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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The formal organization is a major component of today's society. A listing of formal organizations which are part of every day life seems almost unending. Included in this list are business, government, military, education, church, the Girl Scouts, Kiwanis, and the Y.W.C.A. When people working together attempt to apply an orderly pattern to accomplishing their task, a formal organization is created. The pattern given to the organization sets relationships between people, work, and resources. The relationships may be as many-faceted and complex as the federal government or as basic as the local women's club. As long as there is a conscious, rational pattern to the interaction of people in reaching a common goal, a formal organization exists. However, the term formal organization is usually used to refer to those organizations which exist for an extended period of time and which choose to place their organizational pattern in writing. The actual recording of the relationship pattern gives to the organization the total formality most often assumed when the term formal organization is used.

An important ingredient in the formal organization is people. The accomplishment of an organizational goal is dependent upon the action of people. Composing the aggregate of people within an organization
are individuals. Each individual, then, must contribute to this goal. As the organization grows in size, this concept of individual contribution becomes more and more important. However, the organization and the individual are often in conflict. The organization controls. It demands conformity, order, and obedience and cannot allow too much freedom, creativity, or independence to the individual. At the same time the individual is striving to be a person. He wants independence and self-esteem. He needs to self-actualize. Because he spends forty hours or so within the formal organization each week, much of the individual's striving for satisfaction and identity centers around his work.

The formal organization needs the individual to enable it to reach its goals. The individual needs the formal organization not only to satisfy security and social needs but also to enable him to develop identity and realize certain other satisfactions for which he strives. The recognition of this mutually dependent position is a step toward reducing the conflict often found between an individual and the formal organization. Out of this recognition many concepts for managing formal organizations have been devised which are intended to aid in the reduction of conflict.

Role conflict and role ambiguity are concepts which are dealt with in the management of the divergent interests of the individual and the formal organization. The term role suggests that each individual, or focal person, has a certain role performance expected of him. When the role expectations for an individual are not unanimous, then role
conflict exists. This may take the form of conflict between the focal person and others holding role expectations for him or it may take the form of a conflict within the focal person himself. Role ambiguity exists when role expectations are not clearly defined by others or are not clearly communicated to the focal person. Either conflict or ambiguity creates a problem for the individual and thus for the formal organization. When the organization recognizes the concepts of role conflict and ambiguity and attempts to reduce or eliminate their presence, then positive steps have been taken to assist the individual in realizing satisfaction through his work and enable him to contribute to the goal of the organization.

The public school possesses the same kinds of characteristics as a business organization. A hierarchical structure composed of the board of education, superintendent, assistants to the superintendent, principals, assistant principals, department chairmen, guidance counselors, teachers, and clerical staff exists in practice and on paper. These positions are intended to work together to meet the goal of the public school in providing an education for the youth of the community. In each of the positions is a person or a group of people once again looking for satisfaction and identity through his work.

As in the business world, the individuals working within public schools encounter conflict with the formal organization. Thus the concepts used to assist the individual in relating to the formal organization of business should also be applicable to the individual as he works in the formal organization of public schools.
A representative group of individuals in the public schools are school counselors. While they are working within the framework of the school organization, they are also striving to reach their personal identity and fulfill certain needs. If they experience a conflict with the organization, it is possible that they may be frustrated in their own satisfactions and in turn not contribute much to the goal of the public school.

The frustrations from conflict can result in a variety of inner tensions. Among these are anxiety, depression, hypersensitivity, and lack of self-confidence. Some persons may react by becoming highly independent or by tending to totally rely on others. Low job satisfaction and a desire to escape from the situation may also occur within a counselor experiencing role conflict.

This role conflict and its accompanying inner tensions increase when the role expectations of students, teachers, parents, other counselors, and various other personnel are considered. An equally great conflict might exist if the superintendent, principal, teachers, and students did not communicate any role expectations and the counselor experienced role ambiguity. In either of these situations, the individual stands the chance of being frustrated in realizing any identity or satisfaction and the goals of the public school will be of little importance to him. The existing role conflict or ambiguity would have to be recognized, identified, and reduced before the individual and public school could unite in reaching their objective.
Two factors which affect the individual as he functions within the formal organization are role conflict and role ambiguity. A third factor, role stress, is the combination of role conflict and role ambiguity. The presence of these factors are important to both the organization and the individual; they may inhibit the individual from establishing and maintaining his identity and from satisfying his needs, and they may keep the organization from reaching its goal.

This research consists of an effort to replicate research already conducted by Kahn et al. In considering the findings which Kahn et al. presented on the variables which they studied, four were selected as being most applicable to the school setting being considered in this research. These four are neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and independence.

Kahn et al. talk about stress and measure it in terms of conflict and ambiguity. For their research they assume that a personality variable is affected in the same manner by conflict as it is by ambiguity and thus present their findings in terms of role conflict. Their data is based on correlations considering high role conflict and low role conflict in connection with other personality variables.

In brief the research by Kahn et al. found that a high level of neuroticism was associated with a high degree of role conflict being experienced. Kahn et al. also found that the characteristic of independence was associated with a high degree of role conflict. A third finding presented was that the characteristic of flexibility is associated with a high level of role conflict. Finally their research
indicated that a strong tolerance rating is associated with a high level of role conflict.

Other characteristics which might have been investigated in relation to role conflict, ambiguity, and stress were not a part of this research because the intent of this study was primarily to replicate. However, these other characteristics which may be significant in their relationship to role conflict, ambiguity, and stress will be discussed as a part of a consideration of the implications for the findings of this research.

**Statement of Problem**

The purpose of this study was to examine the factors of role conflict, role ambiguity, and role stress as they relate to selected characteristics of public school counselors in Franklin County, Ohio. These selected characteristics of public school counselors which were examined include the age of the counselor; the sex of the counselor; the number of years of counseling experience which the counselor had prior to the school year 1971-1972; the counselor's assignment to an elementary, junior, or senior high school; the size of the school in which the counselor is practicing; the number of days the counselor was absent during the 1971-1972 school year; and the counselor's scores on scales intended to measure neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence.

Specifically the research questions addressed by this study are:

1. What is the relationship between the dependent variable of role conflict and the independent variables
of age, sex, years of previous counseling experience, counseling assignment, size of school, absenteeism for the school year 1971-1972, neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence?

2. What is the relationship between the dependent variable of role ambiguity and the independent variables of age, sex, years of previous counseling experience, counseling assignment, size of school, absenteeism for the school year 1971-1972, neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence?

3. What is the relationship between the dependent variable of role stress and the independent variables of age, sex, years of previous counseling experience, counseling assignment, size of school, absenteeism for the school year 1971-1972, neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence?

**Definition of Terms**

**DEPENDENCY** - A coping behavior of a person which results in increased need for authority figures. Operationally the score on part 6 of the Questionnaire administered to public school counselors.

**FLEXIBILITY** - A behavior pattern which results in an individual who adjusts to change readily. Operationally the score on part 4 of the Questionnaire administered to public school counselors.
FOCAL PERSON - The individual who receives information about his expected role behavior.

FORMAL ORGANIZATION - A goal-oriented group of people joined by logical relationships which are set forth on paper by the rules and policy of the group.

NEUROTICISM - A personality variable which is reflected in physical and psychological manifestations of anxiety, particularly neurasthenia, depression, hypersensitivity, and lack of self-confidence. Operationally the score on part 3 of the Questionnaire administered to public school counselors.

RIGIDITY - A behavior pattern which results in a person who is stable, systematic, and self-controlled.

ROLE - A set of activities which are potential behaviors of the person in a particular job or position.

ROLE AMBIGUITY - Lack of adequate information about the position or job a person is expected to perform. Operationally the score on part 2 of the Questionnaire administered to public school counselors.

ROLE CONFLICT - The focal person's awareness of the presence of two or more sets of information about expectations toward the focal person which are not congruent. Operationally the score on part 1 of the Questionnaire administered to public school counselors.

ROLE SENDER - A person who communicates to the focal person certain expectations about the role of the focal person.
ROSE STRESS - The presence of role conflict and/or role ambiguity. Operationally the combined score on part 1 and 2 of the Questionnaire.

TOLERANCE - The personal ability to have a good capacity for positive affective relations with others. Operationally the score on part 5 of the Questionnaire administered to public school counselors.

Importance of Study

The general proposition that role conflict, role ambiguity, and role stress are associated with decreased organizational effectiveness implies that schools should be concerned with the presence of these factors among their employees. As is the case with other types of organizations, public schools should be attempting to operate with the maximum effectiveness possible and any inhibiting factors should be recognized, understood, and dealt with.

Studies in business have reported a positive relationship between the factors being studied. This study deals with the school counselor. If the results of the study support other research and indicate that there is a relationship between role conflict, role ambiguity, and role stress and the factors of age, sex, years of previous counseling experience, counseling assignment, size of school, absenteeism for the school year 1971-1972, neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence; there are specific implications for schools. Each of these variables was selected because it could contribute meaningful information about role conflict, ambiguity, and stress.
The factors of age, sex, and previous counseling experience were chosen because they are readily available facts about any individual. Perhaps they are overlooked because they are so obviously accepted. If this research shows a significant relationship between age and sex and role conflict, ambiguity, and stress, then counselors, counselor educators, and school administrators could all benefit from the findings. If, for example, females over 40 are more prone to role conflict, counselor educators might profit from this knowledge in providing training for this group. Counselors could be assisted in their understanding of themselves, and fellow counselors and administrators might consider the information in making assignments and working with counselors. If role conflict, ambiguity, and stress are related to years of previous counseling experience, this information might be helpful to an administrator, counselor educator, or counselor. As an example, if a negative correlation were found between role ambiguity and years of experience, a school administrator might attempt to see that a beginning counselor was placed in a situation where he could work closely with another counselor who had been counseling for a few years.

The relationship between role conflict, ambiguity, and stress and the situational variables of counseling assignment and size of school were also chosen for study. If information indicated that characteristics of the elementary, junior, and senior high school differed, then counselors, counselor educators, school administrators, and possibly even teachers could benefit from knowledge in this area in
selecting and assigning counselors and in working with them. If the size of the school has a relationship to conflict, ambiguity, or stress, the findings could present implications about facets of the school such as autonomy and channels of communication. Because it would be of assistance to school personnel, this study was designed to consider school size in relation to role conflict, ambiguity, and stress.

Since school counselors are service and often crisis-oriented, their availability is an important factor. For this reason, this research investigated the relationship between absenteeism and role conflict, ambiguity, and stress. If a positive relationship was found between role stress and absenteeism, it is possible that this absenteeism might be a behavioral manifestation of stress.

The four personality variables of neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence were chosen for this study. They were found to be significant in a study by Kahn et al. If their relationship to role conflict, ambiguity, and stress is found significant in this study, they could certainly get in the way of the counselor's performance. Writings on the nature and characteristics of counselors emphasize that the counselor should know himself, have a healthy self-concept, be able to work well with others, and be able to empathize with clients. Yet research such as the replicated study has shown that certain personality traits may inhibit these abilities.

People measuring high on neuroticism were found to have a high level of anxiety, experience low job satisfaction, greater futility,
and lack affective personal bonds. Perhaps the implication of greatest significance is the inability to form affective personal bonds. Because a counselor must work closely with many groups of people, it is crucial that students, teachers, parents, administrators, and others have a respect and warm regard for the counselor and his efforts. Lack of this feeling toward the counselor may impair significantly his effectiveness. It could also be speculated that low job satisfaction and a greater feeling of futility could affect the enthusiasm and effort of a counselor.

Secondly the factor of dependence in its relation to role stress has implications for the population under study. Since Kahn et al. found that under high stress a person tends to become more independent almost to the point of isolation, the repercussions of this finding needs to be examined. This extreme independence is an undesirable trait within any organization because of its affect on the individual and those he works with. It seems that extreme independence would be a particular handicap to a school counselor since his interaction with others in the school and community is so essential. Without cooperation from a variety of people, it is questionable that the counselor can accomplish little, if anything. Even a routine matter such as course selection is dependent upon information from and interaction with a number of people within the school setting.

The research points to a third area of discussion, flexibility. Kahn et al. found that flexible people are other-directed, open-minded, and want to participate totally in the lives of others. Flexible people find it difficult to say "no" and want to avoid routine.
Often they experience role overload because they are so easily influenced.

Inherent in these findings is a dilemma for school counselors. While some of the characteristics of the highly flexible person such as other-directed and open-minded seem highly desirable traits for a school counselor, other characteristics may present difficulties. If a counselor finds himself with a tendency to agree to everything and to be actively involved in the lives of others, he may create for himself a situation which brings about his ineffectiveness. Counselors typically complain about having too much to do and too many students to see. If these counselors are highly flexible people, they may be adding to the overload about which they are complaining. The effect of high tolerance level has been found to be quite similar to high flexibility and thus may present the same kind of dilemma for the counselor and the school.

On the other hand, if role conflict, role ambiguity, and role stress are not aspects of the job of a school counselor which have a relationship to the selected factors being studied, an interesting situation exists. Perhaps there are specific ingredients which reduce or eliminate the effects of role conflict and ambiguity. Then it would be important to examine closely possible explanations for the lack of relationships being studied. Aspects to be considered might include factors which make the role of a counselor less prone to conflict and ambiguity and aspects which may have caused the results of this research to differ from other research. Many possibilities
for future research would exist if no significant relationships are reported.

**Limitations**

This study measured only those counselors who were currently serving in a public school in Franklin County, Ohio during the second semester of 1972. The population consisted of school systems which are in a predominately urban area. The presence of a large metropolitan city such as Columbus, Ohio with an institute of higher education such as The Ohio State University is a definite characteristic of this population. Therefore results of this study can be generalized only to similar populations.

This study is a replication of other research. For this reason, the variables which are used do not claim to encompass all variables which might be considered but were selected rather because of their presence in the replicated study and their appropriateness to this particular research. The four personality variables were selected from the study being replicated. The other variables were included because of their potential significance to counselors, counselor educators, and school administrators.

Also because it was a replication, the instruments used to measure the variables are those which were used in the original research as they could best be applied to the particular population under study in this research. Therefore the definitions of terms employed in this study are restricted to the description provided by the original instruments from which the measurement of those terms were derived.
In replicating previous research, this study is not a direct measurement of role conflict, role ambiguity, and role stress as such. This study did not attempt to identify and describe role but rather to look at the manifestations of role conflict, role ambiguity, and role stress as they were presented in the research being replicated.

Organization of Remainder of Study

Chapter II is a review of the literature on role theory and school counselor's role conflict and ambiguity. Chapter III contains a discussion of the procedures for the study including population, sample, instrumentation, data collection, and statistical analysis. Chapter IV presents the findings of this study in table and narrative form, and Chapter V deals with the conclusions and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature associated with this study is divided into two major parts: role theory and school counselor's role conflict and ambiguity. The first section presents a brief discussion of the concept of role theory and then details the literature written on role conflict and role ambiguity. The second segment of this chapter concerns itself with those aspects of the literature on school counselor's role which reflect conflict or ambiguity within the role.

Role Theory

As one begins a survey of the available literature on role theory, it is immediately obvious that there is an abundance of writing and no consensus as to approach or definition. The precursors of role theory include James Baldwin and Cooley writing about the self; Dewey describing habit and conduct; Summer developing concepts about mores and folkways, and Durkheim and Ross writing on social forces.

In their writing on role theory, Biddle and Thomas (1966) attempt to organize the literature into a meaningful whole. The following statement about role theory gives some indication of the complexity of the area.
Role theory is a new field of study; and although it has not yet been widely recognized, it shares with more mature fields of behavioral sciences the fact that it possesses an identifiable domain of study, perspective, and language; and that it has a body of knowledge, some rudiments of theory, and characteristic methods of inquiry.

The field apparently has chosen as its domain of study nothing more nor less than complex, real-life behavior as it is displayed in genuine ongoing social situations. Role analysts examine such problems as the processes and phases of socialization, interdependencies among individuals, the characteristics and organization of social positions, processes of conformity and sanctioning, specialization of performance and the division of labor and many others (p. 13).

In defining role, Sargent (1951) states that "...role is a pattern or type of social behavior which seems situationally appropriate to him in terms of the demands and expectations of those in his group (p. 360)."

Parsons and Shils (1959) present an explanation of role which views the occupant as the main determiner of action. They state that the actor in the role has a system of relations-to-objects and that this system

...is constituted by a great number of specific orientations. Each of these...is a "conception"...which the actor has of the situation in terms of what he wants (his ends), what he sees (how the situation looks to him), and how he intends to get from the objects he sees the things he wants... (p. 54).

Sarbin's (1954) concept of role is often used as a general background against which to organize role theory.
...we regard a culture as an organization of
learned behaviors and the products of behaviors
which are shared and transmitted. When analyzed,
these behaviors seem to be no more and no less
than the ordered actions of persons.... More-
ever, persons are always members of a society
(defined as an aggregate of persons with common
goals), and these societies are structured into
positions or statuses or offices. The positions
are collections of rights and duties designated
by a single term, e.g., mother, village chief,
teacher, etc. The actions of persons then are
organized around these positions and comprise the
roles. Role and position are cojoined. Roles are
defined in terms of the actions performed by the
person to validate his occupancy of the position.
In sum, all societies are organized around positions
and the persons who occupy these positions perform
specialized positions or roles. These roles are
linked with the position and not with the person
who's temporarily occupying the position (p. 224).

A concept similar to Sarbin is that expressed by Newcomb (1958)
as he discusses role.

A role...consists of a whole set of behaviors
which are more or less characteristic of all
the occupants of any position. A prescribed
role includes all the approved ways of carrying
out the necessary functions required of the
occupant of a position.... Roles and pre-
scribed roles, therefore, are not concepts
which refer to the actual behavior of any given
individual (p. 33).

Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, & Shoek (1964) discuss the concept of role in
relation to management theory and therefore their definition has dimen-
sions not found in those by Newcomb, Sarbin, and others. Kahn et al.
view the office as the linking factor between the organization and the
individual. The term office "... is essentially a relational concept,
defining one position in terms of its relationship to others and to
the system as a whole (p. 13)." Associated with each office is a set
of activities or potential behaviors. "These activities constitute the role to be performed, at least approximately, by any person who occupies that office (p. 13)."

Kahn et al. also discuss the concept of role expectations because of its implication for the individual in the role. Role expectations are explained as "the prescriptions and proscriptions" held by those who have a stake in the performance of a person in a certain role.

The content of these expectations may include preferences with respect to specific acts and personal characteristics and styles; they may deal with what the person should do, what kind of a person he should be, what he should think or believe, and how he should relate to others. Role expectations are by no means restricted to the job description as it might be given by the head of the organization or prepared by some specialist in personnel, although these individuals are likely to be influential...for many persons in the organization (p. 15).

Another concept which is vital to the idea of role held by Kahn et al. is that of role pressures. These pressures are an attempt to influence the focal person in a role.

Some of these pressures...may be directed toward the accomplishment of formally specified responsibilities and objectives of office. Others...may be directed toward making life easier or more pleasant for the senders themselves. The pressures may come from formal or informal sources; they may or may not be legitimate; in combination they may not conform to anyone's ideal view of the job. They may be prescriptive or proscriptive, punitive or benevolent, subtle and indirect or direct and blatant (p. 15).
A major concern of Kahn et al. as well as others is the conflict and ambiguity which are associated with role. The literature presented about role conflict and ambiguity is gathered from the field of business for in discussing conflict and ambiguity as it is associated with organizations, the ideas in business literature are presented in more specifically defined terms and situations.

Parsons (1951) commented on the significance of role conflict when he stated "exposure to role conflict is an obvious source of strain and frustration in that it creates a situation incompatible with a harmonious integration of personality with the interaction system (p. 282)."

Kahn et al. describe the general situation which surrounds role conflict and ambiguity.

The episode starts with the existence of a set of role expectations held by role senders about a focal person and his behavior on the job.... In fact, each role sender behaves toward the focal person in ways determined by his own expectations and his own anticipations of the focal person's responses.... Role expectations (often) lead to role pressures, but there is no simple isomorphism between them.

To determine the likelihood and nature of sent role pressures, the expectations of each role sender must be investigated separately. To understand the degree of conflict or ambiguity in the role, the total pattern of such expectations and pressures must be considered (p. 26).

There are four different types of role conflict which result from the role pressures on the focal person. Kahn et al. term the first type an intra-sender conflict which is a result of conflicting demands
from a single sender. The second variety, a discrepancy in the demands from two or more senders, is termed an inter-sender conflict. Inter-role conflict, which is listed as the third type, describes the pressure that the focal person experiences because he plays at least two different roles and the pressures for the roles in combination result in conflict. The last type of conflict, person-role, is an internal conflict which is experienced because the sent roles conflict with the needs and values of the focal person (p. 19-20).

The four types of role conflict just presented are not the only results of role pressure. The result of other types of pressure can take more complex forms. One such example is role overload. When a focal person is sent many legitimate expectations but finds it impossible to perform all of the tasks, then role overload exists. The experienced pressure is due to a conflict of priorities. Another complexity occurs when the pressures received by the focal person dictate a change in his role. Because he has already been operating in a set manner for his role, the conflict becomes even greater if a change in role is suggested (p. 20).

The conflict which is generated about the role of the person usually creates a conflict for the person himself according to Kahn et al. While the environmental pressures give rise to a conflict, so do the needs, values, capabilities, and personality of the focal person. The individual characteristics of the focal person affect the expectations of the role senders as they exert pressure. In fact, the unique characteristics of the focal person may determine the kinds of
pressure which the role sender transmits. Kahn et al. also point out that the individual personality variables of the focal person determine how he perceives and deals with the pressures (p. 227-228).

In their research, Kahn et al. examined certain personality variables and their relation to role conflict. They found that under stress a flexible person shows a high level of anxiety and emotional tension. Additionally the flexible person looks to his peers for help. The person displaying rigidity, on the other hand, directs his anxiety toward his environment and increases his dependence on authority figures, compulsive work habits, denial, and projection (p. 301-307).

The personality variable of neuroticism was another researched by Kahn et al. They found that if a person is already exhibiting some signs of neurotic behavior, then conflict and ambiguity will probably strengthen the tendency toward neuroticism. Neuroticism is usually characterized by high sensitivity to a stressful environment and a low degree of stress tolerance. Additionally neurotics have excessive and conflicting motivations, inadequate coping procedures, and a low self-esteem. The findings of the study even suggest that

...in people who are emotionally stable, severe role conflicts can lead to those kinds of cognitive, emotional, and physiological responses which are generally interpreted as symptoms of neurosis...(p. 256-262).

Role conflict has an affect on the organization as well as on the individual. In their writing on the organization, Filley and House (1969) have derived three propositions which are intended to be used as guidelines for the managing of organizations. Proposition three states
that "Role conflict is associated with decreased satisfaction and
decreased organizational effectiveness (p. 300)."

In citing research which contributes to proposition three, a
survey by Seeman (1953) is mentioned. Seeman found that school
executives who were experiencing role conflict had significant
difficulty in making decisions. Gullahorn's study (1956) revealed
that those union members experiencing conflict about their job dis-
played a tendency to view problems unrealistically and to attempt to
do more than could be accomplished. The study by Getzels and Guba
(1954) found that the ineffective teachers were the ones who ex-
perienced the most conflict. A fourth study (Gross, Mason, & McEachern,
1957) found a statistically negative correlation between perceived
role conflict and job satisfaction.

Kahn et al. sum up the difficulty presented for the organization
in stating

One of the great inherent needs of any organization
is dependability of role performance. In the inter-
dependent process of organizational production, each
member must do his part (p. 5).

In referring to organizational stress Kahn et al. include role
ambiguity in addition to role conflict. Role ambiguity occurs when
information about a role is either not known or not communicated to
the focal person. Role ambiguity generally takes one of two forms.
First role ambiguity can result from lack of knowledge about the scope
of responsibility associated with a role. The focal person may not
have information about what he is supposed to do or how to do it. The
second type of ambiguity according to Kahn et al., is that lack of clarity about whose expectations about role the focal person must meet. The focal person needs to determine who the legitimate role sender is (p. 24).

A number of sources of role ambiguity can be identified. Kahn et al. cite three conditions which create ambiguity about role. The first of these is the complexity of modern organizations. In large companies the division of labor is more specialized and differentiated. The fact that size and complexity exceed the individual's span of comprehension probably accounts for much of the role ambiguity found today (p. 75). A second cause is the rate of change within the organization. Kahn states that there are three kinds of changes that pervade today's organization: organizational growth, changes in technology, and frequent personnel changes. The third cause of role ambiguity can be attributed to managerial philosophy. Role ambiguity "may...result from practices and procedures that members develop and persist in quite intentionally (p. 77)." Most organizations have restricted channels of communication and this characteristic lends itself to ambiguity.

Just as role conflict is costly for both the individual and organization, so is role ambiguity. Kahn et al. point out that in order to direct his behavior toward a goal, the person must be able to predict future events. When he is placed in an organizational setting, an individual has only a limited control over the future outcomes which concern him. Still he must be able to know those events which he can
control so that he can focus his attention on producing favorable outcomes. In order to provide this predictability, three conditions must be met. First the individual must be able to anticipate fairly accurately the consequences of his actions. Secondly, he must be aware of the factors which are important to him but not produced by him, and he must know the likelihood of the occurrence of these factors. The third condition which is essential is that the individual must be able to count on stability in a number of surrounding conditions (p. 72).

Specific affects of role ambiguity on the personality of the individual are discussed by Kahn et al. When he is confronted with an ambiguous environment, a person often finds it difficult to form and continue close bonds with others. If the person withdraws entirely from the situation, then the ambiguity becomes more severe. Other characteristic reactions to ambiguity have been found to include tension, anxiety, fear, anger, hostility, and apathy. The eventual affects of this situation can cause emotional tension, decreased satisfaction, a sense of futility, and a loss of self-confidence (p. 84-86).

Tosi and Tosi (1971) studied the affect of role conflict and ambiguity on the job satisfaction of public school teachers. Their findings supported the position taken by Kahn et al. that the costs of role conflict and ambiguity include low satisfaction with the job. They also reported that participation was negatively related to role conflict and role ambiguity.
Since this study is a replication of the study by Kahn et al., it is necessary to note the comments of others about the Kahn et al. study. This discussion serves to substantiate the selection of the Kahn et al. study as one which would be suitable for replication. Its contribution to the frontier of role dynamics in business has been attested to by numerous authors and researchers in the field. A replication in education of such a study could provide for a comparison of role dynamics.

In American Sociological Review, Donald F. Roy sums up the book Organizational Stress in which the research appears by stating that the work by Kahn et al. is certainly thought provoking because it makes a strong attempt to operationalize concepts which were purely theoretical prior to the research. Abraham Zaleznik in American Journal of Sociology states that the social scientists at the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research have traditionally ranked among important contributors to the study of organizational behavior. The authors of Organizational Stress go even further and represent a new contribution in research techniques in the study of leadership, productivity, and organizational change. In reviewing Organizational Stress and its study Zaleznik states that "It works with a wide range of variables, both organizational and individual, and several important research methods (p. 104)." The review concludes by stating that the study marks a departure from the simpler and less sophisticated
research efforts and should be applauded for formalizing an investigation that relates personality and organizational phenomena.

The references made to Kahn and to the Kahn et al. study in various textbooks used in business give further evidence of the importance of the study. Constant reference to the work of Kahn and others at the Institute of Social Research is found in texts especially as the work relates to change, productivity, job satisfaction, and interviewing techniques. With the appearance of Organizational Stress textbooks cite the Kahn et al. study as the only reference for their theories.

In Human Relations at Work: The Dynamics of Organizational Behavior, Davis provides three examples of this heavy reliance on Kahn et al. and their work. The first example of this reliance occurs in discussing the status of the individual within the organization. Organizational Stress is cited as the only source for a detailed discussion of role conflict. Later in presenting ideas on the problems of middle management, Kahn et al. and Organizational Stress is the only research cited thus providing a second example. As the textbook discusses organizational change once again the work by Kahn et al. as it is found in Organizational Stress is the only reference listed.
Summary

The related literature on role theory indicates that the topic is of concern to those writing and researching in various fields. In talking about role, most look to the person in the role and his reaction to other factors such as coworkers, the general environment, and other roles he may perform. An important aspect of role is the conflict and ambiguity which may be associated with it. Particularly that work coming from the field of business examines role conflict and ambiguity as it affects the individual and the organization.

The literature reviewed suggests the importance of the present study. Because role conflict and ambiguity can be detrimental to the individual as well as to the organization, it is an important task to attempt to identify and manage this conflict and ambiguity.

School Counselor's Role Conflict and Ambiguity

When one begins a survey of the literature on the role of the school counselor, he is immediately confronted with the problem of limiting the review. A great deal of literature on the role of the school counselor has been written by authorities such as Wrenn, Patterson, Krumboltz, Hoyt, Williamson, and Arbuckle. Additionally the American School Counselor Association has issued a statement (1964) on the role of the counselor. Because of the unlimited amount of literature available on the subject of school counselor's role and because the attempt in this study was specifically to examine role conflict and ambiguity, the review of literature on school counselor's
role will be focused on that writing which deals with school counselor's role conflict and ambiguity.

In their writing Ivey and Robin (1968) indicate that there are four types of role conflict which are independent of each other. The first type is role conflict stemming from role definers. The authors believe that more research is needed in this area to determine the specific role expectations of the various role definers for a counselor. Ivey and Robin present a research paradigm which includes the major definers of a school counselor's role. These definers are divided into two general classifications: high school social system and other social systems. Those included within the high school social system are students, teachers, and administrators. School boards, parents, community, and counseling profession are listed under other social systems. The school counselor himself is seen as a part of both social systems.

A second type of role conflict discussed is that conflict internal to the role. Ivey and Robin suggest that:

"Research is needed to determine the types of mutually exclusive and contradictory norms frequently found within a counselor's role (p. 232)."

Role conflict arising from the role in interaction with the social system is the third type mentioned. The differing expectations of others in the social system of the school are significant and should be investigated. If the counselor has another role within the school, it should also be studied as to its compatibility with the counselor's role.
The fourth type of role conflict presented by Ivey and Robin is that stemming from the interaction of the individual and his role. The authors state that it is important to investigate personality characteristics which best allow a counselor to assume that role (p. 225-236).

Accepting the position of Ivey and Robin that one type of conflict stems from role definers, it is necessary to investigate who those determiners actually are and what their feelings are about the counselor's role. In attempting to determine who the role definers for a counselor were, Herr and Cramer (1965) surveyed a group in the state of New York. Counselors and counselor educators were found to rank the significant role definers in different order although the overall correlation between the rankings was .531. The list of the significant role definers as seen by the counselors were ranked as follows:

1. Principal  
2. Abilities of counselor  
3. Guidance supervisor  
4. Students  
5. Superintendent

In writing on the determiners of counselor's role, Steward (1961) indicated that there are a variety of criteria that determine what should and should not be included. In his statement, Steward enumerated a few of the determiners:

...school counselors may play many roles, the particular roles determined partly by the administrative assignments, partly by their own competencies, and partly by the social complex within which they work (p. 133).
In their writing Shertzer and Stone (1968) are concerned with role definers and contend that "...much of the current difficulty and confusion surrounding the school counselor's role stems from the contradictory and conflicting expectations of his various publics (p. 130)." In order to illuminate the conflict, they present a brief discussion of opinions of counselors held by pupils, teachers, administrators, and parents.

A study by Tyler (1953) cited by the authors found that students believe the guidance program adds something of value to the school. When pupils are further questioned, however, Gibson (1962) found that they are not really sure why the counselor role exists. In attempting to determine how students viewed the usefulness of the counselor, it was found that the pupils preferred to consult about educational and vocational planning but not about personal-emotional problems.

In general the teachers hold a negative view of the counselor. Pierson's statement (1964) seems to explain the reason for this view:

...it is difficult for the classroom teacher to accept the need for specialists in the school. For to admit that specialists are necessary is to imply that teachers have certain limitations which they are reluctant to face (p. 326).

The discussion in the text of this negative attitude on the part of the teaching staff breaks down into four specific complaints. Many teachers view counselors as another variety of administrator and thus transfer their negative reaction toward administrators to counselors too. The services which counselors provide are regarded as ancillary services and therefore expendable ones. The third point cited is the
belief on the part of the teachers that counselors coddle and pamper incompetent students. The fourth charge by teachers is to the effect that the confidentiality which a counselor claims is only a shield to hide behind when his activities are challenged.

The attitude of administrators toward counselors seems to be a question of the level of confidence they have in the counselor's ability. In his study (1954) Grant found that administrators did not feel counselors were competent to handle personal-emotional problems. Shertzer and Stone suggest that the best indicator of administrative attitude may be the assignment given to a counselor. Many times the assignment approaches a clerical or quasi-administrative assignment. Other studies indicate that the counselor is viewed as a "jack-of-all trades." This position suggests that the administrator may view the counselor as efficient at many things rather than respecting the unique function which the counselor should be serving.

Studies cited in Shertzer and Stone dealing with parent opinions of counselors lead to two general conclusions. First, parents hold an outdated view of the counseling function and tend to view the counselor as one who helps with program planning. Secondly parents see the counselor as only slightly more helpful than the family's best friend (p. 130-137).

While Shertzer and Stone present a general description of the attitudes of four groups who are role definers for the counselor, other writers discuss orientations held by the counselor himself as well as by some of his role definers. The conflict found in these
ideas can translate itself into role conflict and ambiguity for the school counselor.

Dahlem (1969) refers to several studies which have shown role conflict among counselors and particularly between counselors and principals. Studies (Dunlop, 1964 & Schmidt, 1961) have found certain areas of tasks for counselors such as academic counseling, vocational guidance, and testing on which role definers agree. However, Schmidt's research found discrepancy between the counselors' and principals' ideas on the actual and ideal role of a counselor. The study showed that 60 percent of the variation in ideas was unaccounted for. Dunlop also found disagreement among professional educators, parents, and students as to the role of the counselor.

Hitchcock (1953) utilized a questionnaire in attempting to determine the duties counselors believed they should be performing and those which they were actually performing. The study found that many school counselors actually were performing many duties which they felt were not in their domain of responsibilities. Further, it was found that a major discrepancy exists in the amount of time thought appropriate for clerical and administrative tasks by the counselor and the amount of time actually spent on those tasks by the counselor. Hitchcock sums up his findings by stating:

An analysis of duties which counselors are now performing in comparison with what they believe they should not do reveals a striking study of contrasts (p. 72).
An issue frequently raised about the role of the counselor is whether or not the counselor should be a disciplinarian. Gilbert (1968) addresses himself to this topic in a study he conducted. Included in the study were a group of counselors who had some disciplinary responsibility and a group who had no disciplinary responsibility. He found that students view the ideal counseling relationship similarly and are not affected by the actual duties of the counselor. However, it was also found that counselors who have no disciplinary responsibility seem to have a more favorable relationship with the students. The characteristics of this favorable relationship approached the ideal counseling relationship described by the student (p. 245-253).

It is not uncommon for counselors to be assigned to teaching duties on either a part time or substitute basis. Arbuckle (1968) attacks the practice of having a dual counselor-teacher. It is his contention that the counselor must be considered a professional with a specific body of knowledge just as the classroom teacher is considered a professional. He states that there are specific functions and skills required of a counselor which are different than those of a teacher. Arbuckle suggests that there are desirable personality traits for a counselor which may be different than those for a teacher. From his argument it can be concluded that the practice of having a dual counselor-teacher role creates conflict and inefficiency (p. 254-258).
Berdie (1968) concerns himself with seven dogmas surrounding the counseling process which he feels create conflict for new counselors as well as for those who have been practicing for a period of time. The first dogma he presents is that the counselee determines the purposes of the counseling relationship. The author suggests that it is not always possible or necessary to conform to the popularly held opinion. Actually he feels many counseling relationships strive for a rather specific change in behavior rather than a major revision of behavior and that the counselor may feel it advisable to determine that course of action for the counselee.

Thinking that counseling and psychotherapy are the same thing is another belief which Berdie feels should be examined critically. While it may be that many of the same techniques and methods are used, the actual goal and specific process may be different. The author suggests that a counselor may be more successful if he can separate the counseling from psychotherapy.

A third dogma presented is that counselor's values should not influence their counseling. The conflict often created by this dogma is that counselors do have values and many counselors recognize those values, but they do not know how to keep them out of the counseling process. Berdie makes the suggestion that it is more critical to be aware of the values and how they affect the counselor as a person than it is to try to keep them out of the counseling process.

A dogma advocated by psychologists which presents difficulty for counselors in education, psychology, social work, and ministry is that
counseling should be done by psychologists. Berdie points out that there is no evidence to lead one to this conclusion. There have been no findings that one type of background is superior to another in giving counselors skill.

Listed as the fifth dogma by Berdie is the statement that counselor's actions should be determined by their professional code of ethics. The dilemma here involves "...the distinction between professional ethical decisions and professional methodological decisions (p. 242)." Berdie states that some of the frustration surrounding the dogma stems from the counselor's failure to distinguish between what is right and what is effective.

Another belief which gives rise to conflict in counselor's roles is that the effectiveness of counseling depends upon its basis of sound psychological and social theory. As counselors actually counsel, Berdie feels they must realize that one specific theory can be most appropriate for one situation and client and inappropriate for another. It is suggested that the counselor not feel guilty or inadequate in shifting theories when appropriate.

The seventh and final dogma presented is the one stating that counseling must be on a voluntary basis for counseling and discipline do not mix. The author states that this issue must be considered logically. The true meaning of discipline involves educating and training in self-control. Therefore discipline in the true sense of the word has to be involved in the counseling process (p. 236-245).
Another factor which enters into the role conflict and ambiguity felt by a counselor may be the training of a counselor and its effect on the personality of the counselor. This factor might actually detract from the conflict and ambiguity felt by a practicing counselor. Research (Case and Munger, 1966; Kassera and Sease, 1970; Felker and Brown, 1970; Rochester, 1972) has shown that significant personality changes take place during counselor training. Kassera and Sease (1970) used the California Psychological Inventory as one of their instruments and found that after going through a counselor training program, trainees were more accepting of others, less dogmatic, and less authoritarian. Rochester (1972) considered the factors of age and sex in determining attitudes and found that although these variables were significant at the beginning of counselor training, there was no significance to the variables at the end of the training period. Felker and Brown's (1970) comparison of graduate students enrolled in teaching and counseling found significant differences. Counselor trainees were more outgoing, casual, and more interested in immediate solutions than theoretical concerns.

A study by Gruberg (1969) found that at least on personality variable, tolerance of ambiguity has a significant affect on the way a counselor counsels. Those counselors with a low tolerance of ambiguity were found to be more directive, advising, diagnosing, and questioning.

The scope of this study encompasses those counselors working at the elementary school level and therefore it is appropriate to review
some of the literature dealing with counselor's role conflict and ambiguity at that specific level.

While the need for guidance services in the elementary school have been well established, there is disagreement about what the role of the elementary school counselor should be. Some authorities feel that the guidance program in the elementary schools should be a downward extension of the secondary school program. Among these authorities are Miller (1961), Hatch (1961), and Bernard, Evan, and Zeran (1954).

Moore (1971) feels that the elementary counselor should be different from the secondary school counselor in two general areas.

The elementary counselor works directly through the elementary principal. The principal determines, with the counselor's aid, those situations in which the counselor can be of assistance. The line of referral is from the teacher to the principal to the counselor. The primary difference here is that the student usually does not initiate the contact with the counselor. The reverse of this is highly desirable at the secondary level.

A second difference is the shift of emphasis from concentrated work with the student to concentrated work with his environment. This means greater participation on the part of the teachers, parents, other special personnel, the principal, and community agencies (p. 47).

Shertzer and Stone (1966) have expressed their concern over the conflicting expectations held for the counselor at the elementary level. They cite that the need for elementary guidance counselors is so great that
...the demands have produced many conflicting and often unrealistic expectations for counseling services at the elementary school level. The risk inherent in such an unclear situation appears obvious. Non-productive and potentially damaging efforts could be undertaken if for no other reason than that different groups expect different things of such a service (p. 463).

Perhaps Apostal (1963) most clearly states the extent of the conflict involved around the role of the elementary school counselor when he states

Today many questions are being proposed concerning the role and responsibilities of the elementary guidance counselor. And principals, teachers, and parents aren't the only ones asking them. Counselors, and counselor trainees as well, are dramatically concerned with role definition (p. 109).

There is evidence from research of the conflict existing specifically at the elementary school level in the role of the counselor. Foster (1967) attempted to identify functions of the elementary school counselor's role as viewed by elementary school teachers, principals, elementary and secondary school counselors, and counselor educators. He found that teachers and counselor educators displayed the largest difference in how they perceived the role of the elementary school counselor. Foster also found that the major differences surrounded the performance of consultant-type activities versus social work-type activities. The elementary school teachers and counselors agreed that the counselor should be involved in social work-type activities, while the other three groups of educators rated the social work function somewhat lower.
Raines (1964) studied thirty-one elementary school counselors in Ohio. The results of his research show that there was lack of agreement about the role of the elementary school counselor as seen by principals, special service personnel, and counselor educators.

Summary

The review of related literature found in this section of Chapter II focuses specifically on those aspects of school counselor's role which can give rise to role conflict and ambiguity. The writing found in this area covers many aspects of role conflict and ambiguity. One topic of concern is the role definers for the school counselor's role. Theoretical viewpoints as well as specific research on the subject has been included in the review. A second area discussed in the literature involves some general ideas which the counseling profession holds differing views on. The specific problems relating to the elementary school counselor's role conflict and ambiguity comprise the third segment of this discussion.

That material covered in the review of related literature has led to the conclusion that there is a need for the present study. The literature indicates that there are many aspects of the school counselor's role which may give rise to role conflict and ambiguity. As a result of this study, other factors which are associated with the role conflict and ambiguity felt by public school counselors will be illuminated. This knowledge should then assist those who are concerned with school counselor's role conflict and ambiguity in understanding
and beginning to deal with this conflict and ambiguity and their
associated characteristics.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES

Introduction

This chapter contains a discussion of the procedures for the study. First the population of this research is considered. The second section of this chapter deals specifically with the sample used for the study. Next instrumentation of the research is presented. The fourth section discusses data collection and the fifth considers the statistical analysis. A summary concludes the chapter.

Population

The setting for this study was the public schools that serve the entire population of Franklin County, Ohio. Franklin County is located in the central portion of the state of Ohio and has a total population of 833,429 residents living in 538 square miles of land. Foreign born residents account for 2 percent of the population and 5.6 percent are native born with one or both parents of foreign birth. There are 758,895 inhabitants over the age of 5 years; in 1965, 66,049 of these were living in a different county and 64,463 were living in a different state. The labor force of the county over age 16 is comprised of 78 percent of the men and 46 percent of the women in the county. Of the employed 57 percent held white collar jobs and 20 percent were
government workers. The population is 95.5 percent urban in that this percentage of residents live in an area of the county that is classified as non-rural. The median income of Franklin County residents is $10,582 while the mode is $12,036.

Of the residents between the ages of 3 and 34 years 261,259 persons were enrolled in school. Those residents 25 years or older contained 61 percent of the men and 62 percent of the women who were high school graduates. Nine city school districts and one local school district serve the population of Franklin County in addition to private and parochial schools. The public school systems and their total enrollment for the school year 1971-1972 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bexley City Schools</td>
<td>2,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Public Schools</td>
<td>105,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview Heights Public Schools</td>
<td>1,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scioto-Darby City School District</td>
<td>4,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Western City School District</td>
<td>16,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Arlington Schools</td>
<td>9,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerville City School District</td>
<td>8,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall City Schools</td>
<td>5,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington City Schools</td>
<td>6,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Winchester Local Schools</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Local Schools</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Local Schools</td>
<td>5,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Local Schools</td>
<td>6,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Local Schools</td>
<td>1,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynoldsburg Local Schools</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Local Schools</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also located in Franklin County are several institutions of higher education and vocational and technical schools. A list of these includes:
Bliss College
Capital University
Capitol College of Oratory and Music
Columbus Business University
Columbus College of Art and Design
Columbus Drafting College
Columbus Technical Colleges, Inc.
Columbus Technical Institution
Electronic Computer Programming Instruction
Franklin University
Institute of Human Understanding
LaSalle Extension University
MATA College
Methodist Theological Seminary
Nationwide Schools
Ohio Dominican College
Ohio State University
Otterbein College
Pontifical College Josephinum
St. Cecilia School

The population of this study was comprised of the practicing school counselors within the elementary, middle, junior, and senior high schools in the ten school systems listed above. In the fall of 1971 a listing of these counselors was obtained from the State of Ohio Department of Education, Division of Guidance and Testing. This list included the following number of counselors for each system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bexley City Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Public Schools</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview Heights Public Schools</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scioto-Darby City School District</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Western City School District</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Arlington Schools</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerville City School District</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall City Schools</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington City Schools</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin County</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Winchester Local</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Local</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Local</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Local</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Local</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynoldsburg Local</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Local</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus the total population consisted of 204 practicing counselors in the public schools of Franklin County, Ohio. Of this 110 were in high schools, 59 were in junior high or middle schools, and 35 were in elementary schools.

Sample

The sample for this research consisted of 103 public school counselors practicing in the Franklin County, Ohio schools. This sample was obtained by distributing 155 Questionnaires. The attempt was to include all ten school districts and to get a 50 percent representation of the total number of counselors in each school system. It was not possible to gain a commitment from each school district. Therefore, a minimum number of 100 was determined as adequate for the sample. From the 155 Questionnaires distributed and the 103 which were returned, the desired number of 100 Questionnaires to constitute the sample was obtained. Following is a list of the number of Questionnaires returned from each public school system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bexley City Schools</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Public Schools</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview Heights Public Schools</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scioto-Darby City School District</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Western City School District</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Arlington Schools</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerville City School District</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall City Schools</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington City Schools</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin County Schools</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample was comprised of 49 males and 54 females. Their training ranged from one counselor who obtained a bachelor's degree to 102 counselors who possessed master's degrees. Of the total number of 103 in the sample, there were 14 counseling at the elementary
level, 29 at the junior high level, 56 at the senior high level, and 4 in a junior and senior high level combination. The years of counseling experience prior to the current year ranged from 16 counselors with no prior experience, 11 with one year of experience, 30 with two to five years of experience, 21 with six to eight years of experience, to 16 with nine or more years of experience.

The total sample used for this study consisted of over one-half of the total practicing counselors within Franklin County. In all but two cases the sample was made up of at least one-half of the counselors in that particular system. While there is no record of the division of practicing counselors into male and female members, the sample contained approximately one-half of each sex. Additionally, the division of counselors into groups working in elementary, junior high, and senior high schools were represented by approximately one-half of the total population. Therefore the sample can be said to be representative of the total population.

**Instrumentation**

In order to be appropriate, the instrument used for this study had to fulfill certain requirements. These were:

1. The instrument must provide some information about the general characteristics of the sample population

2. The instrument must provide a measure of role conflict and/or role ambiguity among the sample population

3. The instrument must provide a measure of the variables of sex, age, counseling assignment, years of previous counseling experience, size
of school, neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, dependence, and absenteeism among the sample population.

To meet the above requirements a Questionnaire was devised. A complete copy of the Questionnaire is found in Appendix A. It was comprised of two sections: a general information sheet and a 100 item checklist. The first section, general information, contained seven items about the participant: sex, age, education and certification, counseling assignment, years of previous counseling experience, size of school in which participant is counseling, and number of days absent during current school year.

The second section consisted of 100 items. Statements 1 through 20 provided two subscales, one for role conflict and one for role ambiguity. These subscales were developed by Tosi and Tosi from an original scale of thirty items developed by Rizzo and House. A seven point scoring scale with responses ranging from "very true" to "very false" was checked by the respondents.

It should be noted that the subscales by Tosi and Tosi were found to show a strong parallel to the a priori concepts of role conflict and role ambiguity as discussed by Kahn et al. The measurement of conflict and ambiguity in the Kahn et al. study was a structured list of questions used in a personal interview situation. The participants answered by using one of four or five responses provided for each question. Thus the Tosi and Tosi subscales provided the same types of answers in a written form.
The remaining 80 items provided subscales for neuroticism, tolerance, flexibility, and dependence. Each of these subscales were taken directly from the instrument developed by Kahn et al. Kahn's original instrument consisted of 323 items and 25 scales. The items on the Kahn et al. instrument were drawn from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the California Psychological Inventory, Cattell's IPAT anxiety test and 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire, the Cornell Medical Index, the Bernreuter Personality Inventory, and from previous work at the Institute for Social Research. The four subscales -- neuroticism, tolerance, flexibility, and dependence -- used in this study comprise the 80 items. Each of the subscales were factor analyzed by Kahn et al. and the four used in this study seem to be relatively independent of each other. The factor loadings for the subscales used in the research are as follows:

- Neuroticism: 0.48
- Tolerance: 0.41
- Flexibility: 0.76
- Dependence: -0.37

Regarding the first of the four subscales used for this study, twenty-nine items originally from the Bernreuter Personality Inventory made up the neuroticism subscale. Respondents checked the appropriate response on a three point scoring scale which most often contained "yes" and "no" as the extremes.

The second subscale, tolerance, contained 24 items which were part of the California Psychological Inventory. Most items had two possible responses: "true" or "false."
Also taken from the CPI were the 19 items measuring flexibility, the third subscale. A two point scale consisting of "true" and "false" was used for these items.

The last subscale, dependence, contains 8 items initially taken from an instrument developed at the Institute for Social Research. Responses were recorded on a five point scale ranging from "very much" or "extremely" to "not at all."

**Data Collection**

Three general methods were used to distribute and collect the Questionnaires used for this research. Counselors in the Franklin County, Worthington, and Bexley school systems received through the mail a copy of the Questionnaire, a Cover Letter addressed to them individually, and a return envelope with postage. The Cover Letter stated the purpose of the research and gave instructions for completing and returning the Questionnaire. A copy of the Cover Letter appears in Appendix B. These instruments were returned through the mail by the individual completing them.

In the Columbus Public Schools the Cover Letter, a copy of the Questionnaire, and return envelope with postage were handed out at a system-wide counselors' meeting by a member of the administrative staff. The information in the Cover Letter was identical and the Questionnaires were returned by the individual.

In the remaining school districts, the Cover Letters and copies of the Questionnaire were delivered in person or by mail to one counselor in each school. This person then passed out the packet to
the other counselors and collected the instruments after they were completed.

Of the total of 155 Questionnaires which were sent out with the intent of obtaining 100 completed Questionnaires, 103 were received. This represents a 66 percent distribution. The 52 Questionnaires which were not included in the study were omitted because the counselors receiving these Questionnaires did not return them.

The 103 Questionnaires used as the data for this study represent over one-half of the total number of counselors practicing in Franklin County, Ohio. Questionnaires were obtained from nine of the ten school districts and at least one-half of the counselors in eight systems were included. Additionally the sample includes over one-half of the total number of junior and senior high school counselors and is shy by only 3 Questionnaires of representing one-half of the total number of elementary school counselors.

Statistical Analysis

When the 103 Questionnaires were returned, the information on the Questionnaire was tabulated. A total of 14 categories of information was prepared for each Questionnaire. Each of the scores were transferred to an IBM card. The raw scores for each participant can be found in Appendix C.

There were a total of 103 IBM cards prepared and a multiple regression analysis was run on them. The program used is known as BMD02R - Stepwise Regression - January 29, 1970 Revision, Health Sciences Computing Facility, U.C.L.A. This program was run in three
parts. Each problem considered one dependent variable and ten independent variables. The dependent variables were role conflict, role ambiguity, and role stress. The ten independent variables were held constant through the three problems and included sex, age, counseling assignment, previous experience, size of school, absenteeism, dependence, tolerance, flexibility, and neuroticism.

The technique of multiple correlation was chosen because it permits the consideration of one variable in association with more than one other variable at any given time. This type of correlation made it possible to consider the dependent variable and any combination of the ten independent variables which might be associated with it.

**Summary**

This chapter begins by discussing the characteristics of the population for this research and then focuses specifically on the sample. A discussion of the various parts of the instrumentation is included along with a presentation of the source of these instruments. The methods used for data collection are presented and then the multiple regression technique used for statistical analysis is considered.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the factors of role conflict, role ambiguity, and role stress as they relate to other characteristics of public school counselors in Franklin County, Ohio. The specific characteristics of public school counselors which were examined include the age of the counselor; the sex of the counselor; the number of years of counseling experience which the counselor had prior to the school year 1971-1972; the counselor's assignment to an elementary, junior high, or senior high school; the size of the school in which the counselor was practicing; the number of days the counselor was absent during the 1971-1972 school year; and the counselor's score on scales intended to measure neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence.

Specifically the research questions addressed by this study are:

1. What is the relationship between the dependent variable of role conflict and the independent variables of age, sex, years of previous counseling experience, counseling assignment, size of school, absenteeism for the school year 1971-1972, neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence?
2. What is the relationship between the dependent variable of role ambiguity and the independent variables of age, sex, years of previous counseling experience, counseling assignment, size of school, absenteeism for the school year 1971-1972, neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence?

3. What is the relationship between the dependent variable of role stress and the independent variables of age, sex, years of previous counseling experience, counseling assignment, size of school, absenteeism for the school year 1971-1972, neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence?

The population of this study consisted of the practicing school counselors within the elementary, middle, junior, and senior high schools in ten school districts: Bexley City Schools, Columbus Public Schools, Grandview Heights Public Schools, Scioto-Darby City School District, South-Western City School District, Upper Arlington Schools, Westerville City School District, Whitehall City Schools, Worthington City Schools, and Franklin County Schools.

The sample for this research was composed of 103 school counselors practicing in the Franklin County, Ohio schools listed above. The responses from the sample were obtained on a Questionnaire which had a general information sheet and a 100 item checklist.
The discussion of the findings is organized as follows. First a section is presented which considers each of the dependent and independent variables along with the mean score, the standard deviation, and a discussion of the range of scores for that variable. Sections two, three, and four each consider one of the research questions and present the statistical findings on that question. The discussion is organized around the procedure which was used in the multiple regression analysis program selected for this study. In each section one of the dependent variables, role conflict, role ambiguity, or role stress, is related to each of the ten independent variables.

**Summary of Dependent and Independent Variables**

In order to examine the variables being discussed in this study, it was necessary to arrive at a score for the three dependent variables and the ten independent variables. In analyzing the data presented, the computer provided a mean score and a standard deviation for each variable. Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations, and range of scores arrived at among the sample for each variable.
TABLE 1

MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND RANGE OF SCORES
FOR DEPENDENT AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.52427</td>
<td>0.50185</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.26214</td>
<td>1.03811</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>1.50485</td>
<td>0.81498</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>2.11650</td>
<td>1.23114</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of School</td>
<td>4.90291</td>
<td>0.34740</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>2.67961</td>
<td>2.49002</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>21.21358</td>
<td>3.51089</td>
<td>9-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>23.72815</td>
<td>5.39823</td>
<td>12-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>13.31068</td>
<td>4.18218</td>
<td>3-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-30.22330</td>
<td>37.28766</td>
<td>-83-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>35.70872</td>
<td>13.22917</td>
<td>12-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
<td>30.25243</td>
<td>5.32422</td>
<td>18-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>65.9612</td>
<td>11.6392</td>
<td>35-109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The factor of sex on the Questionnaire gave two choices: male and female. Male was scored as 0 and female as 1. The mean of .52 indicates that there was almost a 50 percent representation of each sex. On the Questionnaire the categories and their weights for age were as follows: 20-30 (0), 21-40 (1), 41-50 (2), 51-60 (3), and Over 60 (4). The mean age among the sample, 1.26, was slightly above the 31 to 40 bracket.

Three choices were originally provided for counseling assignment: elementary weighed 0, junior high weighed 1, and senior high weighed 2. After the Questionnaires were returned it was necessary to add a junior-senior high assignment with the weight of 3. The scores averaged out
at the junior or senior high assignment with a mean of 1.50. Years of previous counseling experience were listed and scored as follows: None (0), One (1), Two to Five (2), Six to Eight (3), and Nine and Over (4). The mean of 2.11 indicates the average experience was two to five years. Size of school listed six choices: 1-50, 51-100, 101-200, 201-300, 301-400, and 401 or more. They were weighed from 0 to 5. The mean of 4.92 showed that the average size was almost 401 or more.

Eleven choices were listed for days absent. They were listed and scored from 0 days absent, scored as 0 through 10 or more days absent, scored as 10. The mean of 2.67 indicates that the average days absent was 2½.

While it is possible to report the range and mean for the remaining four independent and three dependent variables, it is impossible to discuss their significance. No comparison data are available and therefore the scores are merely reported as they appear in the sample and are not interpreted.

The Dependence subscale consisting of 8 items were recorded on a five point scale from "very much" scored as 5 to "not at all" scored as 1. Possible scores ranged from 8 to 40; the mean of 21.21 would indicate no apparent tendency toward independence among the sample. The weights for responses to the 24 items measuring Tolerance were 0 for "yes" or "true," 1 for "no" or "false," and 9 for "in between." Possible scores ranged from 0 to 40 and the mean of 23.72 did not indicate an apparent strong tendency in either direction. The 19 items measuring Flexibility were answered "true" (0 points) and "false"
Potential scores could range between 0 and 19 and the mean of 13.31 indicated an apparent tendency toward flexibility. The Neuroticism subscale consisting of 29 items was measured by a wide range of weights for various types of three choice responses usually containing "yes" and "no" as the extremes. The potential range of scores was -115 or low neurotic to 164 or high neurotic. The actual scores showed a wide range with the mean of -30.22 toward the non-neurotic end of the scale.

Although the study was not intended to measure conflict, ambiguity, and stress as such, scores were provided for these dependent variables in order to correlate them with the independent variables. Role conflict was measured by a seven point weighing system ranging from 6 for "very true" to 0 for "very false." Potential variance of individual scores was 0 to 72. The actual range was from 12 to 70 with a mean of 35.70. Ambiguity was measured on the seven point scale weighing system ranging from 6 for "very true" to 0 for "very false." Potential scores were 0 and 48 and the range was 18 to 45. The mean score was 30.25. Role stress was the sum of the scores on role conflict and role ambiguity. The possible ranges were 0 and 120, and the actual range was 35 to 109 with a mean of 65.96.

**Role Conflict**

What is the relationship between the dependent variable of role conflict and the independent variables of age, sex, years of previous counseling experience, counseling assignment, size of school, absentee-
ism for the school year 1971-1972, neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence?

In order to consider the research question posed about role conflict, the multiple regression analysis used for this study began by providing a correlation between the dependent variables of role conflict and each of the ten independent variables. Table 2 presents the correlations which were found between role conflict and each independent variable and the F ratio for each variable run.

**TABLE 2**

**CORRELATION MATRIX AND COMPUTED F RATIOS FOR ROLE CONFLICT AND TEN INDEPENDENT VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>1.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>1.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of School</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>-0.0103</td>
<td>1.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>1.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>1.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first independent variable selected for analysis on the basis of its correlation with role conflict was neuroticism. An analysis of variance for neuroticism with role conflict is shown in Table 3.
TABLE 3

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR
NEUROTICISM AND ROLE CONFLICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>308.480</td>
<td>308.480</td>
<td>1.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>17542.633</td>
<td>173.689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since an F ratio of 2.92 was needed for significance at the .05 level, there was no significance to neuroticism as it correlated with role conflict. The other nine factors had even lower correlation with role conflict than neuroticism and therefore were not significant at the .05 level. Since this research was conducted in a social environment, the findings were also examined at the .10 level of significance. There was no significant correlation found at this level.

Table 4 contains the multiple regression summary table for role conflict and the ten independent variables.
TABLE 4
MULTIPLE REGRESSION SUMMARY
TABLE FOR ROLE CONFLICT AND FIVE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>Multiple R^2</th>
<th>Increase in R^2</th>
<th>F Value to Enter or Remove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.1315</td>
<td>0.0173</td>
<td>0.0173</td>
<td>1.7760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>0.1917</td>
<td>0.0368</td>
<td>0.0195</td>
<td>2.0223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.2108</td>
<td>0.0444</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
<td>0.7959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.2237</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>0.5779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>0.2303</td>
<td>0.0530</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
<td>0.3056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Role Ambiguity

What is the relationship between the dependent variable of role ambiguity and the independent variables of age, sex, years of previous counseling experience, counseling assignment, size of school, absenteeism for the school year 1971-1972, neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence?

In attempting to answer the second research question dealing with the dependent variable of role ambiguity and the ten independent variables, once again a correlation was run between the dependent variable and independent variables. Table 5 presents the correlations which were found and the F ratios which were computed.
### TABLE 5
**CORRELATION MATRIX AND COMPUTED F RATIOS FOR ROLE AMBIGUITY AND TEN INDEPENDENT VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>3.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>2.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>5.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of School</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>3.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>2.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>1.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
<td>4.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>2.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-0.218</td>
<td>4.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The order in which the independent variables were considered was based on the correlation with ambiguity and the first independent variable considered was experience. It was found to be significant at the .05 level. Neuroticism, the second variable considered, was also significant at the .05 level. The third independent variable, tolerance, was found to be significant at the .05 level. Significance at the .05 level was also found for sex, size of school, age, flexibility, and absenteeism. No relationship was found between ambiguity and the other two independent variables. Table 6 shows the analysis of variance for role ambiguity and tolerance.
TABLE 6
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TOLERANCE AND ROLE AMBIGUITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>349.494</td>
<td>116.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2541.931</td>
<td>25.676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to predict role ambiguity on the basis of scores for experience, neuroticism, and tolerance, the following formula can be used for this study. Regression weights on which the formula is based can be found in Appendix D.

\[
\hat{y} = 31.98215 + 1.00219 X_4 + (-0.19965) X_8 + (-0.02933) X_{10}
\]

The predictive significance was determined to end with the variable of tolerance since the amount of variance accounted for beyond that factor was so low. Table 7 shows the multiple regression summary table for role ambiguity and nine independent variables.
TABLE 7
MULTIPLE REGRESSION SUMMARY
TABLE FOR ROLE AMBIGUITY AND
NINE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Sq</th>
<th>Increase in R Sq</th>
<th>F Value to Enter or Remove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>0.2198</td>
<td>0.0483</td>
<td>0.0483</td>
<td>5.1282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.2870</td>
<td>0.0823</td>
<td>0.0340</td>
<td>3.7078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>0.3477</td>
<td>0.1209</td>
<td>0.0385</td>
<td>4.3386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.3733</td>
<td>0.1393</td>
<td>0.0185</td>
<td>2.1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Size of School</td>
<td>0.3831</td>
<td>0.1468</td>
<td>0.0075</td>
<td>0.8475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.3863</td>
<td>0.1492</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>0.2716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>0.3876</td>
<td>0.1502</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>0.1134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>0.3887</td>
<td>0.1511</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td>0.1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>0.3891</td>
<td>0.1514</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Role Stress

What is the relationship between the dependent variable of role stress and the independent variables of age, sex, years of previous counseling experience, counseling assignment, size of school, absenteeism for the school year 1971-1972, neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence?

As previously mentioned, the third dependent variable which was role stress was derived by combining the scores for role conflict and role ambiguity. The first step in answering the research question concerning the relationship between role stress and the ten independent variables was to assess the correlation between role stress and each of the variables. Table 8 presents these correlations along with the F ratios
which were computed.

TABLE 8
CORRELATION MATRIX AND COMPUTED F RATIOS FOR ROLE STRESS AND TEN INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>3.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>2.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of School</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>1.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>0.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variable of sex was considered first since it had the highest correlation with role stress. Table 9 presents the analysis of variance for sex and role stress.

TABLE 9
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SEX AND ROLE STRESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.827</td>
<td>4.827</td>
<td>3.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>141.988</td>
<td>1.406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The F ratio was not significant for sex and role stress at the .05 level. Since correlations for the other independent variables were lower than that for sex, there was no significance at the .05 level found for any of the ten independent variables and role stress. Once again because of the social nature of the research, the findings were examined at the .10 level. A positive correlation between sex and role stress was found at this level. However, the .05 level was maintained for significance of findings and the .10 is interesting to note simply as a direction of findings.

Table 10 presents the multiple regression summary table for role stress and five independent variables.

**TABLE 10**

MULTIPLE REGRESSION SUMMARY TABLE
FOR ROLE STRESS AND FIVE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Sq</th>
<th>Increase in R Sq</th>
<th>F Value to Enter or Remove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.1813</td>
<td>0.0329</td>
<td>0.0329</td>
<td>3.4338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>0.2009</td>
<td>0.0404</td>
<td>0.0075</td>
<td>0.7812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.2141</td>
<td>0.0458</td>
<td>0.0054</td>
<td>0.5645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>0.2209</td>
<td>0.0488</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
<td>0.3074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>0.2254</td>
<td>0.0508</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>0.2027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

This chapter begins with a brief introduction to the study in which the research questions are posed. Next a discussion of the dependent and independent variables is presented. Included in it are the mean, standard deviation, and range of scores for each variable along with a discussion of what each score represents.

In running a multiple regression analysis on the data collected for this study, the program was divided into three questions. Question one dealt with role conflict as the dependent variable. Question two compared role ambiguity with the independent variables. The third dependent variable of role stress was considered as the last question. The findings of this study can be summarized as follows:

1. There is no significant relationship between the dependent variable of role conflict and the independent variables of sex, age, experience, assignment, size of school, absenteeism, neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence.

2. There is a significant relationship between the dependent variable of role ambiguity and the independent variables of experience, neuroticism, and tolerance. There is no significant relationship between role ambiguity and sex, age, assignment, size of school, absenteeism, flexibility, and dependence.

3. There is no significant relationship between the dependent variable of role stress and the independent variables of sex, age, experience, assignment, size of school, absenteeism, neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final chapter of this study is divided into three sections. In the first section the study is briefly reviewed. Presenting the implications drawn from the data obtained is the concern of the second segment. Finally recommendations for further study conclude the chapter.

Summary of the Study

Formal organizations, such as the public schools, are a major component of today's society. The individual is an important ingredient in the organization. As an individual attempts to function in the formal organization, he sometimes finds that he is in conflict with the organization. One source of this conflict between individual and organization is the role of the individual. Two basic kinds of conflict arise around role. One is actual role conflict where there is a lack of agreement within or among people as to the role of an individual. The second kind is role ambiguity which exists when there is a lack of clarity about the role of the individual.

In this research the public school counselors were studied as a representative of the individual functioning in the formal organization.
The purpose of the study was to determine if role conflict and ambiguity do exist within the school counselor role and if they do in fact exist, how those who experience conflict and ambiguity differ from those who do not experience conflict and ambiguity. The specific differences considered were the age of the counselor; the sex of the counselor; the number of years of counseling experience which the counselor had prior to the school year 1971-1972; the counselor's assignment to an elementary, junior high, or senior high school; the size of the school in which the counselor is practicing; the number of days the counselor was absent during the 1971-1972 school year; and the counselor's score on scales intended to measure neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence.

This research consists of an effort to replicate research already conducted by Kahn et al. In considering the findings which Kahn et al. presented on the variables which they studied, four were selected as being most applicable to the school setting being considered in this research. These four are neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence.

The research question addressed by this study was: What independent variables singly and in combination are most highly associated with role conflict, role ambiguity, and role stress? The independent variables of this study are age, sex, years of previous counseling experience, counseling assignment, size of school, absenteeism for the school year 1971-1972, neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence. The dependent variables are role conflict, role ambiguity, and role stress.
A review of the literature was conducted in two areas which were pertinent to this study. Literature on the subject of role theory indicated that role is of great concern to those writing and researching in various fields of study. Particularly the work coming from business administration examines the concepts of role conflict and role ambiguity as it affects the individual and the organization. The second area in which literature was reviewed, school counselor's role conflict and ambiguity, was considered. Specifically concerned with those aspects of school counselor's roles which can cause conflict or ambiguity, the literature presents a number of aspects such as the definers of school counselor's role and the differing views on role held by the counseling profession. A segment of the discussion is focused on the role of the elementary counselor since there are some unique aspects of that role.

The setting for this study was the public schools that serve the total population of Franklin County, Ohio. Franklin County is located in the central portion of the state and has a total of 833,429 residents. Nine city school districts and one local school district serve the population of Franklin County. The public school systems are: Bexley City Schools, Columbus Public Schools, Grandview Heights Public Schools, Scioto-Darby City School District, South-Western City School District, Upper Arlington Schools, Westerville City School District, Whitehall City Schools, Worthington City Schools, and Franklin County Schools.

The population of this study was comprised of the practicing school counselors within the elementary, middle, junior, and senior high schools
in the ten school systems listed above. In the fall of 1971 a listing of these counselors was obtained from the State of Ohio Department of Education, Division of Guidance and Testing. The total population consisted of 204 practicing counselors in the public schools of Franklin County, Ohio. Of this 110 were in high schools, 59 were in junior high or middle schools, and 35 were in elementary schools.

The sample for this research consisted of 103 public school counselors practicing in the Franklin County, Ohio Schools. This sample was obtained by distributing 155 Questionnaires. The attempt was to include all ten school districts and to get a 50 percent representation of the total number of counselors in each school system. It was not possible to gain a commitment from each school district. Therefore, a minimum number of 100 was determined as adequate for the sample. From the 155 Questionnaires distributed and the 103 which were returned, the desired number of 100 Questionnaires to constitute the sample was obtained.

The sample was composed of 49 males and 54 females. Their training ranged from one counselor who obtained a bachelor's degree to 102 counselors who possessed master's degrees. Of the total number of 103 in the sample, there were 14 counseling at the elementary level, 29 at the junior high level, 56 at the senior high level, and 4 in a junior and senior high level combination. The years of counseling experience prior to the current year ranged from 16 counselors with no prior experience, 11 with one year of experience, 39 with two to five years of experience, 21 with six to eight years of experience, to 16 with nine or more years of experience.
The instrument used for the study had to fulfill certain requirements. These were: 1) to provide some information about the general characteristics of the sample population; 2) to provide a measure of role conflict and role ambiguity among the sample population; and 3) to provide a measure of the variables of sex, age, counseling assignment, years of previous counseling experience, size of school, neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, dependence, and absenteeism among the sample.

To meet these requirements a Questionnaire was devised. A complete copy of the Questionnaire is found in Appendix A. It was comprised of two sections: a general information sheet and a 100 item checklist. The first section, general information, contained seven items about the participant: sex, age, education and certification, counseling assignment, years of previous counseling experience, size of school in which participant is counseling, and number of days absent during current school year.

The second section consisted of 100 items. Statements 1 through 20 provided two subscales, one for role conflict and one for role ambiguity. The remaining 80 items provided subscales for neuroticism, tolerance, flexibility, and dependence. Each of these subscales were taken directly from the instrument developed by Kahn et al. The items on Kahn's instrument were drawn from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the California Psychological Inventory, Cattell's IPAT anxiety test and 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire, the Cornell Medical Index, the Bernreuter Personality Inventory, and from previous
work at the Institute for Social Research. The four subscales -- neuroticism, tolerance, flexibility, and dependence -- used in this study comprise the 80 items. Each of the subscales were factor analyzed by Kahn et al. and the four used in this study seem to be relatively independent of each other.

Three general methods were used to distribute and collect the Questionnaires employed in this research. The counselors in the Franklin County, Worthington, and Bexley schools received through the mail the Questionnaire, Cover Letter, and return envelope. In the Columbus Public Schools the Questionnaire, Cover Letter, and return envelope were handed out at a system-wide counselors' meeting. In the remaining school districts the Questionnaires and Cover Letters were delivered to one counselor in each school who then passed out the packets to the other counselors and collected them when they were completed. Of the total 155 Questionnaires which were sent out with the intent of obtaining 100 completed Questionnaires, 103 were received. This represents a distribution of 66 percent.

The data obtained from these 103 Questionnaires completed by the practicing school counselors within the public schools of Franklin County, Ohio comprised the data for this study. The data were tabulated into 14 categories and transferred to an IBM card. These cards were then run on a multiple regression analysis program. The technique of multiple correlation was chosen because it makes it possible to examine one variable in association with more than one other variable at the same time. Actual relationships are seldom as simple as the connection
of one variable to only one other variable. Therefore it was desirable to use the technique which permitted a survey of a number of independent variables which might be associated with one dependent variable.

In the multiple regression program, the run was divided into three questions. Each of the questions considered the same ten independent variables but altered the dependent variable. Question one considered role conflict. The findings concerning role conflict indicated that there is no significant correlation between the factor of role conflict and the variables of age, sex, years of previous counseling experience, counseling assignment, size of school, absenteeism, neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and dependence.

The second question considered role ambiguity and the independent variables. A significant relationship was found between role ambiguity and the factors of experience, neuroticism, and tolerance. No significance was indicated for the other variables.

The third question looked at the relationship between role stress and the independent variables. There was no significant correlation between role stress and the independent variables of sex, age, experience, assignment, size of school, neuroticism, flexibility, tolerance, and flexibility.

**Implications of the Study**

It has been concluded that there are no significant relationships among the factors being considered in this study. Yet research has indicated that there were correlations among the same factors when other
populations were studied. For example, Kahn et al. (1964) found that his subjects exhibited very specific personality responses to stress. Those subjects already showing signs of neuroticism had their tendency toward the characteristic strengthened because of conflict and ambiguity. Subjects who were emotionally stable began to show neurosis symptoms under severe conflict. The same research showed that tension, anxiety, fear, anger, hostility, and apathy can all be a result of role ambiguity. Tosi and Tosi (1971) found that public school teachers experienced low job satisfaction and negative participation as a result of role conflict and ambiguity.

Theoretical writing by many authors indicate that there are a number of sources of role conflict and ambiguity associated with school counselor's role. Ivey and Robin (1968) and Shertzer and Stone (1968) discuss the problem of role definers and cite the area as a cause of conflict. Research indicates that role conflict exists for school counselors. Hitchcock's study (1953) indicated that counselors were performing many duties which they felt were not appropriate. Dahlem (1969) refers to several studies which have shown role conflict among counselors and particularly between counselors and principals. Schmidt's research (1961) found discrepancy between the counselors' and principals' ideas on the actual and ideal role of a counselor. The study showed that 60 percent of the variation in ideas was unaccounted for. Dunlop (1964) also found disagreement among professional educators, parents, and students as to the role of the counselor.
In light of the above information, it seems crucial to look for some possible explanations for the lack of significant findings associated with this study. Potential reasons lie in two areas: factors internal to the study and factors external to the study. Among those internal factors are considerations such as sample, instrumentation, and data collection. External factors include the influence of The Ohio State University, the influence of the local guidance counselor's association and the State Department of Education, the consideration of the actual role being performed by counselors, the nature of the counselor education training program, and the environment of business as compared to the environment of the school.

Another aspect internal to the study which might provide some explanation for the lack of findings is the instrumentation. The same instruments had been used in other research on other populations and resulted in significant findings. Still there are two possible explanations in the area of instrumentation. Because school counselors are generally familiar with standardized tests, it is possible that they may have either recognized specific items on the Questionnaire or may have resented what they felt to be the implications of certain items on the Questionnaire. Thus the instrument may not have been appropriate for this particular sample. A second possibility lies in the fact that the Questionnaire actually took only a few minutes to complete if instructions were followed but still seemed to be lengthy since it consisted of eleven pages. The sample may not have given to each item the minimum attention which was required for proper completion of the Questionnaire.
A third difficulty internal to the study was the plan for data collection. This aspect might have affected the findings on absenteeism. Since the data was collected before the school year was completed, the absenteeism figures represent days not in attendance at school for only a portion of the school year. If the data had been collected after the termination of the year, the findings might have differed.

The first area to consider external to this particular study is the influence that The Ohio State University exerts on schools in Franklin County. Ohio State is the only university in the central region of Ohio that offers a graduate degree program in guidance and counseling in education. Since the State Department of Education requires a graduate degree in counseling in order for certification, it would seem reasonable to assume that a large number of the counselors in Franklin County received their training at Ohio State. Because they have come from the same training program, counselors in Franklin County may hold very similar attitudes about the role of the counselor.

A second major area which might explain the discrepancy between the findings of this study and those of other studies is the influence of the State Department of Education, Division of Guidance and Testing and the Central Ohio Personnel and Guidance Association. Headquarters for the Division of Guidance and Testing are in Columbus, Ohio. Because of its proximity, many of the personnel within the division are actively involved with school in the area and with the university. Three way communication between the State Department, the university, and the local
schools takes place and thus may reduce conflicts and uncertainties about the role of the counselor. This three way communication may also be carried to other role determiners within the public schools.

The presence of a local professional organization for counselors could be a factor in facilitating communication among counselors in various systems. Additionally it must give to counselors a professional identity and a vehicle of some importance for taking an active part in legislation, policy decisions of the State Department, and other activities which are of concern to practicing counselors.

Another area which needs to be considered in explaining the lack of findings in this study is the actual role which the counselors in the sample were performing. This particular study made no attempt to assess what the counselors were doing in their role. It is possible that if a Q-sort test had been conducted with this sample, differences might have been found. The counselors in the sample might have been reacting to their particular situation in one of three ways; they might have been doing what they were told to do, they might have been doing only those things around which no conflict or ambiguity exists, or they might have been doing those things which were congruent with their personality.

Studies (Dunlop, 1964 and Schmidt, 1961) have shown that there are areas of tasks for counselors such as academic counseling, vocational guidance, and testing on which role definers agree. The disagreement as to role may center around other activities such as personal counseling and administrative - clerical tasks. It is entirely possible that, due
to time constraints and the numbers of students they must deal with, the counselors in the study were performing only those tasks on which there existed little or no conflict. A study by Gruberg (1969) found that at least one personality variable, tolerance of ambiguity, has a significant effect on the way a counselor counsels. Those counselors with a low tolerance of ambiguity were found to be more directive, advising, diagnosing, and questioning. They also talked more during the interview. In light of these findings, it is possible to speculate that counselors in their actual day to day activities adjust themselves to their external environment and conduct those counseling activities which are congruent with their personality and specific situation.

One final possibility, the nature of the counselor training program, needs to be explored as a possible explanation for the results of this study. There are certain general ingredients in counselor training programs, one of which is the emphasis on personal analysis of the trainee. Counselor trainees are given the opportunity to learn about themselves as persons; to recognize their needs, abilities, and personal characteristics; and to examine how those personal aspects affect them in their role as a counselor.

Research (Case and Munger, 1966; Kassera and Sease, 1970; Felker and Brown, 1970; Rochester, 1972) have shown that significant personality changes take place during counselor training. Kassera and Sease (1970) used the California Psychological Inventory as one of their instruments and found that after going through a counselor training program, trainees were more accepting of others, less dogmatic, and less authoritarian.
Rochester (1972) considered the factors of age and sex in determining attitudes and found that although these variables were significant at the beginning of counselor training, there was no significance to the variables at the end of the training period. Felker and Brown's (1970) comparison of graduate students enrolled in teaching and counseling found significant differences. Counselor trainees were more outgoing, casual, and more interested in immediate solutions than theoretical concerns.

On the basis of this information it seems that the counselor training program does have an affect on the individual counselor and may assist the person in dealing more effectively with conflict and ambiguity.

One final factor which must be considered is that the general environment of business differs from the general environment of the public school. If this is true, then the role dynamics in business may not be comparable to those in the public school and therefore the individual's reaction to role conflict, ambiguity, and stress may not be the same in the two environments. The potential differences between business and public schools can be divided into two areas: the hierarchical structure of the two environments and the educational levels of the personnel in the two environments.

Business, especially those businesses operating on a large scale, have a wide dimension on the hierarchical chart ranging from top management to the lowest level on the line. Accompanying this broad hierarchical structure in larger businesses are formalized policies dealing
with aspects of the organization such as channels of communication and chain of command. The individual generally has a very limited degree of autonomy and the opportunities for participatory management generally decrease the farther down the ladder one looks. Goals, standards, and methods are most likely determined for an individual by a superior rather than by the individual himself. In this type of environment the informal group can become a strong tie for the employee and have a great influence on his attitude toward the organization. The combination of all of the above factors may cause an individual to exhibit very strong responses to role conflict, ambiguity, and stress.

On the other hand, most public schools have a more narrow hierarchical structure. Size alone can account for this fact; even large city school districts are operated at the individual school level and the effects of the size of the school may not be experienced by the majority of the individuals within that school system. While some formalized policies are certainly a part of the public school, it can be theorized that these policies, particularly about channels of communication, are not as formal as those found in business. Within the public school the individual has the opportunity to operate with more autonomy. Often decisions as to goals, standards, and methods are left up to the individual; the informal structure may not be as apparent or important as it is in business. If for no other reason then mere size, public schools probably offer a greater chance for participatory management and the total difference between the two environments causes the public school fewer manifestations of role conflict, ambiguity, and stress.
A vital part of the differences between the environment of business and school mentioned above is the educational level of the personnel found in each. A wide variety of educational levels would be expected in business. A certain amount of the hierarchy of the business world in fact is based on that educational distinction. It would not be uncommon for the top and bottom positions on the hierarchy to be separated by ten years of education. Thus the distinctions by level become even more apparent and perhaps more conclusive to role conflict, ambiguity, and stress.

Education, however, shows a much stronger unanimity of educational level. While some of the hierarchical structure may be based on the difference in education, it does not play a major role in determining where an individual is in the hierarchy. The average educational difference between individuals in public schools is probably not more than two or three years. Perhaps because of their educational level, the individuals employed by a public school are subjected to less hierarchical red tape, are given the opportunity to become an integral part of the organization, and are less prone to certain manifestations of role conflict, ambiguity, and stress.

Recommendations

The present study was designed to test general findings about role conflict and ambiguity against the specific sample of practicing public school counselors. It is noteworthy that the results expected on the basis of past research were not supported in this study. In order to further examine the affect of role conflict and ambiguity on public
school counselors, the following recommendations are made.

1. Since the instrumentation used in this particular study may have affected the results of the study, it is recommended that the same variables be measured in a different manner.

2. Since the role of the counselor differs in the elementary and secondary school, it is recommended that a similar study be conducted to compare the findings for elementary and secondary counselors.

3. Since the ideal role of the counselor and the actual role may differ, it is recommended that a study be conducted to describe the role actually being performed and then measure the conflict, ambiguity, and stress which exist between the actual and ideal role.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE
GENERAL INFORMATION

SEX

_____ Male  _____ Female

AGE

_____20-30  _____31-40  _____41-50  _____51-60  ____ Over 60

EDUCATION AND CERTIFICATION

_____B.S.  _____B.A.  _____M.A.  _____Ph.D.

_____ Provisional School Counselor Certificate

_____ Professional School Counselor Certificate

_____ Permanent School Counselor Certificate

COUNSELING ASSIGNMENT

_____ Elementary  _____ Junior High  _____ High School

YEARS OF PREVIOUS COUNSELING EXPERIENCE

_____ None  _____ 1  _____ 2-5  _____ 6-8  _____ 9 and over

SIZE OF SCHOOL (Based on Number of Students Enrolled)

_____ 1-50  _____ 51-100  _____ 101-200  _____ 201-300

_____ 301-400  _____ 401 or more

NUMBER OF DAYS ABSENT THIS SCHOOL YEAR

_____0  _____1  _____2  _____3  _____4  _____5  _____6  _____7  _____8

_____9  _____10 or more
Place a Check in the appropriate response to each item below

1. I feel certain about how much authority I have.

   Very True True Slightly True Uncertain Slightly False False Very False

2. I have clear, planned objectives for my job.

   Very True True Slightly True Uncertain Slightly False False Very False

3. I have to do things that should be done differently.

   Very True True Slightly True Uncertain Slightly False False Very False

4. I am able to act the same regardless of the group I am with.

   Very True True Slightly True Uncertain Slightly False False Very False

5. I work under incompatible policies and guidelines.

   Very True True Slightly True Uncertain Slightly False False Very False

6. I know that I have divided my time properly.

   Very True True Slightly True Uncertain Slightly False False Very False

7. I receive an assignment without the manpower to complete it.

   Very True True Slightly True Uncertain Slightly False False Very False

8. I have to buck a role or policy in order to carry out an assignment.

   Very True True Slightly True Uncertain Slightly False False Very False

9. I have to "feel my way" in performing my duties.

   Very True True Slightly True Uncertain Slightly False False Very False

10. I feel certain how I will be evaluated for a raise or promotion.

    Very True True Slightly True Uncertain Slightly False False Very False

11. I have just the right amount of work to do.

    Very True True Slightly True Uncertain Slightly False False Very False
12. I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently.

Very True  True  Slightly True  Uncertain  Slightly False  False  Very False

13. I know exactly what is expected of me.

Very True  True  Slightly True  Uncertain  Slightly False  False  Very False

14. I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.

Very True  True  Slightly True  Uncertain  Slightly False  False  Very False

15. I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others.

Very True  True  Slightly True  Uncertain  Slightly False  False  Very False

16. I receive an assignment without adequate resources and materials to execute it.

Very True  True  Slightly True  Uncertain  Slightly False  False  Very False

17. I work on unnecessary things.

Very True  True  Slightly True  Uncertain  Slightly False  False  Very False

18. I have to work under vague directives or orders.

Very True  True  Slightly True  Uncertain  Slightly False  False  Very False

19. I perform work that suits my values.

Very True  True  Slightly True  Uncertain  Slightly False  False  Very False

20. I do not know if my work will be acceptable to my boss.

Very True  True  Slightly True  Uncertain  Slightly False  False  Very False

21. If people think poorly of me I can still go on quite serenely in my own mind.

_____True  _____In Between  _____False

22. I find myself upset rather than helped by the kind of personal criticism that many people make.

_____Often  _____Occasionally  _____Never

23. I am nevertheless sometimes overcome by feelings of loneliness and worthlessness.

_____Yes  _____In Between  _____No
24. I tend to tremble or perspire when I think of a difficult task ahead.
   ___ Yes        ___ In Between        ___ No

25. At a party, do you prefer to let others start telling the jokes and stories?
   ___ Yes        ___ Sometimes        ___ No

26. Are you brought near to tears by discouraging circumstances?
   ___ Yes        ___ Sometimes        ___ No

27. Do you think that what people try to say in poetry could be put just as well in plain English?
   ___ Yes        ___ Sometimes        ___ No

28. Do you day-dream frequently?
   ___ Yes        ___        ___ No

29. Do you usually work things out for yourself rather than get someone to show you?
   ___ Yes        ___        ___ No

30. Are you easily discouraged when the opinions of others differ from your own?
   ___ Yes        ___        ___ No

31. Do you often feel just miserable?
   ___ Yes        ___        ___ No

32. Do you blush very often?
   ___ Yes        ___        ___ No

33. Are you much affected by the praise or blame of many people?
   ___ Yes        ___        ___ No

34. Do you feel self-conscious in the presence of superiors in the academic or business world?
   ___ Yes        ___        ___ No

35. Are you troubled with shyness?
   ___ Yes        ___        ___ No

36. Can you usually express yourself better in speech than in writing?
   ___ Yes        ___        ___ No

37. Do you usually try to avoid dictatorial or "bossy" people?
   ___ Yes        ___        ___ No
38. Do you get stage fright?
   
   _____ Yes   _____ No

39. Are your feelings easily hurt?
   
   _____ Yes   _____ No

40. Do you find it difficult to speak in public?
   
   _____ Yes   _____ No

41. Do you often find that you cannot make up your mind until the time for action has passed?
   
   _____ Yes   _____ No

42. Do you experience many pleasant or unpleasant moods?
   
   _____ Yes   _____ No

43. Are you troubled with feelings of inferiority?
   
   _____ Yes   _____ No

44. Have you frequently appeared as a lecturer or entertainer before groups of people?
   
   _____ Yes   _____ No

45. Are people sometimes successful in taking advantage of you?
   
   _____ Yes   _____ No

46. When you are in low spirits, do you try to find someone to cheer you up?
   
   _____ Yes   _____ No

47. Do you lack self-confidence?
   
   _____ Yes   _____ No

48. At a reception or tea do you feel reluctant to meet the most important person present?
   
   _____ Yes   _____ No

49. Do you have difficulty in starting a conversation with a stranger?
   
   _____ Yes   _____ No

50. Are you troubled with the idea that people on the street are watching you?
   
   _____ Yes   _____ No

51. Are you often in a state of excitement?
   
   _____ Yes   _____ No

52. For most questions there is just one right answer, once a person is able to get all the facts.
   
   _____ True   _____ False
53. When a man is with a woman, he is usually thinking about things related to her sex.

___ True  ___ False

54. The trouble with many people is that they don't take things seriously enough.

___ True  ___ False

55. Usually I would prefer to work with women.

___ True  ___ False

56. I am in favor of a very strict enforcement of all laws, no matter what the consequences.

___ True  ___ False

57. I feel sure that there is only one true religion.

___ True  ___ False

58. I set a high standard for myself and I feel others should do the same.

___ True  ___ False

59. It makes me feel like a failure when I hear of the success of someone I know well.

___ True  ___ False

60. I often start things I never finish.

___ True  ___ False

61. In school I found it very hard to talk before the class.

___ True  ___ False

62. I don't like things to be uncertain and unpredictable.

___ True  ___ False

63. I think most people would lie to get ahead.

___ True  ___ False

64. It is hard for me to sympathize with someone who is always doubting and unsure about things.

___ True  ___ False

65. I have often found people jealous of my good ideas, just because they have not thought of them first.

___ True  ___ False

66. I don't like to work on a problem where there is the possibility of coming out with a clear-cut and unambiguous answer.

___ True  ___ False
67. I have strange and peculiar thoughts.

_____ True  _____ False

68. It bothers me when something unexpected interrupts my daily routine.

_____ True  _____ False

69. Once a week or oftener I feel suddenly hot all over, without apparent cause.

_____ True  _____ False

70. Most of the arguments or quarrels I get into are over matters of principle.

_____ True  _____ False

71. Most people are honest chiefly through fear of being caught.

_____ True  _____ False

72. People who seem unsure and uncertain about things make me feel uncomfortable.

_____ True  _____ False

73. I refuse to play some games because I am not good at them.

_____ True  _____ False

74. I always see to it that my work is carefully planned and organized.

_____ True  _____ False

75. I have had very peculiar and strange experiences.

_____ True  _____ False

76. A strong person will be able to make up his mind even on the most difficult questions.

_____ True  _____ False

77. I never make judgments about people until I am sure of the facts.

_____ True  _____ False

78. I feel that I have often been punished without cause.

_____ True  _____ False

79. Once I have my mind made up, I seldom change it.

_____ True  _____ False

80. Sometimes I feel as if I must injure either myself or someone else.

_____ True  _____ False

81. Most people make friends because friends are likely to be useful to them.

_____ True  _____ False
82. I often wish people would be more definite about things.
    ____ True    ____ False

83. I find that a well-ordered mode of life with regular hours is congenial to my temperament.
    ____ True    ____ False

84. Most people inwardly dislike putting themselves out to help other people.
    ____ True    ____ False

85. I think I am stricter about right and wrong than most people.
    ____ True    ____ False

86. Most people will use somewhat unfair means to gain profit or an advantage rather than to lose it.
    ____ True    ____ False

87. I like to have a place for everything and everything in its place.
    ____ True    ____ False

88. I have had more than my share of things to worry about.
    ____ True    ____ False

89. It makes me uncomfortable to put on a stunt at a party even when others are doing the same sort of thing.
    ____ True    ____ False

90. Several times a week I feel as if something dreadful is about to happen.
    ____ True    ____ False

91. With things going as they are, it's pretty hard to keep up hope of amounting to something.
    ____ True    ____ False

92. I have often met people who were supposed to be experts who were no better than I.
    ____ True    ____ False

93. How important is it for you to feel that you can run your life without depending upon people who are older and more experienced than you?

    Extremely    Very    Somewhat    Slightly    Not at all

94. How often do you find that you can carry out other people's suggestions without changing them any?

    Almost always    Very often    Often    Sometimes    Rarely
95. How much humility do you think you should show to those whom you respect and admire?

Very much  Quite a bit  Some  A Little  None at all

96. How much do you usually want the person who is in charge of a group you are in to tell you what to do?

Very much  Quite a bit  Somewhat  A Little  Not at all

97. How hard do you find it to disagree with others even in your own thinking?

Very  Quite  Somewhat  Slightly  Not at all

98. If you have thought about something and come to a conclusion, how hard is it for someone else to change your mind?

Extremely  Very  Quite  Somewhat  Not at all

99. How much do you feel that you are not as good in most things as people who are older and more experienced than you?

Very much  Quite a bit  Somewhat  A little  Not at all

100. How much do you dislike being told to do something by a superior that is contrary to your wishes?

Very much  Quite a bit  Somewhat  A little  Not at all
Dear Counselor:

We are asking your help in completing dissertation research for the Faculty of Special Services at The Ohio State University. By taking approximately 15 minutes of your time just this once, you will provide valuable information. If for any reason you are unable or unwilling to help, please return the enclosed questionnaire immediately with a note to that effect. The successful completion of this research depends on a full return of the enclosed questionnaires. We do sincerely appreciate your cooperation.

The subject of this research is your role as a guidance counselor. We are attempting to find out how you feel about that role and how it in turn affects other aspects of you as a person. Hopefully the results of this research will help counselors, administrators, and others in education.

Inside this packet you will find 100 questions dealing with common situations and difficulties that most people experience at one time or another. In order to respond to a question or statement, please check the answer below each item that most frankly and truthfully describes your habits or feelings.

These responses are essential to the research we are doing. The answers will be kept strictly confidential and will be used only for research purposes. Your name does not appear on the questionnaire and there is no way to identify your responses with your name.

Please use answers such as "sometimes," "occasionally," and "don't know" only when you cannot possibly decide on the other choices.

Please answer every question. Do not spend time pondering a question. Answer each item immediately in the manner that seems most appropriate at the moment.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Anthony C. Riccio  
Professor of Education  
Joseph J. Quaranta  
Professor of Education  
Barbara D. Redick
APPENDIX C

RAW SCORES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>ASSIGNMENT</th>
<th>YEARS OF EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>SIZE OF SCHOOL</th>
<th>ABSENTEEISM</th>
<th>DEPENDENCE</th>
<th>TOLERANCE</th>
<th>FLEXIBILITY</th>
<th>NEUROTICISM</th>
<th>CONFLICT</th>
<th>AMBIGUITY</th>
<th>STRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-67</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-79</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>ASSIGNMENT</td>
<td>YEARS OF EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>SIZE OF SCHOOL</td>
<td>ABSENTEEISM</td>
<td>DEPENDENCE</td>
<td>TOLERANCE</td>
<td>FLEXIBILITY</td>
<td>NEUROTICISM</td>
<td>CONFLICT</td>
<td>AMBIGUITY</td>
<td>STRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-75</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-68</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-96</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>ASSIGNMENT</td>
<td>YEARS OF EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>SIZE OF SCHOOL</td>
<td>ABSENTEEISM</td>
<td>DEPENDENCE</td>
<td>TOLERANCE</td>
<td>FLEXIBILITY</td>
<td>NEUROTICISM</td>
<td>CONFLICT</td>
<td>AMBIGUITY</td>
<td>STRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-81</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-78</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>ASSIGNMENT</td>
<td>YEARS OF EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>SIZE OF SCHOOL</td>
<td>ABSENTEEISM</td>
<td>DEPENDENCE</td>
<td>TOLERANCE</td>
<td>FLEXIBILITY</td>
<td>NEUROTICISM</td>
<td>CONFLICT</td>
<td>AMBIGUITY</td>
<td>STRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-83</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>ASSIGNMENT</td>
<td>YEARS OF EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>SIZE OF SCHOOL</td>
<td>ABSENTEEISM</td>
<td>DEPENDENCE</td>
<td>TOLERANCE</td>
<td>FLEXIBILITY</td>
<td>NEUROTICISM</td>
<td>CONFLICT</td>
<td>AMBIGUITY</td>
<td>STRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-71</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-68</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>ASSIGNMENT</td>
<td>YEARS OF EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>SIZE OF SCHOOL</td>
<td>ABSENTEEISM</td>
<td>DEPENDENCE</td>
<td>TOLERANCE</td>
<td>FLEXIBILITY</td>
<td>NEUROTICISM</td>
<td>CONFLICT</td>
<td>AMBIGUITY</td>
<td>STRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-67</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-80</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

REGRESSION WEIGHTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>F to Remove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>31.45828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.47898</td>
<td>1.02020</td>
<td>2.1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>1.06704</td>
<td>0.42286</td>
<td>6.3677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>-0.21999</td>
<td>0.09635</td>
<td>5.2133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-0.03244</td>
<td>0.01379</td>
<td>5.5286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Dahlem, Glenn G. "Counselor Image: Crucial Target for Research Counselor Education and Supervision, 1969, 8, 130-134.


Miller, Frank M. *Guidance Principles and Services.* Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1961.

Moore, L. H. "The Elementary Counselor." *School and Community,* 1971, 47, 47.


