley (1934), came at the University of Bologna where students organized into houses called "soccii." Students also formed similar
living arrangements called "paedagogies" at the University of Paris, and at Oxford grouped themselves together in common living arrangements referred to as "halls" and "colleges." These houses were totally democratic, autonomous units. Each was governed by an elected body of students from the house. At the University of Paris, these students were called "regents," and at Oxford they were known as "principles" (Cowley 1934).

In time the masters, resenting student dominance, joined with various outside non-academic authorities, the town officials, the church, and eventually the king, to weaken the students' power and strengthen their own. McGrath describes this development:

In order to free themselves from the bondage which financial dependence imposed, the teachers by threat of migration extracted salaries from town officials to take the place of tuition fees. This practice grew in popularity with town officials and professors alike as they recognized in it a device to sap the power of the student guilds. As civic leaders and private donors provided more and more funds to the academic establishment, influence of these outsiders in the internal policy-making grew (1970:22).

Gradually, external governing boards, curators or similar bodies were developed, and in time, student dominance over academic societies was dead.

Student housing was, of course, affected by this process. At Oxford University, endowed hostels called "domus pauperum" (Cowley 1934) were established for the purpose of providing housing for poorer students. Gradually, the university began selecting its own staff for these and other residences, and by the end of the Middle Ages, Oxford and the rest of the English universities had permanent control over student accommodations. Although the rest of Europe eventually
returned to barracks-style dormitories, residential concepts continued in England.

College housing as it developed in the United States during the colonial era was a modification of the British system.

As was typical at Oxford and Cambridge, from which most of the earliest American educators were graduated, tutors lived with the students and were responsible for their conduct away from the classroom. The tutors were generally either faculty members or recent graduates of the institution. In contrast to the British method, which was intended to enhance the total education of the student, dormitories in America became mere places for board and lodging and the administration of a stringent set of regulations governing the daily lives of students. The American college was usually located in a relatively isolated area where travel was difficult and availability of housing away from the campus at a minimum. The students of that day were much younger than those today, many entering college at the age of thirteen or fourteen. These two factors combined with a strong religious concern for the moral discipline of the student were instrumental in molding the university housing policies of the time (Powell et al., 1969:21).

The facilities of early student residences were very meager at best. According to Leonard, "they were crude log houses, later replaced by brick buildings. Two or three students were assigned to each room and were usually required to bring their own furniture, bedding and candles" (1956:18).

The college and universities in colonial America were also unacquainted with student government and had no opportunity to develop independent student life. "Debate, oratory and dramatics were the primary co-curricular activities which provided avenues for growth in these early years of American higher education" (Caruso 1981:8). In some colleges, no classes or groups of students could meet without special permission and then a group was "required to restrict its
discussion to the topics named in the petition to meet" (Leonard 1956:22).

There were, however, some initial efforts directed toward promoting student self-governance. As Brubacher and Rudy illustrate (1958), one early attempt was made by Thomas Jefferson to establish a student court for the purpose of hearing discipline cases at the University of Virginia. Later, other initiatives were taken at a few institutions, but failed in each case due to ineffective enforcement and lack of institutional support.

Overcrowded rooms, makeshift accommodations, and strict regulations eventually precipitated the student revolts of the 1800's. The dormitory itself "concentrated into groups, eager, active, healthy, young men who were as capable of being whipped into an explosive rebellion as into a religious revival" (Rudolph 1962:116).

It is not surprising that educational leaders attacked the dormitory system as objectionable. Francis Wayland of Brown described dormitory life as "unnatural," and pointed to such evils as "the spread of disease by epidemics, the tendency of students to exercise too little, the exposure of many young men to the vice and habits of evil leaders, and the isolation of college from the life of the community and the world" (Rudolph 1962:129). Michigan's President Henry Tappan, according to Cowley, believed that "by withdrawing young men from the influence of domestic circles and separating them from the community, they are often led to contract evil habits and are prone to fall into disorderly conduct" (1934:718). Charles Eliot, president of Harvard, also tried to kill off dormitories at this time.
These men and others were avid members of the German system of education, which looked on higher education as the development of the intellect alone (Cowley 1934). Education to them meant classroom instruction, research and the pursuit of academic excellence. The personal growth and development of individual students was considered outside the responsibility of the universities. There was, therefore, no educational reason to care for students.

It was also argued that living in the home of a local citizen provided a more natural existence and resulted in better order than was afforded in dormitories. Faculty members, too, pointed out that disciplinary functions placed a drain on their energy and hindered their classroom performance (Shay 1964).

Fluctuating business conditions in the nineteenth century also made it difficult for college presidents to construct campus housing for students, and at the same time students found it was much cheaper to room and board in the community (Shay 1964).

Student housing and life in the 1800’s were not lost, however, only severely limited. Women’s colleges of Vassar, Smith, Mount Holyoke and Wellesley reflected the current societal belief that their students needed to be sheltered. "Dormitories were needed to protect young women and ensure their chastity and morality" (Cowley 1934:729).

Oberlin College in Ohio was also established at this time, and from the first was revolutionary in many respects. According to Falvey:

Students of all races were admitted; women were permitted the same educational opportunities as men; the faculty, not the administration alone, had a large part in
the administration; and there was provision for student participation and cooperation in institutional management (1952:31).

As colleges moved from less religious to more secular control, a lessening of commitment to regulate student life occurred. The increased emphasis on organized extracurricular programs allowed students to expand their energies in less destructive ways than previously had been the case, thus reducing the disciplinary problems of the schools (Powell et al., 1969). Organized athletics, in particular, curbed disciplinary problems. With their newly acquired independence, students also began to participate in clubs, fraternities, publications and various forms of student government (Caruso 1981).

College housing too, was viewed in a different light. William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago and Jacob Schurman of Cornell led the resurgence of institutionally provided housing by pointing to the educational values of residence halls. Students living off campus, it was felt, had "less than desirable study conditions and less than adequate diets" (Powell et al., 1969:19).

Woodrow Wilson, President of Princeton in 1902, proposed a quadrangle plan for dormitories and the integration of academic and residential experiences. Lawrence Lowell, in 1927, set up the first of the Harvard House Plans (Cowley 1934).

"Retired military officers, discarded football coaches and elderly housemothers" (Hardee 1964:11) took the place of faculty in supervising residence halls. These, in turn, were eventually replaced by students, as with the increased growth and development of residential housing, many educators became interested in providing
students living in residence halls with more opportunities to participate in self government (Klopf 1950).

Student government associations sprang up, including the National Self Government Committee, Inc., and the National Student Federation of the U.S.A. In 1947, the United States National Student Association was founded through the efforts of war veterans "on the premise that the American Student should have a direct role in shaping his own educational experience" (Schodde 1967:253). Membership was limited to elected student governments of accredited colleges and universities.

Student unrest and demonstration during the years 1964 - 1972 forced reconsideration of their role in governance (Corson 1975). "Students began to question the concept of in loco parentis as a basis for a college-student relationship, and were successful in killing off most of the rules and regulations they considered offensive" (Upcraft 1982:13).

This was also the era in which most of the residence halls of today were built, because the great influx of the post-war Baby Boom created an immediate need for additional housing (Blimling and Miltenberger 1981).

Rationale and Support for Student Government

Much of the literature concerned with the purposes of campus student government appears to fall into one of two categories:

1. An educational rationale involving development of the whole student, particularly in terms of experiences in responsibility, leadership, citizenship and shared participation.
2. Practical support in view of the benefits derived by the institution.

Educational Rationale

McGrath advances the case for student participation on the principle "that citizens ought to have a voice in and are capable of determining the character of social institutions which in turn determine the character and quality of their own lives" (1970:187).

Keeton supports this view by listing four grounds for claiming the right to share in governing:

1. Those whose concerns and lives are most affected by campus activities should surely have a part in their control.

2. Those who are most competent to do the work of the campus should have a voice that ensures the effective use of their competence.

3. Those whose cooperation is essential to the effectiveness of the campus in its work should have a place in governing that facilitates their continuing cooperation.

4. Those whose sponsorship and resources created and sustain the institution, and thus make possible the opportunity of higher education, are entitled to protect and further their purposes and interests (1971:49).

Chesler also advances the notion of student participation in the consideration of "moral justice and political appropriateness of life in an institution being governed by those people who live in and are affected by the decision of that institution" (190:10).

The right of student representation in campus governance, however, is only secondary, according to Bell and Kager, who believe that the primary purpose of student government "should be to provide leadership training and group experiences" (1981:19). Bell and Kager further state that institutions "should utilize student government as
a learning tool that helps participants obtain and apply valuable leadership skills and self knowledge that will serve them in the future" (1981:14).

The acquisition and development of leadership skills and experiences of citizenship are also supported by a number of other authors. Horner and Horner, in particular, express "preparation for civic responsibility" as one of the most important aims of higher education. Effective participation in democratic citizenship, they feel:

... is a desirable manner of developing intelligent leadership - fellowship, including the legitimacy, even desirability of dissent. Education must always support and strengthen our democracy by preparing competent and responsible citizens as well as highly trained leaders and scholars (1966:73).

Gould also agrees with Horner and Horner by suggesting that:

If we expect the student to govern himself and later his country, we must provide him with the experience of governing himself and his campus world here and now. He must learn the relationship between authority and responsibility, the relationship between action and consequence if he is ever to be an active, productive citizen in tomorrow's world (1966:55).

Additional factors such as "development of feelings of effectiveness and self-esteem" (DeCoster and Mable 1980:96), and the "opportunity to discover which principles and procedures are right and effective" (Meinecke 1953:426), have been advanced by other proponents of student government.

Other theories of student government are more broad. Burke believes that:

Student government must be considered a growing, changing, developing aspect of the total educational experience of college life and must be understood as providing a trial laboratory in which students may
evaluate experiences of authority and responsibility (1956:153).

Turner suggests even more institutional responsibility in creating:

... a situation in which the place of student government is looked upon sympathetically and with respect; it must convince the faculty and administration that the education of the whole student is the work of the entire institution, including the students (1960:38).

Both the right and need of students to participate in the total life of the institution is advanced by Knock because "involvement in the total learning milieu of an institution contributes appreciably to the development and improvement of each student's educational experience" (1970:173).

Brother discussed the role of student government in the institution and concluded that:

Student government is concerned with the student as a social being, in relation to both the college community and the other social environments in which he will live. It has been a means for unifying all efforts of the college toward the education of the student as a social being (1960:320).

Institutional Support

Although the case for involving students in college and university governance is generally based on moral-democratic grounds, a number of authors support student participation in the practical application of institutional advancement.

Goldberg suggests that student ideas and views can be useful to administrators in various ways:

1. Student input can help administrators make sounder decisions.

2. Student input can help administrators ascertain and then better serve the needs of present students.
3. Student input can help administrators to anticipate and then position their institutions to address the needs of prospective students.

4. Students can bring to the attention of administrators fresh ideas and innovative approaches.

5. Active encouragement of student involvement can strengthen future alumni support (1980:16).

Valuable outcomes of leadership participation are also stressed by Caruso for "improving the rate of student retention, increasing productivity, output and outcomes, promoting equal opportunity, and improving mental and physical health of participants" (1981:23).

Keyes also makes a case for placing students in policy-making roles because "it is quite stylish and can even be the source of some prestige" (1968:80), while Horner and Horner simply state that "student involvement is an excellent way to get things done" (1966:81). Others list "improving the quality of student life" (Onthank 1936:120), increased "faculty-student understanding and cooperation" (Scanlon 1958:119), and "to rid the faculty and administration of annoying and time-consuming tasks" (Falvey 1952:52).

Although the list of suggested areas of student participation is extensive, those most frequently cited in the literature include:

1. freshman orientation (Horner and Horner 1966),
2. selecting speakers (Horner and Horner 1966, Richardson 1972),
3. campus clubs and organizations (Horner and Horner 1966, Richardson 1972, Schoen 1965),
4. controlling residence hall policies (Brown 1980, Horner and Horner 1966),
5. student discipline (Horner and Horner 1966, Richardson 1972),
7. recreational, social and cultural activities (Lawson 1981, Richardson 1972, Schoen 1965),
8. services for students (Lawson 1981, Spolyar 1968),

The Role of Residence Halls

Diversity in residence hall objectives is found from campus to campus. With respect to this diversity, however, residence halls appear to be striving to fulfill their purposes in three major areas. The most obvious is simply to provide a place for a student to sleep and eat, i.e., when residence hall facilities are built, there is a desire to accommodate the physical well-being of the student. A second purpose is the desire to supplement academic learning. In this function, the halls may be perceived as a place where peer interaction can lead to academic development.

The third purpose is . . . to assist in the student maturation process, i.e., to provide programs and environmental conditions that will enhance his personal development. In this respect, the residence hall performs a specific educational function because it is seen as a social laboratory where the student can experiment both with his own feelings and traits and with those of others. The first objective is accepted and well fulfilled on all campuses, and the second no longer arouses great debate in theory, only in practice. However, the third objective -- providing programs which facilitate the students' personal development -- is still a critical issue. It is an area of vital interest to student
personnel faculty, since the residence halls are the principal classrooms in which they function (Schoerner and McConnell 1979:35).

Dressel and Lehman used a combination of standardized tests and interviews to determine the changes in attitudes, values and critical thinking of undergraduates at Michigan State University. With an initial sample of 3,000 students, "this study was the most extensive one of its kind carried on by any single institution" (Dressel and Lehman 1975:250).

Two implications of the Dressel and Lehman study add insight to the student position on the value of programs which are extracurricular in nature. They report that the majority of those students studied, regardless of sex and amount of college education, felt that a college education should place emphasis on both the academic and social aspects of development.

The most significant reported experience in the collegiate lives of those students was their association with different personalities in their living unit. The analysis of interview and questionnaire data suggested that discussions and bull sessions were a potent factor in shaping the attitude and values of these students (Dressel and Lehman 1975:245).

"Although courses and instructors do seem to have some impact on student attitudes and values -- especially in the last two years -- peer group contacts and nonacademic experiences are regarded by students as being more important" (Dressel and Lehman 1975:245). In the final analysis, these researchers concluded that "the scholarly approach of the classroom must be paralleled by a deliberate approach to all other phases of campus activities" (Dressel and Lehman 1975:245).
Ester (1981) did a specific study to examine the location of where issues related to higher education are discussed. Her conclusion adds support to the importance of residence hall programs, i.e., significant learning most frequently occurred in the residence hall setting as compared to any other setting, including the classroom.

The experience of residence hall living, according to Mueller can:

... teach an individual social competence, emotional stability, and citizenship - all of which will aid his growth and development into a mature person. The hall is seen as a laboratory for social interchange, so rich in possibilities that its potentiality for education must not be left to chance but must be exploited in a variety of ways (1961:176).

Greenleaf, a leading spokesperson and proponent of residence halls, also states that purposes for residence halls include provision for (1) personal growth and development on the part of the individual student and (2) student self-responsibilities for the living unit (1974).

In 1973, the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, listed two functions of college and university residence halls:

1. Students, particularly freshmen students, have a high need to identify with, and affiliate with other students. The residence halls provide an opportunity to express this need, because of optimal physical facilities, and commonality of purpose of students.

2. Residence hall environments can be described, influenced and channeled by residence hall staff and students to create an optimal personal and academic climate (1973:43).

Three landmark studies have established, from a research point of view, the tremendous influence of the residential environment upon
the personal and academic development of students. In 1973, Alexander Astin, in a national survey of both private and public colleges and universities for the American Council on Education, compared students who live in residence halls with those who did not, and concluded that students who live in residence halls:

1. were more likely to achieve a higher grade-point average,
2. were most likely to complete their baccalaureate degree in four years and to apply for admission to graduate school,
3. were generally reported to participate in more social activities,
4. reported greater satisfaction with their living environment,
5. had more positive self images.

Arthur Chickering followed in 1974 with a highly controlled study of commuting and residence students, and reported that students who lived in college residence halls:

1. exceeded in learning and personal development,
2. were more fully involved in academic, extracurricular and social activities,
3. earned higher grade point averages.

Three years later, another study by Astin resulted in additional support for the residence hall environment. Among his conclusions was that students in residence halls expressed more satisfaction with their undergraduate experience, particularly with friendships, relations and social life; and were more likely to achieve in extracurricular areas, such as leadership and athletics (1977).

Other studies compared students living in residence halls with those living elsewhere. Feldman and Newcomb (1969) found residence
hall students earning higher grades and less likely to dropout; Smallwood and Las (1973) concluded that residents performed better academically, developed better study habits, and were more involved in volunteer programs and social activities. They also found that residence hall students had a greater sense of community and involvement with the university.

More satisfaction by residence hall students with living environments and college experiences was found by Selby and Weston (1978), and an investigation by Scott (1975), concluded that residence hall students exhibited more interpersonal development.

The Role of Residence Hall Staff

The college residence hall was the first division of higher education to use students as paraprofessionals in systematic and sustained programs. Currently, housing programs use more students in paraprofessional roles than any other campus agency. Students were first used in the residence hall for "inspecting rooms each morning, maintaining a quiet atmosphere, and reporting violations of college policies to the faculty member in charge of the hall" (Kuhn 1955:82).

According to Winston, Ullom and Werring, residence hall staff roles eventually evolved to the point where "staff went about their work with students in loco parentis and sought to provide services that supported or complemented the development of the mind and maintained acceptable social conduct" (1984:53).

Staff, in the words of Mueller, also were used "to encourage students in acquiring adult habits, attitudes and abilities in such a way that the student could reach the maximum attainments consistent with his personal resources" (1961:176). Other responsibilites,
Bowling adds, involve "helping individual leaders and groups focus on practical skills so that they in turn can develop and maintain the community" (1980:240).

During the 1950's, residence hall student staff were often called "proctors" which accurately reflected their principal role as enforcers of rules. In the 1960's they generally came to be known as "resident assistants" or "resident advisors," which reflected the change in the responsibilities assigned to them - moving away from being primarily a disciplinarian toward a role of peer helper (Winston, Ullom and Werring 1984).

The concept of student development emerged in the 1970's and included, as part of its basic purpose, the belief that students are capable of making decisions about their own best interests. More and more hall staff became involved as "group advisors" (Greenwood and Lembcke 1975), who "assisted in establishing a mode of student government in the residence hall and worked with its participants toward the objective of self regulation" (Klepper and Worsfold 1975:60).

Crookston (1974) also identified "the achievement of democratic community" as one of the goals of student staff, while Upcraft (1982) listed a good living environment, the development of activities and programs, and enhancement of education potential as staff responsibilities. Earlier, Thompson proposed that residence hall advisors encourage students "to establish and participate in democratic group government by exercising the right and responsibilities of the housing group to govern itself" (1953:325). In 1963, Yarborough and Cooper also identified the support of student
government in residence as one of the critical areas of a student assistant program. Greenleaf followed in 1967 with the idea that staff support democratic living as an opportunity for students to learn to work with others.

Stead suggests that the well-being of residences depend upon the relationship between the residence assistant and house officers, and that student staff should remember that they are advisors and do not have responsibility for resident decision-making (1975). He further lists responsibilities for staff advisement of student government:

1. serve as a resource expert in areas of knowledge,
2. introduce new program ideas; provide consultation,
3. point out additional perspectives and directions into their problems,
4. assist group members in the development of insight into their problems,
5. identify additional resources within the university or outside the community,
6. interpret policies (1975).

Strohm sums up the role of student staff in the residence hall by stating that:

The manner in which the paraprofessional provides services to students may either complement or conflict with institutional programs, making the attitudes, knowledge and skill of the paraprofessional staff vital to a residence education program that supports student development (1980:110).

In terms of staff role, a number of authors suggest the need for delineation. Greenleaf (1974:190) believes that it is important that there is an "understanding of the relationship of student staff
members and elected student officers;" Antes (1971) states that limits of student and staff authority be clearly defined; while Tripp clarifies this by indicating that staff should only serve in an advisory capacity (1977).

A number of studies also support the role of residence hall student staff. In a survey of both public and private institutions on administrative practices in residence hall programs, Murphy (1969) found a primary duty of student staff to be advising hall government. Dixon's 1970 nationwide survey of private coeducational colleges and universities supports this. Gifford, in a survey of residence patterns, also concluded that resident assistants needed to work in conjunction with hall government (1974).

In a comparison of resident and staff perceptions of the residence hall environment, Ivey, Miller and Goldstein (1977) found that hall staff perceived the living environment to be less job centered and vocationally oriented than did the residents. The staff felt more strongly than residents with regard to the university being more rigid because of rules, yet less structured academically and organizationally. Perhaps this is indicative of the residence hall staff's feelings of being aside from the on-going academic processes, yet continually having to uphold and enforce a detailed set of rules. Passons also studied perceptions of residence staff in comparison to other groups on campus, both student and staff, and found:

... that residence hall advisors ... demonstrated an accurate understanding of their charges. Further use of this group might include planning residential programs, assisting with study habits and shaping policies on student conduct. With inservice training they can easily and readily assume responsibilities in helping students develop interpersonal relationships, conduct short-term
counseling and refer students to counseling and psychiatric agencies (1978:128).

The Role of Residence Hall Student Government

According to Bowling, "the role of student governance within a residence hall system should be multifaceted. The governance system established should promote and enhance the community of student learners" (1080:234). In support of this role:

... students living in the residence halls have the responsibility for meeting the educational needs of their residence community. They alone know what their cognitive and affective needs are and what type of programming curriculum will best meet these needs (Hoelting 1973:23).

Colleges and universities also have responsibilities in regard to residence hall student government. "Residence hall administrators and residence educators should insist that, through some governance structure, students accept responsibility for establishing the procedures, policies and programs that affect the quality of life in the residence halls" (Bowling 1980:230). College residence halls, in fact, should in every aspect "reflect the institution's faith in its students' ability to make decisions" (Saffian 1968:9).

In the words of the National Association of College and University Residence Halls, "the hall government should be one that stimulates the student to enjoy living and working in the residence hall" (NACURH 1970:16). To do so, a number of basic conditions are necessary.

1. The student governing group in the living unit must be as closely integrated with the professional staff and policy-making machinery as possible. In effective community government, the responsibility must be shared between staff and students.

2. The student residence governing groups must be representative. The problem resolves itself into providing a
governing body which will, if possible, give full representation with respect to numbers, opinion and location.

3. Effective government involves as many of the residents as possible in the governmental structure.

4. The student governing body should have the opportunity to deal with policy and major issues which affect all the residents. It should not only plan the activity program but also be concerned with the general administration of the residence hall. Students cannot be expected to enforce regulations which they have not shared in formulating.

5. If responsibility is to be fully shared, students need experience in handling finances for their government organization (Klopf, Felsted and Hawley 1952:579).

Fredericksen also advances the concept that student housing centers are communities with many of the same ingredients as other noncollegiate communities. "Successful community building requires the involvement and participation of its members, thus the need to involve students in residence halls arises" (1977:26). He concludes with the idea of appropriateness of housing administrators considering the involvement of students in residence halls "as an essential ingredient in the development of student housing programs" (1977:27).

Dowse and Harrison sum up the role of hall student government as the "foundation and driving force of the entire residence hall program, because it provides all aspects of the life of the student in this primary group" (1957:89).

A number of studies support the theory of residence hall government. Bristow reported the necessity of student involvement as "advisable in all areas of residence hall management" (1971:34). In research on student housing in a nationally selected group of private coeducational colleges, Brieve and Mayfield concluded that a relationship existed between the "absence of conduct problems in
student housing and the participation of students in the establishment of conduct policies" (1970:226). In another study, Duvall determined that of all residence hall programs, his sample population of students and staff "felt student government to be the most worthwhile and desirable activity" (1969:55).

**Summary**

The vast majority of literature available in the area of residence hall student government is presented in topical form expressing various principles relative to the merits of such participation. The field of student involvement in all areas of university governance is notably deficient in studies of a research nature.

The preponderance of literature, regardless of the chronological span, emphasizes the necessity for student participation in university governance. Residence hall student government’s purposes have been defined most often as a teaching method for democratic principles and practices, although there appears to be sufficient evidence to presume that at least one other reason for its growth was that the shift of control of student behavior to student government was more successful than previous methods used. Student government organizations, as a result of their acceptance by university administrations, have became the most popular vehicle for most student efforts in influencing university governance during the past fifty years.

Since the student activist movement began in the 1960’s, students have been increasingly accepted as "equal" partners in more and more areas of university governance. The organizational method for this inclusion, particularly in university housing, has most often been through official student government organizations.
The findings of this review of the literature relative to residence hall student staff and student government officers would appear to have some implications for this present study. It would seem that the two groups under investigation might have measurable differences in several areas, particularly those attitudes and values related to participation in residence hall student government. From this review it might be tentatively concluded that some of these differences could be attributed to the influence of age, gender and position as well as to the type of housing itself.
The purpose of this study was to determine if differences in perceived effectiveness of residence hall student government are related to perceptions of its role held by residence hall student government officers and residence hall student staff members, and to the type and size of residence hall. The study also investigated the relationship of the role perceptions and the gender, age and time in office or position of the residence hall student staff members and government officers.

This chapter includes sections on the population description, categories for investigation, questionnaires, the method of collecting data, statistical hypotheses, and the method of analyzing data.

**Population Description**

The population of this study included all residence hall directors, student staff members and student government officers of all residence halls at Idaho State University, Montana State University, Oregon State University, Utah State University and Washington State University.

**Categories for Investigation**

The three population categories included in this study are residence hall directors, residence hall student government officers and residence hall student staff members.

Residence hall directors were surveyed in regard to their perceptions of effectiveness of their residence hall student government. Residence hall student government officers and staff members were questioned about their perceptions of the role of
Both residence hall student government officers and residence hall student staff categories included the following variables for investigation:

1. Age
2. Gender
3. Length of time in position/office

Since type and size of hall are categories which define specific residence halls and corresponding populations, these variables were also used in this study. In addition, the variable of length of time in position/office was used to differentiate between first and second year student staff members or government officers.

**Questionnaires**

Two questionnaires were utilized. The first surveyed the effectiveness of residence hall student government as perceived by the residence hall director. The instrument utilized a Likert range of response scale from 1 to 10, "not effective" to "very effective," to identify the degree of perceived effectiveness with respect to each of twenty criteria. Each hall’s effectiveness score consisted of the sum of the responses.

Residence hall directors were also asked to complete a hall data section which identified the number of residence hall student staff and government officers, and the hall population. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix A.

Content validity for the effectiveness questionnaire was established utilizing a DELPHI panel of 20 members. The DELPHI panel procedure, according to Courtney:
is built on the premise of informed intuitive judgments and is intended to obtain professional opinion without bringing the experts together in a face-to-face meeting. Information from each of the panel members is assembled by the researcher using successive questionnaires and feedback, with each serial round being designed to produce closer and closer consensus among the judgments of 8-25 experts... The DELPHI method is an acceptable means of establishing the content validity of a measurement scale (1988:10).

The second questionnaire utilized was the student government section of the Residence Hall Attitude Scale, previously designed by Patrick M. Murphy (1971). The author's permission to use the questionnaire in this investigative study was obtained by telephone.

The instrument was administered by residence hall directors to residence hall student government officers and staff members to survey their perceptions of the role of residence hall student government. It utilized a scale which identified the intensity of respondent agreement or disagreement with respect to each of twenty indicators of effectiveness. Categories of response ranged from strong agreement through neutral to strong disagreement, and were assigned the respective weights 4, 3, 2, 1, 0. Each student's score consisted of the sum of the item weights. From the ten favorable statements, the "strongly agree" response was given the highest weight, with the scoring system reversed for the ten unfavorable statements (Murphy 1971). A copy of this questionnaire is also included in Appendix A.

Students were also asked to complete a demographic data section which identified respondent age, gender, hall of residence and length of time in the position/office.

Reliability for the student government section of the Residence Hall Attitude Scale, computed by the split-half method, was found to
be .70 (Murphy 1971). Content validity was assumed on the basis of:

(a) The solicited expert judgement of professional residence hall staff members, student personnel administrators, and graduate students in student personnel and guidance in determining the final wording and selection of items for the scale; (b) incorporation of many items as a result of a pilot study done at Oklahoma State University in the summer of 1970; and (c) all of the conditions reflected in the attitude instrument being selected from the professional literature related to residence halls (Murphy 1971).

Packets of questionnaires were mailed to professional housing administrators at Idaho State University, Montana State University, Utah State University, and Washington State University. The researcher distributed the questionnaires at Oregon State University.

The questionnaires were administered primarily in group meetings - at residence hall staff meetings conducted weekly in each hall and at individual residence hall student government meetings held weekly or bi-weekly.

**Statistical Hypotheses**

1. (HO) The perceived effectiveness of residence hall student government is not related to:
   a. residence hall student staff perceptions of residence hall student government
   b. residence hall student government officer perceptions of residence hall student government
   c. the type of residence hall
   d. residence hall population

2. (HO) Residence hall student staff perception of residence hall student government is not related to student staff members’
   a. gender
b. age
c. time in position

3. (HO) Residence hall student government officer perception of residence hall student government is not related to student officers'  
   a. gender
   b. age
   c. time in office

Method of Analyzing Data

All null hypotheses were tested using multiple regression. According to Nie (1975), multiple regression is a general statistical technique which one can use to analyze the relationship between a dependent or criterion variable and a set of independent or predictor variables. It can be viewed as both a means of evaluating the overall contribution of the independent variables and as a means of evaluating the overall contribution of a particular independent variable with the influence of other independent variables controlled.

A confidence level of .05 was utilized for this study. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) computer package available at the Milne Computer Center at Oregon State University was used to analyze the data.
RESULTS AND FINDINGS

This study collected information about residence hall student government at land grand universities in Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Utah and Washington. The findings of the study are presented in four major subdivisions. The first is a description of the population of this study. The second is a descriptive profile of the residence halls represented in this study. The third is a descriptive profile of the residence hall student staff and government officers included in this study. The fourth is an analysis of data as related to the tested hypotheses. Where appropriate, tables are presented within the subdivisions.

Represented Population and Response

The population of this study included all residence hall directors, student staff members, and student government officers at Idaho State University, Montana State University, Oregon State University, Utah State University and Washington State University.

Each residence hall had one resident director and a varying number of student staff and government officers. A response from the hall director and a minimum of fifty percent of both the student staff members and government officers was required to include the residence hall in the study. Table 1 presents the residence hall representation by university. Table 2 presents the student staff and officer population and response.
Table 1. Residence hall representation by university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84.2*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of total

Table 2. Residence hall student staff and government officer population and response from halls by university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Student staff members</th>
<th>Student government officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n Responses/% Response</td>
<td>n Responses/% Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of total

Residence hall directors were surveyed in regard to the perceived effectiveness of their residence hall's student government. The directors were asked to respond to twenty effectiveness criteria on a 10 point scale ranging from "not effective" to "very effective." The hall student government effectiveness score was determined by the sum of the criteria scores. Possible effectiveness scores, therefore, ranged from twenty to two hundred.
Residence hall student government officers and staff members were surveyed in regard to their perception of the role of residence hall student government. The students were asked to respond to each of twenty items which identified the intensity of agreement or disagreement. Weights of 4 to 0 were assigned to categories of response which ranged from strong agreement through neutral to strong disagreement. Each student’s score consisted of the sum of the weighted items, which made the range of possible role perception scores eighty to zero.

Table 3 presents the average effectiveness and role of perception scores.

Table 3. Average effectiveness and role perception scores of residence hall student government by university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Role Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>122.5</td>
<td>48.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>46.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>125.3</td>
<td>48.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>48.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>45.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>110.5</td>
<td>47.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Residence Halls

Residence hall directors were also asked to complete a hall data section which identified the types of hall and hall population. Table 4 presents the hall data by university.
Table 4. Population and type of residence hall by university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Hall population Range</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Number of hall types Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Coed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>114-225</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>150-350</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>83-450</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200-460</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12-250</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>219</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Residence Hall

Student Staff and Officers

Both residence hall student staff and government officers were requested to complete a demographic section of their questionnaire identifying respondent age, gender and length of time in position or office. Table 5 presents a description of the age breakdown of student staff and officers; Table 6 identifies the representation, by gender, of student staff and officers; and Table 7 identifies the categories of time in position or office of both groups.

Table 5. Age of residence hall student staff and student government officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Age</th>
<th>Staff n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Officer n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 and younger</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and older</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Gender of residence hall student staff and student government officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Time in position/office of residence hall student staff and student government officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or less</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Data

Multiple regression analysis was used to determine the extent to which all variables contributed to either perceived effectiveness or perceptions of role of residence hall student government. A .05 level of significance was used to determine whether to accept or reject the null hypotheses.

**Null Hypothesis One:** The perceived effectiveness of residence hall student government is not related to:

a. Residence hall student staff perceptions of residence hall student government;
b. residence hall student government officer perceptions of residence hall student government;
c. the type of residence hall;
d. residence hall population.

The analysis of the independent variables of staff perception, officer perception, hall type and hall population determined the relationship to the perceived effectiveness score. In utilizing the SPSS computer package, it was necessary to define the three categories of hall type as two independent variables. Tables 8 and 9 give the results of the analysis of hypothesis one.

Table 8. Correlation coefficients for hypothesis one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Perception Staff</th>
<th>Perception Officer</th>
<th>Hall type (1)</th>
<th>Hall type (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff perception</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer perception</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall type (1)</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall type (2)</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall population</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>-.392</td>
<td>-.495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Multiple regression of student staff and officer perceptions, hall type and hall population on perceived effectiveness of residence hall student government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff perceptions</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer perceptions</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall type (1)</td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall type (2)</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall population</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis indicated no significant relationship at the .05 level. Null Hypothesis One, therefore, was retained. The total R square equaled .077. This finding indicated that only 7.7 percent of the variance of perceived effectiveness was accounted for by the independent variables of staff perceptions, officer perceptions, hall type and hall population.

**Null Hypothesis Two:** Residence hall student staff perception of the role of residence hall student government is not related to student staff members':

a. gender,  
b. age,  
c. time in position

The analysis of the independent variables of gender, age and time in position determined the relationship to the perceived score. In utilizing the SPSS computer package, it was necessary to define the three categories of age as two variables in order to compute the regression formula. Table 10 exhibits the correlation coefficients for hypothesis two, while Table 11 describes the results of its regression analysis.

**Table 10. Correlation coefficients for hypothesis two.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Staff perception</th>
<th>Age (1)</th>
<th>Age (2)</th>
<th>Time in position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (1)</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (2)</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in position</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.205</td>
<td>-.224</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>-.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Multiple regression of age, gender and time in position of student staff on student staff perceptions of the role of residence hall student government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (1)</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (2)</td>
<td>-1.149</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in position</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-1.257</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level

The analysis indicated a significant relationship at the .006 level for the independent variable of gender. Null Hypothesis Two, therefore, was rejected. The total R square, however, equaled .044, indicating that only 4.4 percent of the variance of student government perception was accounted for by the independent variables of age, time in position and gender.

Null Hypothesis Three: Residence hall student officer perception of the role of residence hall student government is not related to student government officers’:

a. gender,
b. age,
c. time in office.

The analysis of the independent variables of gender, age and time in office determined the relationship to the perceived role score. In utilizing the SPSS computer package, it was again necessary to define the three categories of age as two variables in order to compute the regression formula. Table 12 exhibits the correlation
coefficients for hypothesis three. Table 13 provides a description of the results of its regression analysis.

Table 12. Correlation coefficients for hypothesis three.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Staff perception</th>
<th>Age (1)</th>
<th>Age (2)</th>
<th>Time in position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (1)</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (2)</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in office</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.254</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>-.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Multiple regression of age, gender and time in office of student government officers on student government officer perceptions of the role of residence hall student government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (1)</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (2)</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in office</td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-1.490</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>15.66</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level

The analysis indicates a significance of .000 for the gender independent variable, thereby rejecting Null Hypothesis Three. The total R square, however, for all independent variables, remains low at only 7.8 percent.

Findings

Forty-eight residence halls or 84.2 percent of the residence halls of the land grant universities of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Utah and Washington were included in this study. From these halls, 209 student staff members (84.6 percent) and 281 student government
officers (76.4 percent) were represented. Thirteen residence halls housed males, 18 housed females and the remaining 17 were coeducational. The mean residence hall population was 219, with a population range of from 12 to 460.

Over 67 percent of the represented student staff were 21 years of age or older, while only 36.3 percent of the student officers were found to be in this age category. Only 1.9 percent of the student staff and 14.6 percent of officers were 18 years or younger. The remainder, 49.1 percent of the officers and 30.6 percent of the staff, were in the 19-20 year old category.

In regard to gender, staff and officer percentages were very close, with 53.6 percent of the staff and 51.2 percent of the officers being female. A difference of time in position or office was observed, however, with 58.4 percent of the student staff, but only 21.7 percent of the student officers being employed or elected for more than one year.

The distribution of a questionnaire to residence hall directors surveying perceived residence hall student government effectiveness, resulted in a mean score of 110.5 from a possible range of from 20 to 200. A second questionnaire, measuring the perception of the role of resident hall student government resulted in means of 47.38 from residence hall student staff and 47.83 from residence hall student government officers, with a possible range from 80, most positive to 0, most negative.

Three null hypotheses were tested using multiple regression analysis. Null Hypothesis One, which stated the perceived effectiveness of residence hall student government to be not related
to residence hall student staff and government officer perceptions of the role of residence hall student government, the type of residence hall and residence hall population was retained. Null Hypothesis Two, which stated the student staff perceptions of the role of residence hall student government to be not related to student staff age, gender and time in position, was rejected when the independent variable of gender was found to have a significance of .006. This indicated female staff members perceived the hall government more positively than their male counterparts. Null Hypothesis Three which stated the student officer perceptions of the role of residence hall student government to be not related to student officer age, gender and time in position, was also rejected, with the independent variable of gender this time having a significance of .000. Again, the women's perceptions of hall government were more positive than those of the men.

For each null hypothesis, the total R square was very low for all the independent variables, accounting for only 7.7 percent in Null Hypothesis One, 4.4 percent in Null Hypothesis Two and 7.8 percent in Null Hypothesis Three.
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was specifically designed to determine if: (1) the effectiveness of residence hall student government varies according to the perception of its role held by residence hall student staff members and student government officers, and the type and size of residence hall; (2) the perception of residence hall student government held by residence hall student staff varies according to their age, time in position and gender; and (3) the perception of residence hall student government held by residence hall student government officers varies according to their age, time in office and gender.

This chapter summarizes the entire investigation, offers conclusions based on findings and recommends current implementation and future research directions.

Summary

Literature and research available on student participation in university governance, particularly residence hall student government is scarce. Since residence hall student government involves various aspects of college and university student government, residence hall life and staff advisement, literature was also cited which related to these topics. The review of the literature, therefore, consisted of sections which presented the roles of residence halls, residence hall staff and residence hall student government.

The population which was surveyed included forty-eight residence hall directors, two hundred and nine residence hall student staff
members and two hundred and eighty-one residence hall student government officers from land grant universities in Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Utah and Washington. Residence hall directors were surveyed in regard to the perceived effectiveness of their residence hall’s student government. Residence hall student staff and officers were asked to complete the student government section of the Residence Hall Attitude Scale (Murphy 1971). The instrument identified the intensity of agreement or disagreement with respect to criteria relating to the role of residence hall student government. The students also provided information in regard to their age, gender, length of time in position or office, and the type of hall of residence. Multiple regression analysis was used to test three null hypotheses at a .05 level of significance.

Null Hypothesis One was retained, indicating the perceived effectiveness of residence hall student government was not related to residence hall student staff and officer perceptions, type of residence hall and residence hall population.

Null Hypothesis Two, which stated that student staff perceptions of the role of residence hall student government was not related to the staff members’ age, gender and time in position was rejected when the independent variable of gender was found to be significantly related.

Null Hypothesis Three, analyzing the relationship of residence hall student government officer perceptions to the same set of independent variables, was also rejected due to the significance of gender.
Conclusions and Implications

The following conclusions and implications were derived from this study.

1. While more study is needed, it appears that the perceived effectiveness of residence hall student government is not related to either the type or the population of residence halls. As both criteria serve a basis for hall designation and assignment, housing administrators need not be concerned about their effect on residence hall student government in the organization of campus housing.

2. Although both female residence hall student staff and government officers were found to be more positive than males in their perceptions of residence hall student government, the influence of gender would seem to be negligible since all independent variables, including gender, accounted for only 4.4 and 7.8 percent of the effect on perception.

3. Although student staff members were, for the most part, older than student government officers, the age of the staff proved to be unrelated to perceptions of the role of residence hall student government. Age, therefore, could be eliminated from consideration as a criterion of student staff selection and placement. Since the effect of age on student officer perceptions was also not significant, it would appear that assignment to halls based on student age could be accomplished without influencing perceptions of the role of residence hall student government.

4. Student staff, also, had on the average more years of involvement in their residence hall positions than their student government counterparts. As in the case of age, however, time in
position or office for both groups proved to be unrelated to the perceptions of the role of residence hall student government. Such findings would seem to eliminate any need for specific training of first versus second year staff or officers in terms of the role of hall government.

5. Although residence hall student staff and officers differed to some degree in their profiles, their differences did not affect their perceptions of residence hall student government. This fact possibly indicates involvement as either staff member or officer produces a similar impact on students. It is possible that students who participate in the current structure of residence hall government advisement or leadership have already developed fixed perceptions before actually becoming involved. Two possible explanations may be offered. The current organization of residence hall student involvement seems to attract a homogeneous group of students in regard to their perceptions of the student government role. Secondly, the perceptions of the subjects remained unchanged by their experience, indicating that the current university residence hall government system attracts that group of students who closely identify with its existing structure.

Recommendations

1. If learning may be assumed as a change of behavior as a result of experience, then housing administrators may not be able to afford to view student government as of secondary importance. For those students involved and for the upgrading of residence hall student government, full support from college and university student personnel professionals is needed. Such support may well take the
form of funding, advising, and motivational support. In this way, the current positive student view may well be improved.

2. Research should be broadened to other interested residence hall oriented groups. Specifically, non-leader residents should be compared to student staff and officers on the basis of perceptual similarities and differences, particularly in regard to student government effectiveness. Housing administrators, student development programmers and fraternity and sorority leaders and advisors might be comparatively studied in various ways. A comparison of effectiveness of hall student government and other student associations would also warrant investigation. A major thrust, too, should be to measure the effectiveness of student members on university committees.

3. Studies of residence hall student government in local campus situations should be initiated for an understanding of feelings, needs, attitudes and perceptions. Decisions about residence life programs as a student development tool could then be made on a more substantive and defendable basis.

4. Regional residence hall differences may also be considered. This study was limited solely to institutions in the northwest section of the United States, and further research on a national basis may reveal different perceptions and conclusions. Likewise, other types of institutions, such as private or smaller public colleges and universities, are viable loci for residence hall student government study.

5. Other factors related to the effectiveness of residence hall student government should be identified. Consideration should be given to institutional and departmental control and support,
resources, staff training, and student officer orientation and development programs.

6. The assessment of the effect of residence hall student staff on student government officers' perceptions would be beneficial in order to add to the information concerning factors within the residence hall setting which influence the development of perceptions of residence hall student government.

7. Further studies should be conducted which examine the organization of college and university residences and its relation to student government involvement to ascertain if certain factors within the group living situation influence residence hall student government effectiveness.

8. Research is needed to develop alternative methods to include a more diversified group of students in the structure of residence hall student governments.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: Questionnaires
EFFECTIVENESS OF RESIDENCE HALL COUNCILS

The purpose of this survey is to determine the effectiveness of your current residence hall council as you perceive it. Do not compare your current council to any others you have been associated with. Limit your answers to your specific hall and council.

If any of the criteria listed below are not currently a responsibility of your hall council, base your response(s) on the potential of your council's effectiveness in that area.

## Range of Effectiveness

Not Effective 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Effective

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (1) Representation of residents to hall staff.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (2) Communication of hall needs to campus wide resident government.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (3) Development of a hall newsletter or other internal communication vehicle.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (4) Disbursement of activity fees or other revenues which reflect hall priorities and values.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (5) Development of education programs.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (6) Development of social programs.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (7) Development of recreational programs.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (8) Development of cultural programs.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (9) Communication to residents of university and housing policies and regulations which affect them.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (10) Development of handbooks for hall officers.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (11) Determination of group living rules and standards.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (12) Work with other residence hall and university student groups on special occasions such as Homecoming, etc.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (13) Maintain and supervise group study areas.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (14) Encourage scholarship among residents by recognizing achievement.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (15) Organize and operate supplemental hall library.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (16) Provide newspapers and magazines.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (17) Provide recreation and athletic equipment.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (18) Inform residents about all-school social, cultural and athletic events.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (19) Develop and maintain activity rooms for photography, weightlifting, aerobics, etc.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (20) Conduct hall orientation sessions and tours for visitors.

Please fill in the following hall data: Name of Hall__________________________

# of student staff_______ # of hall council officers_______ # of residents_______
ROLE PERCEPTIONS OF RESIDENCE HALL STUDENT GOVERNMENT

The purpose of this survey is to identify the role of residence hall student government as perceived by both residence hall student staff members and student government officers. This information will be used in research study to assess and, hopefully, improve the quality and relevance of residence hall government.

All of the data will be coded and used in group comparisons for research purposes only. Under no circumstances will individual responses be reported. Universities and residence halls will be identified on this answer sheet only to assure proper coding. Residence halls at a number of universities will be included in this study. In order to get an accurate picture, it is important that a high percentage of responses be obtained. Your busy schedule as a hall staff member or officer is appreciated, as is your cooperation. The total time involved in responding to this questionnaire should be less than 15 minutes.

Please complete this questionnaire and return it to your residence hall director/supervisor. As a deadline exists, it is important that this be done as soon as possible. Thank you for your time and consideration.

DIRECTIONS: All statements relate specifically to residence hall student government. Whenever possible, respond to the statement from an overall point of view rather than from the basis of your experience in one specific hall.

Questions 1 - 20 are statements about residence hall student government. Answer all statements by circling the response which represents your opinion. In addition, please print the name of your university and residence hall in the space provided and answer demographic information questions 21 - 25 as they relate to you. This information is necessary so the data gathered in this survey might be fully interpreted.

Statements on Residence Hall Student Government
In circling: SA means STRONGLY AGREE, you agree completely; A means AGREE, you tend to agree but with some reservation; U means UNDECIDED, you are just not sure or don't have an opinion one way or another; D means DISAGREE, you tend to disagree but with some reservation; and SD means STRONGLY DISAGREE, you disagree completely.

SA A U D SD 1. In the dynamics of residence hall student government, involvement is fundamental.

SA A U D SD 2. Bluff, pull and personality usually get students elected to leadership positions.

SA A U D SD 3. Given a free choice, the residence hall student government body would elect their residence hall director as their advisor.

SA A U D SD 4. Student government in the residence hall is a nuisance.

SA A U D SD 5. Student government is subject to the restrictions of the administration, which limits its authority.

SA A U D SD 6. Residence hall student government is perceived by residents as a control device.

SA A U D SD 7. Residence hall government elections do not usually generate student enthusiasm or support.

SA A U D SD 8. In general, student government contributes to the betterment of the residence hall environment.

(Please continue the questionnaire on the reverse side.)
SA=STRONGLY AGREE  A=AGREE  U=UNDECIDED  D=DISAGREE  SD=STRONGLY DISAGREE

9. Student government leaders in residence halls should be paid for their service.
SA A U D SD

10. Residence hall student government officers are sincere in their desire to do a good job for the people they represent.
SA A U D SD

11. When a student serves in a leadership position in residence hall student government, his/her grade point average usually drops.
SA A U D SD

12. Student government should play a direct part in exposing students to areas like poetry, music, painting, sculpture, etc.
SA A U D SD

13. In general, residence hall student government is representative of student opinion.
SA A U D SD

14. Residence hall government is effective.
SA A U D SD

15. Most students living in residence halls feel that student government is a worthwhile activity.
SA A U D SD

16. Salaries for serving in student government should not be paid as these positions are tools for learning.
SA A U D SD

17. Residence hall government teaches the student the skill of organizing and directing the work of others.
SA A U D SD

18. Even though housing administrators go through the motions of working with student government, they permit little real involvement in planning the environment in which students work and live.
SA A U D SD

19. The student government advisor should have the opportunity to say "no" to student proposals.
SA A U D SD

20. Residence hall government should be closely supervised to insure against mistakes.
SA A U D SD

Demographic Information

University ____________________________ Residence Hall ____________________________

21. Type of hall? ______ M ______ F ______ Co-ed

22. Current position? ______ Student Staff Member ______ Student Government Officer ______

23. Sex? ______ M ______ F

24. Age? ______ 18 or younger ______ 19-20 ______ 21 or older ______

25. How long have you been a staff member or hall officer of any type (include current term, but not any summer periods)?

One academic year or less ______ More than one academic year ______

Please return this as soon as possible to your residence hall director/supervisor. Thanks again for your help.
APPENDIX B: DELPHI Panel
DELPHI Panel Members

Adams, Daniel E.
Director of Residential Living, University of Utah

Bogacz, Jack
Director of Student Life, Northern Montana College

Crisp, Tammie
Director of Residence Life, Eastern Montana College

Daniels, Dan
Director of Housing, University of Colorado

Grutzmacher-Simpson, Paula
Director of Housing, Yavapai College

Guy, Keith
Director of University Residences, Western Washington University

Harris, Harland
Director of Housing and Food Services, Humboldt State University

Henry, Carole S.
Director of Residential Life, Keene State College

Keller, John J.
Director of Resident Services, University of South Dakota

Kingston, William M.
Director of Housing and Food Services, University of Washington

McKinnon, Richard D.
Director of Residential Life, Boise State University

Miller, Thomas E.
Dean of Students, Canisius College

Murphy, Dennis
Director of Housing, Elizabethtown College

Osborne, Clifford
Director of Residence Life, Arizona State University

Piccolo, Nicholas A.
Director of Housing and Conference Services, University of Manitoba

Sanders, Dallan
Director of Campus Union and Housing, Eastern New Mexico University

Sherwood, Grant P.
Director of Housing and Residence Education, Colorado State University
DELPHI Panel Con’t.

Weitz, Sue
Dean of Students, Gonzaga University

Wetzel, Dan
Director of Residence Life, Western Oregon State College

Wilson, Dana
Director of Residence Life, Colorado College