

STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD RESIDENCE HALL DIETITIANS  
AND DIRECTORS AS RELATED TO FOOD ACCEPTANCE

by

JEAN SPENCER PRIDEAUX

B. S., Texas Technological College, 1942

---

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Institutional Management

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1965

Approved by:

*Trace O. Shugart*  
Major Professor

LD  
2668  
T4  
1965  
P947  
C.2  
Document

ii

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	3
Dining-Out Habits and Attitudes of the Consumer .....	3
Personality Traits and the Image of the Dietitian ....	10
PROCEDURE .....	15
Selection of Respondents .....	16
The Questionnaire .....	16
Statistical Analysis .....	17
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....	18
Student Attitudes toward Residence Hall Dietitians as Related to Food Acceptance .....	18
Student Attitudes toward Residence Hall Directors as Related to Food Acceptance .....	20
General Attitudes of Students as Related to Opinions of Dietitians, Food, and Directors .....	23
Comparison of Attitudes toward Dietitians, Food, and Directors .....	27
SUMMARY .....	30
CONCLUSIONS .....	35
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	37
LITERATURE CITED .....	38
APPENDIX A .....	41
APPENDIX B .....	50

## INTRODUCTION

The food service industry since 1947 has risen from a relatively obscure place in business to one of prominence. The number of persons employed by food services in the United States has reached approximately 3 million--a number three times greater than that working in the steel industry (Greenaway, 1964).

As a result of this surge in growth, such trends as centralization of management functions and food preparation have developed. Technological advances have revolutionized the industry, resulting in automation, radical changes in equipment, and use of convenience foods. With such large-scale developments has come a loss of some degree of the personal relationships with customers that were possible in the smaller operations. Awareness of the importance of satisfying associations between management and the consumer has evolved.

College and university food service expansion has kept pace with the growth of the food industry as a whole. Buchanan (1963) commented:

Today universities boarding 2,000 students in residence halls are not uncommon; at least several dozen schools feed more than 6,000 and several others serve more than 10,000 men and women three meals a day.

About four million students live in university and college residence halls at the present time, and that number is expected to reach eight to twelve million by 1978 (Buchanan, 1964).

Observations of relationships, both congenial and otherwise, between residence hall dietitians and college students, led to

the present study. A positive attitude toward the dietitian appeared to result in a relatively favorable attitude of the student toward residence hall food. Likewise, a negative student opinion of the dietitian seemed to result in a less favorable reaction to the food. Various studies have been made of dining-out habits and attitudes of the American consumer. Other research has been concerned with personality traits, interests, and public image of dietitians. Little research to determine whether a relationship exists between student attitudes toward residence hall dietitians and student acceptance of food has been reported in the literature, however.

Subjects of the present investigation were women students living in residence halls at Kansas State University. The chief purpose of the study was to determine whether a significant relationship existed between acceptance of residence hall food by students and their attitudes toward the dietitian. A second objective was to study the relationship between student attitudes toward the residence hall director and the food. The third goal was to investigate whether an association existed between general attitudes of the student and her acceptance of residence hall food, dietitian, and director. A comparison of attitudes toward residence hall food, dietitian, and director among the five residence halls included in the study was the fourth objective.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

## Dining-Out Habits and Attitudes of the Consumer

In a two-year study by the School of Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Management at Michigan State University, the effects of service on restaurant customers were studied. As a result, Farrell (1963) noted that few customers were satisfied and that they had a tendency to evaluate food establishments by the people who served them rather than by the food. He observed also that goals for service set by both management and waiters were decidedly different from those desired by customers. Waiters and waitresses appeared to measure their service traits by impressiveness of performance rather than by the degree of satisfaction noted in their customers. Managers used the same criteria for their evaluations, but added "promptness," which demonstrated their concern for turnover and public relations. Customers indicated they expected promptness, attentiveness, neatness, friendliness, competence, and interest from those serving them in restaurants. Farrell further commented:

In general, the American customer wants to be assisted to purchase food as he does a good book, by a friendly, courteous, helpful, well-bred, self-respecting human being, and to have his food delivered to him with promptitude, care, and good manners.

The importance of direct personal relations of customer with waiters and waitresses, as well as indirect association with busboys and kitchen employees, again was stressed by Farrell (1964). He described the trademark of most top level food

establishments as a genuine desire to please the guest. Non-supervisory employees, through poor downward communication, often have an entirely different conception of their duties than do the various levels of management. Farrell observed that dishwashers worked to satisfy their own personal desires, which contributed little to, and sometimes opposed, satisfaction of the customer. Dishwashers, cooks, busboys, and chefs had less concern for customer opinion than did waiters, waitresses, hostesses, general managers, their assistants, and departmental managers. Improved guest satisfaction through an effective communication system was cited as a means of increasing profit in the food service industry.

Ghene (1964), foreseeing increased demand for service, stated:

Most industries create things. . . . But it's different when you offer a service. True, we create a product. Food is essential to life. But without the service that accompanies it, without the people who offer it in an atmosphere of social conviviality, it becomes as mechanical as a pill, as foreboding as loneliness, and as unreal as an atomic nightmare. . . . I foresee an everincreasing need and hunger for more service, for that outstretched warm welcoming hand that volume feeding industry must increasingly proffer. We can meet mechanization and automation in the kitchen where it rightfully should make increased inroads. But the front of the house wants, needs, and demands more service, more warmth, the glow of real people.

General Foods Corporation, in cooperation with the National Restaurant Association (1960), conducted an eating-out index and consumer attitudes survey. In describing criteria for a good restaurant, 78 per cent of the respondents named good food, 75 per cent checked appearance and atmosphere, 57 per cent mentioned



service, and 20 per cent cited prices. Of the 57 per cent who listed service as being important to a good restaurant, 22 per cent believed courteous, friendly service was necessary.

A similar survey by General Foods Corporation and the National Restaurant Association (1962) followed two years later. The second study indicated that 55 per cent of the respondents considered friendliness of the waiter or waitress of prime importance in patronizing a restaurant. Twenty-eight per cent of the respondents considered being welcomed by name to be "very" or "fairly" important.

Brooks (1963) commented:

Good service and pleasant surroundings cannot turn a poorly prepared dish into a gourmet masterpiece, but poor service and jarring surroundings are certain to spoil the enjoyment of even the most outstanding product of the chef's art.

Difficulty in standardizing human service was contrasted with ease in standardizing a product by Whyte (1964). He noted that the guest who tips well and gets along with people receives far better service than the individual who lacks these attributes.

The importance of knowing individual needs, interests, and backgrounds of customers in the School Lunch Program was emphasized by Egan (1961). She suggested that it is not enough for the dietitian to know how many school children she is serving and their respective ages. She said, "One cannot affect nutrition and nutrition education unless one really knows one's customers and plans a program accordingly."

Crooks (1958) reported methods developed by 173 Veterans Administration hospitals for determining patient reactions to food, dietary guidance, and service provided by departments of dietetics. Patient councils, meeting with representatives from various departments to discuss patient grievances, were developed in some hospitals. In others, selective menus and booklets explaining the part played by dietitians and food in the patient's medical treatment contributed to public relations. According to Crooks, dietary staffs of Veterans Administration hospitals are constantly searching for ways to stimulate patients to express themselves, thus allowing dietitians to know the patients as individuals.

Patients at the Hartford Hospital, Hartford, Connecticut, are furnished self-addressed forms on which to evaluate hospital services (Rockwood, 1958). The forms, returned to the Executive Director of the hospital, provide a means of evaluation for the different departments. Signed evaluations are answered by the departments concerned, offering another opportunity for public relations.

According to Hinkle (1957), a dietary department cannot create good relations with people outside the hospital until good public relations exist within the hospital walls. She asked, "Do we not become so absorbed in the inanimate objects of the job--papers and memos, pots and pans--as to forget the person involved?" Hinkle recommended creation of an atmosphere in which each employee feels that he personally can help the patient



recover. In such an atmosphere, clean dishes and good coffee become important to the employee. She warned that unless the dietitian is dedicated to such a patient-centered atmosphere, she cannot expect her employees to be interested. The feeling must permeate all levels from dietitian to lowest-paid pantry maid or dishwasher.

In a group of hospital patient surveys summarized by Feldman (1962), the majority of patients in most hospitals indicated satisfaction with food quality and method of service. Hospital food is berated, according to Feldman, because the dissatisfied patients are more verbose than are the satisfied ones. Because hospital patients anticipate poor food when they enter, they are pleasantly surprised to find it better than they had expected. Feldman pointed out that patients with lower socio-economic backgrounds tended to be better satisfied with hospital food than those from higher socio-economic groups. Patients from the higher income groups tended to voice their likes and dislikes more than others and more weight was given their opinions.

Bettis (1959) remarked, "Most hospitals over a period of time cultivate a reputation for some type of food--either good or bad; seldom is the patient indifferent in this appraisal of the hospital." He often is apprehensive because he is not in the hospital by choice and may not like the diet ordered for him by the doctor. Such conditions complicate customer satisfaction but also provide a challenge that the dietitian is in a position to meet.

The management of St. Luke's Hospital in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, recognizing the importance of hospital-patient relationships, established a training course for employees in the business office (Zimmerman, 1964). Personnel were provided information concerning broad purposes of the hospital, how it was operated and supported, how the patients' money was used, and advanced medical care available to the patients. Following the course, the employees appeared to be better able to solve problems in human relations and often prevented problems with patients.

Direct patient contact is believed by Awalt (1964) to promote public relations beneficial to both patient and dietetic service. Frequent contact between patient and representatives of the dietary department are provided. Dietetic employees deliver and pick up all bedside trays. Ambulatory patients are accompanied along the cafeteria line by dietetic employees helping them select food in accordance with their diets. Dietitians are on hand in the dining room to answer questions and discuss diets with patients.

Andrews (1957) pointed out the importance of the consumer to the dietary department. He said:

The consumer . . . tends easily to be thought of only as a grouchy, demanding person. What makes him special and not average is that he is hungry! His whole physiology is different. Hunger makes a person hyperactive, more sensitive to his environment, more alert and critical, . . . and more interested in himself alone. He also is seeking a sociable and hospitable situation in which to feed his stomach and his ego. This is especially bad for the food server. She is on the firing line. If she is ultrasensitive she

is going to have trouble. If she is completely insensitive she is going to have trouble. . . . It takes well adjusted and socially secure people to weather this physiological and psychological unrest of mealtime in the human zoo. If a server works in an organizational atmosphere of good communication and sensitive human relations, she will be more likely to perceive the underlying feelings of the consumer, who will then easily be perceived as less of a demanding grouch and more like merely a hungry fellow human being.

Dietitian-patient relationships determine the kind and quantity of food eaten by the patient, which in turn contributes to the success of the hospital dietary department (Vivian, 1954). A project sponsored by The American Dietetic Association from 1952 to 1954 was reported by Vivian. Its purpose was an exchange of ways to establish satisfactory rapport between the dietitian and the patient. Ninety-five per cent of the dietitians responding to a questionnaire cited as the most outstanding factor in establishing a desirable patient-dietitian climate a "food happy" patient being served foods he likes. Respondents recommended that the dietitian discuss food likes and dislikes with the patient as soon after admission as possible. All dietitians responding to the questionnaire stressed the importance of frequent visits to patients by the dietitian.

Serving of "captive" groups was mentioned by Drake (1958) as one of the most difficult problems facing dietitians. Because their patronage is assured, such groups often think dietitians will serve them any food available regardless of quality. Drake urged the dietitian to make the "captive" consumer feel welcome, identified, and appreciated as an individual and to let him know she appreciates and respects him. Solicited comments from

consumers on possible ways to improve food and service foster good public relations. Selective menus were recommended by Pearson (1954) for gaining patient satisfaction.

Psychological implications of food acceptance were summarized by Brownfain (1956) when he wrote:

As soon as we realize that food is perceived, appreciated, rejected, throughout all our lives in interpersonal terms, then we must switch our focus from food itself to the interpersonal factors in the dietitian's work.

Brownfain pointed out that consumers tend to blame food when other dissatisfactions might be responsible.

#### Personality Traits and the Image of the Dietitian

Personality patterns of dietitians and nurses at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Houston, Texas, were compared in a report by Cleveland (1963). Such patterns were revealed by Thematic Apperception Tests in which a series of somewhat vague pictures were shown to groups of dietitians and nurses. Each participant wrote a story about each picture, thus projecting her own attitudes, feelings, and desires. Results indicated that dietitians were more status-conscious and more interested in achievement than were nurses. Dietitians indicated a desire to influence and manipulate others. They displayed a great deal of self-confidence and often demonstrated a feeling of superiority. Cleveland called attention to the fact that the dietitian's supervision responsibilities are challenging and require an air of confidence. He also pointed out that the dietitian, through

being able to influence and supervise others, satisfies her needs for prestige and status. He said, "These apparently detracting personality attributes may . . . be very essential characteristics, actually enhancing one's occupational role participation."

The American Dietetic Association surveyed interests of 2,000 members (Hornaday, 1963). This study indicated that dietitians did not display as much interest in social service as did nurses, ministers, social workers, and hospital attendants. Dietitians were relatively less interested in friendly relations with others at all costs, but expressed a high preference for directing and influencing people in thoughts and activities. The study also pointed out that dietitians liked to be in positions of authority.

Gibb (1959) observed that the dietitian often becomes so occupied in operational details that she fails to consider people as individuals. In summary she stated:

The dietitian-administrator, in spite of her many tensions and strains, must come to see that the world is made up of people and not regulations. Laws and regulations and administrative practices must continually change to suit the changing attitudes and needs of the people in them.

Haun (1959) asked, "Are we condemned to view dietetics only as a science of nutrition?" He suggested that food service personnel learn the names of patients and make pleasant comments to them as they enter and leave the dining room.

Corporate image was described by Robinson and Barlow (1959) as concepts of companies and corporations existing in the minds of the public. As pointed out by Cohen (1961) the corporate



image may be vague or clear, weak or strong, and varies among companies and from one person to another. No matter what the image is, nor the manner in which it is structured, companies are affected by their public image. To a group of Portland home economists in business, Van Steenburgh (Anon., 1960) of Pacific Telephone Northwest commented:

In every survey we have ever made, it has been found that people who reported that they knew no telephone employees had a lower opinion of us than those who had employee friends. And those who had employee friends who did talk about the company, had a very much more favorable opinion of us.

As companies and corporations possess public images, so do professions create images in the minds of those they serve. Concern over the American educational image abroad prompted the United States Information Association to sponsor polls in seven foreign countries. As a result, every means of communication available was used to improve the American educational image abroad (Murrow, 1962). Radio programs broadcast 106 hours per day in 36 languages; motion pictures were shown to 150 million viewers each day; television stations were established in 57 countries. Magazines, newspapers, libraries, music records, cultural lectures, and exhibits were added to other means of communicating a favorable American educational image to foreign countries.

Home economists have become interested in their professional image. A study in Iowa explored public opinion of home economics (Hurley, 1961). Questionnaires were presented to respondents in five professional classifications: (1) high school home economics



teachers, (2) college staff members, (3) home economists in business, (4) extension home economists, and (5) dietitians. Respondents were asked to check, among 49 areas of employment, those which they were sure employed home economists. Food service was checked more often than other types of employment by respondents in each of the five classifications. A less favorable image of the home economist was indicated in the university community than in areas where a closer working relationship with a home economist existed.

Forty per cent of dietitians questioned in a study by Wellin (1958) reported an inaccurate concept by patients of the dietitian's role. Respondents noted that some patients looked upon the dietitian as "cook," others as "nurse," and some as an individual usurping part of the physician's role. Others considered the dietitian as a "mess sergeant," particularly if the patient had been denied food he liked. Wellin pointed out that the public was unfamiliar with the role of the dietitian, thought it knew a great deal about diet, and believed the nurse and doctor knew as much about nutrition and diet therapy as did the dietitian. As a result of such misconceptions, the validity of the dietitian's teaching role was reduced in the eyes of the lay public.

A businessman described home economists as "able" and "earnest," but commented that they dressed like policewomen (Lane, 1960). Some home economists, in trying to look professional, had appeared almost neuter in sex from Lane's viewpoint.

The manager of a large farm cooperative, a university graduate, complained of the home economists' solemn manner. Dietitians were urged to be more vocal and were encouraged to identify themselves as champions of American taste buds and as friends to the consumer.

In discussing the image of the dietitian, Keith (1960) said:

Surely it can't be entirely accidental that to many people the word 'dietitian' conjures up a mental picture of a stern, antiseptic-looking gray figure, stiff as her starched white uniform and about as exciting as a calorie chart. . . . You are contributing to the popular image of a dietitian. You have a responsibility to your profession to be seen at your attractive best. . . . You must publicize and popularize your profession, especially if you expect to attract some of the best of the lively young talent. . . . You are going to be left with the duds unless you communicate a sense of the excitement as well as the sense of personal fulfillment inherent in your profession. . . . You are important people, but relatively few persons are going to know how great your contributions are unless you communicate this to them. . . .

Carroll (1959) attributed the doubtful status of the dietitian to the relatively recent development of the dietetics profession. Barlow (1962) listed the first factor contributing to a good image as good performance and the second as communicating to the public that a good job is being done. He added:

. . . performance of a service by itself is not enough for the creation and maintenance of good understanding and attitudes. People have to understand . . . that the deed is good and worth doing in the first place.

Barlow further remarked that images involve the manner in which individuals view themselves, how they think others see them, and how others actually look upon them. Creating or changing a professional image requires much time and is the responsibility

of each individual involved.

Kienzle (1961) remarked:

Talking is no longer enough. Professional people--including home economists--must know how to communicate well, if they are to meet even the routine demands of their daily lives, and they must learn to communicate superlatively, if they are to progress.

A lack of concern among dietitians, nutritionists, and other home economists about their national image was pointed out by McCain (1961). Although dietetics and related fields are becoming increasingly important in accomplishing national goals, ignorance and misunderstanding are prevalent among the lay public concerning these professions. A tendency exists to minimize the value of dietetics. Members of the dietetic and related professions need to inform the public about the true nature and importance of their functions.

The dietitian's "hidden nature" was described by Kirk (1959) when he said:

If the dietitian rarely is seen by the patient, or if seen, is obscured by the presence of others who occupy a more active . . . place in the picture, then . . . the dietitian is a 'hidden figure.'

Kirk believed the dietitian has created an impersonal image and has become, to the patient, a figure rather than a person.

#### PROCEDURE

A questionnaire was developed to ascertain relationships of student attitudes toward residence hall dietitians, food, and directors (Form 1, Appendix). Questions pertaining to general attitudes of students also were included. The questionnaire was

presented to selected students living in five women's residence halls at Kansas State University.

#### Selection of Respondents

Participants were selected by means of a table of random numbers (Snedecor, 1962). Alternates were chosen by the same method as replacements for any unavailable subjects. The sample was composed of 103 women students and was believed by the Department of Statistics at Kansas State University to be representative of the 939 students living in the five women's residence halls.

#### The Questionnaire

Nine questions on attitude of students toward the dietitian were included in the questionnaire. Five concerned residence hall food. Eight questions pertaining to the director were asked. To investigate whether reactions to food were influenced by general attitudes, 15 items relating to student opinions of Kansas State University and residence hall living in general were added. Five unrelated questions were interspersed throughout the questionnaire to mask the purpose of the survey, thus minimizing the possibility of preconceived biases. As a means of checking for reliability, several questions having the same meaning were worded differently (Jahoda, et al., 1952; McNemar, 1946). Space was provided at the end of the questionnaire to allow respondents to make additional comments. This information was to be

available as reference to hall dietitians rather than for statistical analysis.

A Likert-type scale was used in the questionnaire because of the simplicity of its construction. Likert (1932) reported that his method of scaling was effective in revealing differences in attitudes among various groups of subjects.

Clarity of the questionnaire was tested by six students not included in the study. Questionnaires were then distributed in the residence halls to selected respondents. Students were asked by the investigator to complete the forms so that they could be collected within 30 minutes. Of 103 questionnaires presented 103, or 100 per cent, were returned. Four were not usable because they were incomplete, making a total of 99 considered in the study.

#### Statistical Analysis

Completed questionnaires were tabulated and recorded on computer cards. Data were analyzed by the Statistical Laboratory of Kansas State University. Chi square was used:

- (1) to test whether a relationship existed between food acceptance by students and their attitudes toward the director and dietitian;
- (2) to indicate whether general attitudes of the student influenced her opinions of residence hall food, the dietitian, and the hall director;

- (3) to compare student opinions of residence hall food, the dietitian, and the director in each residence hall included in the study.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Selected questions pertaining to student attitudes toward residence hall dietitians, directors, and food, as well as general respondent attitudes, were analyzed. Detailed tabulations are shown in Appendix A. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

Of interest, but not used in the analysis, were the periods of residence indicated by students. Eighty-five (85.9 per cent) had lived in the residence hall more than one semester. Seven (7.1 per cent) indicated residency of less than one school term (Table 10, Appendix).

### Student Attitudes toward Residence Hall Dietitians as Related to Food Acceptance

From the five questions concerned with student attitudes toward residence hall food, one (No. 27) considered a valid measure was chosen for analysis. All nine questions regarding student opinions of the dietitian were analyzed.

Associations between student attitudes toward residence hall dietitians and food acceptance are shown in Table 1. Significant relationships existed between respondent attitudes toward food and: (1) frequency of student talks with dietitians, (2) whether dietitians would appreciate suggestions from residents,



Table 1. Student attitudes toward residence hall dietitians as related to food acceptance

Question :		Attitude toward food
No. :	Attitude toward dietitian	Degree of significance
3	Frequency of talks with dietitians	*
7	Whether dietitians would appreciate student suggestions	*
10	Friendliness of dietitians	*
18	Frequency of making suggestions to dietitians	ns
25	Pleasant manner of dietitians	*
30	Interest dietitians had in students as persons	*
34	Interest of dietitians in pleasing students	*
39	How well dietitians were known by students	*
42	How often dietitians were seen by students	*

\* Significant at the 5% level  
 ns Not significant

(3) friendliness and (4) pleasant manner of dietitians, (5) dietitians' interest in students as persons, (6) their desire to please residents, (7) how well dietitians were known by respondents, and (8) how often they were seen by students. No significant association was found between student attitudes toward food and the frequency with which respondents made suggestions to dietitians.

Student Attitudes toward Residence Hall Directors  
as Related to Food Acceptance

Eight questions regarding student attitudes toward residence hall directors were analyzed statistically to determine whether an association existed between them and student acceptance of residence hall food (Table 2). No relation was found between respondents' food attitudes and (1) how well directors were known by students, (2) whether directors would appreciate student suggestions, (3) pleasant manner of directors, (4) how often directors were seen by respondents, (5) frequency with which students made suggestions to directors, (6) frequency of student talks with directors, (7) interest in students as persons, and (8) friendliness of directors.

A comparison of student attitudes toward residence hall dietitians and directors is given in Table 3. Responses indicate that more students talked with directors than with dietitians. A greater number of students made suggestions to directors than to dietitians. Seventy-nine (79.8 per cent) stated they never made suggestions to the dietitians. Directors were considered friendly by more students than were dietitians, yet close to the same percentage thought directors and dietitians were pleasant. Only 8.1 per cent of the respondents knew the dietitian well, in contrast to 51.5 per cent who were well acquainted with the director. This might indicate that directors are more accessible to students than are dietitians. Of the students responding, 67.7 per cent saw the dietitian more often than once a week,

Table 2. Student attitudes toward residence hall directors as related to food acceptance

Question :		Attitude toward food
No. :	Attitude toward directors	Degree of significance
5	How well directors were known by students	ns
12	Whether directors would appreciate suggestions from students	ns
19	Pleasant manner of directors	ns
23	How often directors were seen by students	ns
29	Frequency of making suggestions to directors	ns
33	Frequency of talks with directors	ns
36	Interest directors had in students as persons	ns
41	Friendliness of directors	ns

ns Not significant

while 90.9 per cent saw the director this frequently. Fifteen residents (15.2 per cent) believed the dietitian was interested in them as persons, as compared with 62 (62.6 per cent) who thought the directors had the same interest in them.

Table 3. Comparison of student attitudes toward residence hall dietitians and directors

Student attitudes	: Directors		: Dietitians	
	: Total	: Per	: Total	: Per
	: number:	: cent	: number:	: cent
Had talked with directors/ dietitians many times	52	52.5	12	12.1
Had never talked with directors/ dietitians	1	1.0	34	34.3
Had made suggestions to direc- tors/dietitians often	6	6.1	2	2.0
Had never made suggestions to directors/dietitians	55	55.6	79	79.8
Thought directors/dietitians were very friendly	52	52.5	39	39.4
Thought directors/dietitians were unfriendly	7	7.1	11	11.1
Thought directors/dietitians appeared pleasant or very pleasant	62	62.6	63	63.6
Thought directors/dietitians appeared unpleasant	8	8.1	10	10.1
Knew directors/dietitians well	51	51.5	8	8.1
Knew directors/dietitians only when they saw them	0	0.0	45	45.5
Saw directors/dietitians more often than once a week	90	90.9	67	67.7
Saw directors/dietitians once a week or less	9	9.1	32	32.3
Believed directors/dietitians were interested in them as persons	62	62.6	15	15.2
Believed directors/dietitians were not interested in them as persons	8	8.1	40	40.4

Table 3 (concl.)

Student attitudes	: Directors		: Dietitians	
	: Total	: Per	: Total	: Per
	: number:	: cent	: number:	: cent
Thought directors/dietitians would always appreciate student suggestions	55	55.5	50	50.5
Thought directors/dietitians would never appreciate student suggestions	10	10.1	6	6.1

General Attitudes of Students as Related to Opinions  
of Dietitians, Food, and Directors

Four questions related to general attitudes were analyzed to ascertain any existing association with opinions of residence hall dietitians (Table 4). Numbers 9 and 28 asked for essentially the same information regarding general attitudes but were worded differently to check for reliability. The same was true of questions 8 and 26.

Students were asked whether they were glad they came to Kansas State University. Statistical analysis revealed a significant association between their replies and beliefs that dietitians were interested or disinterested in them as persons. Some of the numbers, however, were so small as to cause the significance to be doubted (Table 13, Appendix A). A negative-positive relationship existed between students' satisfaction with their choice of university and their belief that dietitians were interested in them. Respondents wishing they had gone to another

Table 4. Student attitudes toward residence hall dietitians as related to general attitudes

Question No.	General student attitudes	Student attitudes toward dietitians	
		:30. Whether dietitians were interested in students as persons	:34. Whether dietitians were interested in pleasing students
		Degree of significance	
8	Whether they were satisfied with their roommates	ns	ns
9	Whether they were glad they came to Kansas State University	*	ns
26	Congeniality of roommates	ns	ns
28	Whether they wished they had gone to another university	*	ns

\* Significant at the 5% level

ns Not significant



university (considered a negative attitude in the study) believed the dietitian was interested in them as persons (considered a positive attitude). No explanation can be given for such a relationship. No significant associations were found between general attitudes and the remaining statistically analyzed opinions of dietitians (Table 4).

In studying possible relationships between four general attitudes and student acceptance of residence hall food, one question (No. 27) concerned with food attitudes was selected for analysis. No significant association was found (Table 5).

Table 5. Student attitudes toward residence hall food as related to general attitudes

Question No.	General student attitudes	:27. Student attitudes toward food	Degree of significance
8	Whether they were satisfied with their roommates		ns
9	Whether they were glad they came to Kansas State University		ns
26	Congeniality of roommates		ns
28	Whether they wished they had gone to another university		ns

<sup>ns</sup> Not significant

Analysis of two questions (Nos. 19 and 36) pertaining to student opinions of residence hall directors and one selected general attitude (No. 9) are given in Table 6. No significant relationships were found.

Table 6. Student attitudes toward residence hall directors as related to general attitudes

Question :		Student attitudes toward directors	
No. :		Degree of significance	
9	General student attitudes :	19. Pleasant manner : 36. Interest directors	
	Whether they were glad	of directors :	had in students as
	they came to Kansas State	persons	
	University		ns

ns Not significant

The findings in this study indicate that student attitudes toward dietitians, food, and directors were associated little if any with general attitudes held by these same students. Such negligible associations further emphasize the significant relationships existing between student opinions of residence hall dietitians and acceptance of residence hall meals.

Comparison of Attitudes toward Dietitians, Food,  
and Directors in Five Residence Halls

Student attitudes toward dietitians in the five residence halls studied are tabulated in Table 7. No significant relationships existed between the hall where residents lived and (1) student-dietitian talks or (2) suggestions made to food service. Place of residence did seem to be associated significantly with: (1) whether resident suggestions would be appreciated by dietitians, (2) student attitudes toward friendliness of the dietitian, (3) dietitian's interest in students as persons, (4) their desire to please students, (5) how well the dietitian was known by residents, and (6) frequency with which the dietitian was seen. Small numbers in the calculations, however, made conclusions difficult to discern and possibly affected the chi-square values. In residence hall E, where small numbers occurred frequently, residents were divided between two other halls for meals. The total number of respondents in each half was relatively small as a result of the division.

An interesting observation in residence hall D was that a relatively high number of students reported: (1) never having

Table 7. Comparison of student attitudes toward dietitians in five women's residence halls

Question No. :	Student attitudes toward dietitian :	Residence halls					Chi-square
		A	B	C	D	E <sup>1</sup>	
		Number					
3	Talked with dietitians many times a few times never	1 15 4	5 9 5	3 12 5	1 8 10	2 4 3	0 5 7  15.94 10 d.f.
7	Thought dietitians would appreciate suggestions from students always sometimes never	13 7 0	9 7 3	17 3 0	5 12 1	5 4 0	1 9 2  29.01* 10 d.f.
10	Thought dietitians were very friendly somewhat friendly unfriendly	13 7 0	6 12 1	14 6 0	1 12 6	4 5 0	1 7 4  39.60* 10 d.f.
18	Made suggestions to dietitians often or occasionally never	3 17	5 14	8 12	2 17	1 8	1 11  8.25 5 d.f.

<sup>1</sup> Students assigned to another hall for meals

\* Significant at the 5% level

Table 7 (concl.)

Question No.	Student attitudes toward dietitian	A	Residence halls				E1	E1	Chi-square
			B	C	D	Number			
30	Believed dietitians were interested in students as persons yes not sure no	3 12 5	4 7 8	4 12 4	3 2 14	3 5 3	1 5 3	0 6 6	19.19* 10 d.f.
34	Thought dietitians were interested in pleasing students very interested yes somewhat or not interested	6 10 4	4 7 8	10 8 2	1 4 14	1 7 1	1 7 1	1 3 8	34.04* 10 d.f.
39	Knew dietitians well or somewhat only when seen not at all	11 8 1	9 8 2	16 4 0	3 13 3	4 4 1	3 4 1	3 8 1	20.12* 10 d.f.
42	Saw dietitians every day almost every day once a week or less	4 7 9	7 8 4	12 8 0	3 9 7	3 2 6	1 2 6	1 5 6	25.67* 10 d.f.

talked with the dietitian, (2) thinking the dietitian was unfriendly, (3) believing the dietitian was not interested in them as persons, (4) thinking the dietitian was "somewhat interested" or "not interested" in pleasing residents, and (5) having seen the dietitian once a week or less.

Relationships between place of residence and student attitudes toward food were not significant (Table 8). A significant association existed between attitudes toward residence hall directors and the hall resided in by students (Table 9) but again small numbers made results questionable.

#### SUMMARY

Relationships between student attitudes toward residence hall dietitians, food, and directors were investigated, using a Likert-type scale. Possible associations between general attitudes of students and their acceptance of dietitians, food, and directors in residence halls also were considered. Data from each residence hall unit were compared with that from other units to ascertain whether place of residence influenced student attitudes towards dietitians, food, and directors.

The questionnaire was presented to 103 students randomly selected from the 939 living in five women's residence halls at Kansas State University. One hundred per cent were returned, but only 99 questionnaires were usable. Data were tabulated and analyzed using chi-square by the Statistical Laboratory at Kansas State University.



Table 8. Comparison of student attitudes toward food in five women's residence halls

Question : No. :	Student attitudes toward residence hall food :	Residence halls					Chi-square
		A	B	C	D	E <sup>1</sup>	
		Number					
27	Considered meals in residence hall very good or good average poor	6 11 3	3 11 5	7 10 3	3 11 5	2 5 2	1 6 5 7.05 10 d.f.

<sup>1</sup> Assigned to another hall for meals

Table 9. Comparison of student attitudes toward directors in five women's residence halls

Question No.	Student attitudes toward directors	Residence halls					Chi-square
		A	B	C	D	E <sup>1</sup>	
		Number					
5	Knew directors well somewhat or only when seen	17	9	7	14	1	24.29*
12	Thought directors would appreciate suggestions from students always sometimes never	3	10	13	5	8	5 d.f.
		18	13	9	11	3	28.10*
		2	4	8	8	4	10 d.f.
		0	2	3	0	2	3
23	Saw directors every day almost every day once a week or less	13	8	12	16	1	38.82*
		7	10	7	3	3	10 d.f.
		0	1	1	0	5	2
29	Made suggestions to directors often or occasionally never	11	10	8	13	1	16.39*
		9	9	12	6	8	5 d.f.

<sup>1</sup> Students assigned to another hall for meals

\* Significant at the 5% level

Table 9 (concl.)

Question No.	Student attitudes toward directors	Residence halls					E <sup>1</sup>	E <sup>1</sup>	Chi-square
		A	B	C	D	Number			
33	Talked with directors many times a few times or never	14 6	11 8	8 12	16 3	1 8	2 10	23.95*	5 d.f.
36	Believed directors were interested in student as a person								
	yes	20	15	8	15	3	1	40.87*	10 d.f.
	not sure	0	3	9	4	4	9		
	no	0	1	3	0	2	2		
41	Thought directors were very friendly somewhat friendly unfriendly	20 0 0	10 8 1	2 16 2	16 3 0	2 6 1	2 7 3	53.56*	10 d.f.

Significant relationships were found to exist between student acceptance of residence hall meals and: (1) frequency with which respondents had talked with the dietitian, (2) friendliness and pleasant manner of dietitians, (3) how well dietitians were known and the frequency with which they were seen by students, (4) interest in residents as persons displayed by dietitians, and (5) whether dietitians seemed to appreciate student suggestions and their concern in pleasing residents. No significant association was found between student attitudes toward food and the frequency with which they made suggestions to dietitians.

No association was found between student attitudes toward residence hall directors and acceptance of food.

Respondents appeared to know and talk with directors more frequently than with dietitians, and made suggestions to directors more often than to dietitians. Likewise, directors were considered friendly and were seen often by more residents than were the dietitians. Greater accessibility of directors likely made more personal student relationships possible than was true with dietitians.

Student attitudes toward residence hall dietitians, food, and directors were associated little if any with respondent opinions of Kansas State University and residence hall living in general. In other words, negative opinions of dietitian, food, and director were associated little if any with a general negative attitude. Neither were positive opinions toward dietitian, food, and director related to a general positive attitude.

In comparing attitudes existing toward dietitian, food, and directors in five residence halls, small numbers in the data may have affected chi-square values. Significant associations, however, between place of residence and most student attitudes toward dietitians and directors did appear to exist. No significant relationships were found between place of residence and opinions of food.

### CONCLUSIONS

Within the limits of this study the following inferences were made.

A relationship existed between student food acceptance and most attitudes of respondents toward dietitians.

No association was found between student attitudes toward residence hall directors and acceptance of food by respondents.

Residents appeared to be better acquainted and to have more contacts with directors than with dietitians.

General attitudes of students seemed to have little if any relationship with their attitudes toward residence hall dietitians, food, and directors.

Place of residence seemed to be related to most student attitudes concerning dietitians and directors.

No association existed between place of residence and student opinions of food.

With the findings of this study indicating existence of significant associations between student attitudes toward the

dietitian and acceptance of residence hall food, a need for desirable dietitian-resident communications is implied. It is possible that the dietitian may fail to create an atmosphere conducive to such contacts. Since food services have become larger, more centralized, and impersonal, dietitians often become so involved in the mechanics of their responsibilities that they fail to recognize the importance of the customer.

College teachers of dietetics and institutional management have an opportunity to impress upon their students the need for creating an amicable climate for their customers. Dietitians with this concept recognize their responsibility for establishing satisfactory customer-management associations.



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere appreciation is expressed to Mrs. Grace M. Shugart, Head of Institutional Management, for her inspiration and guidance as major adviser; to Dr. Bernadine H. Peterson and Mrs. Marjorie M. Hemphill for their assistance and interest; to Dr. Donald Wilkins, formerly of Kansas State University, and Miss Jean Riggs for their encouragement and assistance in planning the survey; and to Dr. H. C. Fryer for his help with the statistical analysis. Special appreciation goes to the writer's children, whose patience and understanding helped make this study possible.

## LITERATURE CITED

- Andrews, Thomas G. 1957. On human relations in the dietary department. *J. of H. E.* 49(1), 13.
- Anon. 1960. Public relations. *J. of H. E.* 58(8), 685.
- Awalt, Ethel E. 1964. Good patient relations lead to good food. *The Mod. Hosp.* 102(6), 126.
- Barlow, Walter G. 1962. The great image debate. *J. of H. E.* 54(8), 679.
- Bettis, Harold. 1959. Dietitian's public relations role in the hospital. *J. Am. Dietet. Assoc.* 35(4), 370.
- Brooks, Edward R. 1963. What makes a restaurant great? *Food Service Magazine* 25(10), 27.
- Brownfain, John J. 1956. Menus and motives. *J. Am. Dietet. Assoc.* 32(12), 1157.
- Buchanan, Robert D. 1963. Seven guides to the best kitchen layout. *Coll. & Univ. Bus.* 34(6), 73.
- . 1964. Innovations in food and equipment are changing. *Coll. & Univ. Bus.* 36(4), 70.
- Carroll, S. C. 1959. Status of dietitians in hospitals. *J. Am. Dietet. Assoc.* 35, 1027.
- Cleveland, Sidney E. 1963. Personality characteristics of dietitians and nurses. *J. Am. Dietet. Assoc.* 43, 104.
- Cohen, Reuben. 1961. The measurement of corporate images. A symposium. Gould House, Ardley-on-Hudson.
- Crooks, Jean. 1958. Patient participation in assessing food service. *J. Am. Dietet. Assoc.* 34(4), 403.
- Drake, Evelyn S. 1958. Merchandising quality food. *J. Am. Dietet. Assoc.* 34(6), 622.
- Egan, Mary. 1961. Do school lunch personnel affect nutrition education in children and youth? *School Lunch J.* 15(2), 13.
- Farrell, Thomas S. 1963. Communications in the food service industry. *The Cornell Hotel & Rest. Admin. Quar.* 4, 20.
- . 1964. Communications in food service establishments. *The Cornell Hotel & Rest. Quar.* 5(3), 15.

- Feldman, Jacob J. 1962. Patients' opinions of hospital food. J. Am. Dietet. Assoc. 40, 325.
- Foods eating-out index and consumer attitudes survey, sponsored by General Foods Corp. & Nat'l. Rest. Assoc. 1960. White Plains, N. Y.
- Ghene, Jack. 1964. People are the key. Vol. Feeding Mgt. 22 (3), 7.
- Gibb, Jack R. 1959. Human relations in administration. J. Am. Dietet. Assoc. 35, 333.
- Greenaway, Donald. 1964. The importance of education to the food service industry. School & Coll. Feeding 2, 35.
- Haun, Paul. 1959. The art of dietetics. J. Am. Dietet. Assoc. 35, 1048.
- Hinkle, Margaret M. 1957. The dietary department and public relations. J. Am. Dietet. Assoc. 33(11), 1170.
- Hornaday, John A. 1963. Interest patterns of dietitians. J. Am. Dietet. Assoc. 43, 99.
- Hurley, Candace. 1961. Iowa home economics image study.
- Jahoda, Marie, et al. 1951. Research methods in social relations. The Dryden Press. New York.
- Kienzle, George J. 1961. This business of communicating. J. of H. E. 53(7), 549.
- Kirk, R. Bruce. 1959. The dietitian's hidden nature? J. Am. Dietet. Assoc. 35, 1055.
- Lane, Laura. 1960. You and your public image. J. of H. E. 52(7), 514.
- Likert, Rensis. 1932. A technique for the measurement of attitudes. Archives of Psychol. 22(140), 5.
- McCain, J. A. 1961. Widening your horizons. An abstract taken from talk at 44th annual meeting of A.D.A., St. Louis, Mo.
- McNemar, Quinn. 1946. Opinion-attitude methodology. Psychol. Bul. 43(4), 289.
- Murrow, Edward R. 1962. Our educational image abroad. NEA Jour. 51(3), 8.

- Pearson, Evelyn. 1954. Selective menus for therapeutic diets. J. Am. Dietet. Assoc. 30(2), 1262.
- Robinson, Claude, and W. Barlow. 1959. Corporate image-fad or the real McCoy? Pub. Relations Jour. 15(9), 10.
- Rockwood, Ann E. 1958. As those we serve see us. J. Am. Dietet. Assoc. 34(9), 943.
- Snedecor, George W. 1962. Statistical methods. The Iowa State Press, Ames, Iowa.
- Survey of dining out habits and motivations and basic merchandising facts, sponsored by General Foods Corp. & Nat'l. Rest. Assoc. 1962. White Plains, N. Y.
- Vivian, Virginia. 1954. The dietitian-patient relationship. J. Am. Dietet. Assoc. 30(12), 1259.
- Wellin, E. 1958. In-patient dietary instruction and the hospital setting. J. Am. Dietet. Assoc. 34(11), 1179.
- Whyte, William F. 1964. Human relations in the hotel industry. The Cornell Hotel & Rest. Admin. Quar. 5(3), 2.
- Zimmerman, David H. 1964. A public relations course for business office employees. Hospitals 38(8), 53.

## APPENDIX A

Table 10. Length of time lived in residence halls by respondents

Length of time	Residence halls												Total
	A		B		C		D		E		No.	%	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%			
Less than one semester	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	5	5.0	7	7.1	
One semester	2	2.0	1	1.0	1	1.0	2	2.0	1	1.0	7	7.1	
More than one semester	17	17.0	18	18.0	18	18.0	17	17.0	15	15.0	85	85.9	



Table 11. Student attitudes toward residence hall dietitians as related to food acceptance

Question No.	Attitude toward dietitian	Number who rated meals			Chi-square
		: Good or : very good:	Average :	Poor :	
3	Talked with dietitians many times a few times never	5 16 1	3 26 25	3 12 18	13.95 4 d.f.
7	Thought dietitians would appreciate suggestions from students always sometimes never	19 3 0	26 24 3	5 15 3	19.60 4 d.f.
10	Thought dietitians were very friendly somewhat friendly unfriendly	16 6 0	19 29 6	4 4 5	18.66 4 d.f.
18	Made suggestions to dietitians often occasionally never	0 8 14	1 6 46	1 4 18	7.43 4 d.f.
25	Thought dietitians appeared very pleasant pleasant somewhat pleasant unpleasant	6 14 2 0	9 25 14 5	2 7 9 5	14.17 6 d.f.

Table 11 (concl.)

Question No. :	Attitude toward dietitian	Number who rated meals			Chi-square
		: Good or :	: Average :	: Poor :	
30	Believed dietitians were interested in students as persons yes not sure no	6 13 3	5 25 24	4 6 13	11.89 4 d.f.
34	Thought dietitians were interested in pleasing students no somewhat yes very interested	0 2 10 10	2 19 23 10	3 10 7 3	16.02 6 d.f.
39	Knew dietitians well somewhat only when seen not at all	3 16 2 1	5 13 30 6	0 9 13 1	22.02 6 d.f.
42	Saw dietitians every day almost every day about once a week seldom never	12 6 3 1 0	10 23 16 4 1	6 10 1 6 0	20.99 8 d.f.

Table 12. Student attitudes toward residence hall directors as related to food acceptance

Question No. :	Attitude toward director	: Number who considered meals :			Chi-square
		: Good or :	: Average :	: Poor :	
5	Knew directors well somewhat only when seen	13 9 0	26 28 0	12 11 0	0.75 4 d.f.
12	Thought directors would appreciate suggestions from students always sometimes never	14 7 1	30 20 4	11 7 5	4.91 4 d.f.
19	Thought directors appeared pleasant somewhat pleasant unpleasant	16 6 0	33 17 3	12 6 5	8.40 4 d.f.
23	See directors every day almost every day about once a week seldom never	13 7 2 0 0	28 21 3 1 0	13 7 1 1 1	5.39 8 d.f.
29	Made suggestions to directors often occasionally never	2 11 9	4 18 32	0 9 14	4.12 4 d.f.

Table 12 (concl.)

Question :		: Number who considered meals :			
No. :		: Good or :		: Poor :	
No. :		Attitude toward director		:very good: Average :	
				Chi-square	
33	Talked with directors many times a few times never	11 11 0	30 23 1	11 12 0	1.45 4 d.f.
36	Believed directors were interested in students as persons yes not sure no	16 5 1	35 16 3	11 8 4	5.00 4 d.f.
41	Thought directors were very friendly somewhat friendly unfriendly	10 12 0	32 19 3	10 9 4	7.69 4 d.f.

Table 13. Student attitudes toward residence hall dietitians as related to general attitudes

Question No.	General student attitudes	Student attitudes toward dietitians									
		30. Believed dietitians were interested in student	31. Not sure	32. Yes	33. No	34. Thought dietitians were interested in pleasing student	35. Very	36. Chi-square	37. inter-ested	38. Some-what	39. Chi-square
8	Wished they could change roommates no sometimes or yes	12	34	35	0.58	19	33	25	4	1.74	3 d.f.
9	Glad they came to Kansas State University strongly agree agree not sure	10	32	26	10.24*	18	26	21	3	4.99	6 d.f.
26	Roommates were very congenial reasonably or not very congenial	12	30	31	0.62	19	28	21	5	3.91	
28	Wished they had gone to another university strongly disagree disagree not sure, agree, or strongly agree	8	18	14	11.74*	11	14	14	1	3.93	6 d.f.
		5	22	17	4 d.f.	11	16	15	2	6 d.f.	
		3	3	8		2	6	4	2		

\* Significant at the 5% level

Table 14. Student attitudes toward residence hall food as related to general attitudes

Question No.	General student attitudes	Very good	Good	Average	Poor	Chi-square
: :						
: :						
: :						
8	Wished they could change roommates no sometimes or yes	5 1	12 2	44 9	20 3	0.21 3 d.f.
9	Glad they came to Kansas State University strongly agree agree not sure	4 1 1	12 4 0	39 14 1	13 7 3	7.48 6 d.f.
26	Roommates were very congenial reasonably or not very congenial	5 1	8 6	40 14	20 3	4.41 3 d.f.
28	Wished they had gone to another university strongly disagree disagree not sure, agree, or strongly agree	3 2 1	6 9 1	20 26 5	11 7 7	12.33 6 d.f.



Table 15. Student attitudes toward residence hall directors as related to general attitudes

Ques- tion No.	General student attitudes	Student attitudes toward directors									
		19. Think directors appear	Some- what	Un- pleas-	pleas-	Chi- square	Yes	Not sure	No	36. Believe directors are interested in student as a person:	Chi- square
9	Glad they came to Kansas State University strongly agree agree not sure	44 15 3	19 9 1	5 2 1		1.52 4 d.f.	42 16 4	20 9 0	6 1 1		3.47 4 d.f.

## APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE  
LIFE IN THE RESIDENCE HALLS

Please place an X in the blank beside the word or phrase which best completes or describes the following statements:

1. I have lived in the residence hall
  - (a) less than 1 semester\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) 1 semester\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) more than 1 semester\_\_\_\_\_.
2. I wish I could live in another residence hall.
  - (a) Yes\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) Sometimes\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) No\_\_\_\_\_.
3. I have talked with the dietitian in my residence hall
  - (a) many times\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) a few times\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) never\_\_\_\_\_.
4. The service clubs on campus
  - (a) take too much of my time\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) take the right amount of my time\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) take very little of my time\_\_\_\_\_.
5. I know the director of my residence hall
  - (a) well\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) somewhat\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) only when I see her\_\_\_\_\_.
6. I find life in the residence hall to
  - (a) have too much variety\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) have adequate variety\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) be monotonous\_\_\_\_\_.
7. I think the dietitian in my residence hall
  - (a) would always appreciate suggestions from students\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) would sometimes appreciate suggestions from students\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) would never appreciate suggestions from students\_\_\_\_\_.
8. I wish I could change roommates.
  - (a) No\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) Sometimes\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) Yes\_\_\_\_\_.
9. When I think of Kansas State University, I am glad I came.
  - (a) Strongly agree\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) Agree\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) Not so sure\_\_\_\_\_.

10. I think the dietitian in my residence hall is
  - (a) very friendly\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) somewhat friendly\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) unfriendly\_\_\_\_\_.
11. Compared with the people in my home town, I find the people on the K.State campus
  - (a) less friendly\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) about the same\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) more friendly\_\_\_\_\_.
12. I think the director in my residence hall
  - (a) would always appreciate suggestions from students\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) would sometimes appreciate suggestions from students\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) would never appreciate suggestions from students\_\_\_\_\_.
13. I think the food in the residence hall usually is seasoned well.
  - (a) Agree\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) Not sure\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) Disagree\_\_\_\_\_.
14. I eat in a restaurant
  - (a) more often than once a week\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) once a week\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) less often than once a week\_\_\_\_\_.
15. I like to run around with
  - (a) a large group of people\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) a smaller group of people\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) just one person\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (d) alone\_\_\_\_\_.
16. I like foods that are
  - (a) highly seasoned (such as Mexican food)\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) somewhat highly seasoned\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) not highly seasoned\_\_\_\_\_.
17. Most of my instructors are
  - (a) good teachers\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) average teachers\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) poor teachers\_\_\_\_\_.
18. I make suggestions to the dietitian in my residence hall
  - (a) often\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) occasionally\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) never\_\_\_\_\_.
19. The director in my residence hall appears to be
  - (a) unpleasant\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) somewhat pleasant\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) pleasant\_\_\_\_\_.

20. I do most of my studying  
(a) in my room\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) elsewhere in the residence hall\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) somewhere else\_\_\_\_\_.
21. I think the food in my residence hall is  
(a) better than in most other residence halls\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) about like the food in most other residence halls\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) poorer than the food in most other residence halls\_\_\_\_\_.
22. I prefer to be in situations where I  
(a) meet a lot of people\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) meet a few people\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) am with only those people I know well\_\_\_\_\_.
23. I see the director of my residence hall  
(a) every day\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) almost every day\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) about once a week\_\_\_\_\_.  
(d) seldom\_\_\_\_\_.  
(e) never\_\_\_\_\_.
24. When I eat in the residence hall dining room, I feel  
(a) very comfortable\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) comfortable\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) sometimes uncomfortable\_\_\_\_\_.  
(d) uncomfortable\_\_\_\_\_.
25. The dietitian in my residence hall appears to be  
(a) unpleasant\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) somewhat pleasant\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) pleasant\_\_\_\_\_.  
(d) very pleasant\_\_\_\_\_.
26. My roommate is  
(a) not very congenial\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) reasonably congenial\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) very congenial\_\_\_\_\_.
27. I consider most of the meals in the residence hall  
(a) very good\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) good\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) average\_\_\_\_\_.  
(d) poor\_\_\_\_\_.
28. I wish I had gone to another university.  
(a) Strongly agree\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) Agree\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) Not sure\_\_\_\_\_.  
(d) Disagree\_\_\_\_\_.  
(e) Strongly disagree\_\_\_\_\_.

29. I make suggestions to the director in my residence hall  
(a) often\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) occasionally\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) never\_\_\_\_\_.
30. I believe that the dietitian in my residence hall is interested in me as a person.  
(a) Yes\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) Not sure\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) No\_\_\_\_\_.
31. I go places with  
(a) the same group most of the time\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) different people at different times\_\_\_\_\_.
32. I think most of my instructors are  
(a) unconcerned about their students\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) not very concerned about their students\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) somewhat concerned about their students\_\_\_\_\_.  
(d) very interested in their students\_\_\_\_\_.
33. I have talked with the director of my residence hall  
(a) many times\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) a few times\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) never\_\_\_\_\_.
34. I think the dietitian in my residence hall  
(a) is not interested in pleasing students\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) is somewhat interested in pleasing students\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) is interested in pleasing students\_\_\_\_\_.  
(d) is very interested in pleasing students\_\_\_\_\_.
35. I feel that the social life on the campus  
(a) takes too much of my time\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) takes the right amount of my time\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) takes very little of my time\_\_\_\_\_.
36. I believe that the director of my residence hall is interested in me as a person.  
(a) Yes\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) Not sure\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) No\_\_\_\_\_.
37. I think the meals in my residence hall  
(a) have too much variety\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) have adequate variety\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) are monotonous\_\_\_\_\_.
38. Before I moved into the residence hall, I ate most of my meals  
(a) in a boarding house\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) with my parents or relatives\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) with roommates in an apartment\_\_\_\_\_.



39. I know the dietitian in my residence hall  
(a) well\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) somewhat\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) only when I see her/him\_\_\_\_\_.  
(d) not at all\_\_\_\_\_.
40. When I eat in a restaurant I feel  
(a) very comfortable\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) comfortable\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) sometimes uncomfortable\_\_\_\_\_.  
(d) uncomfortable\_\_\_\_\_.
41. I think the director of my residence hall is  
(a) very friendly\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) somewhat friendly\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) unfriendly\_\_\_\_\_.
42. I see the dietitian in my residence hall  
(a) every day\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) almost every day\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) about once a week\_\_\_\_\_.  
(d) seldom\_\_\_\_\_.  
(e) never\_\_\_\_\_.
43. Of the persons who serve on the cafeteria line, I know the names of  
(a) none\_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) one\_\_\_\_\_.  
(c) more than one\_\_\_\_\_.

Additional comments:

STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD RESIDENCE HALL DIETITIANS  
AND DIRECTORS AS RELATED TO FOOD ACCEPTANCE

by

JEAN SPENCER PRIDEAUX

B. S., Texas Technological College, 1942

---

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Institutional Management

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1965

The food service industry has risen to a place of prominence in business. From this growth, centralization of management functions and food preparation have developed, with more impersonal dietitian-customer associations resulting.

Relationships between student attitudes toward residence hall dietitians, food, and directors were investigated, using a questionnaire with a Likert-type scale. Possible associations between general attitudes of students and their acceptance of dietitians, food, and directors in residence halls also were considered. Data from each residence hall unit were compared with that from other units to ascertain whether place of residence influenced student attitudes toward dietitian, food, and directors.

From 939 students living in five women's residence halls at Kansas State University, 103 were selected randomly and asked to complete questionnaires. Ninety-nine questionnaires were usable. Data were tabulated and analyzed using chi-square.

Significant relationships were found to exist between student acceptance of residence hall meals and: (1) frequency with which respondents had talked with the dietitian, (2) friendliness and pleasant manner of dietitians, (3) how well dietitians were known and the frequency with which they were seen by students, (4) interest in residents as persons displayed by dietitians, and (5) whether dietitians seemed to appreciate student suggestions and their concern in pleasing residents. No significant association was found between student attitudes toward food and

the frequency with which they made suggestions to dietitians. No association was found between student attitudes toward residence hall directors and acceptance of food.

Respondents appeared to know and talk with directors more frequently than with dietitians and made suggestions to directors more often than to dietitians. Likewise, directors were considered friendly and were seen often by more residents than were the dietitians.

Student attitudes toward residence hall dietitians, food, and directors were associated little if any with respondent opinions of Kansas State University and residence hall living in general. Significant associations between place of residence and most student attitudes toward dietitians and directors appeared to exist. No significant relationships were found between place of residence and opinions of food.