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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

R.M. Frumkin stated "I think that the increased dependence of high school students on drugs is symptomatic of their alienation from the school system in which they have very little democratic participation." (1970, p. 1078).

Much literature has been written about students participating in classes, helping define objectives and being involved in the learning process. But if one views the school as an organization, very little literature can be found dealing with the school in areas of known problems in organizations such as role conflict, role ambiguity, and a loss of satisfaction for one's position in that organization. And yet alienation from a school system causes a loss of satisfaction that can be derived from that school system.

Students have problems and stresses which arise in everyday school experiences and the ability to cope successfully with them is a function of a complex set of factors. Some factors stem from the person himself and other factors stem from the environmental situation. This has been known to be true in work experiences for a long
time. One of the most prevalent problems—role conflict in industrial organizations—has been researched extensively over the years. (Kohn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snock, and Rosenthal, 1964; Wolfe and Snocke, 1962; Tosi and Tosi, 1970). There is very little literature on role conflict as it confronts students in the school organization.

When one examines the movement of students from school to school, it is evident that constantly adjusting from one school or school system has to cause some problem for the young students that this happens to. In the Columbus Public School system where this study takes place there is a program that encourages students to transfer to different schools in the system. The main problem that confronts students in this program which is called the Columbus Plan is adjustment to the new school. The Columbus Plan is a unique program that gives a student a choice about the type of educational or integrated school experience that he or she prefers. If adjustment problems are encountered, then what is it about the school system setting that causes these students adjustment problems?

The Columbus Plan student has one advantage over the student that transfers to a school because his parents bought a house or rent in the area. The Columbus Plan student can return to his old high school if he cannot adjust to the new school. The other student cannot.
Both groups of students have to examine the new school group and decide if this new high school group differs significantly from their old school group. Both sets of students will need to learn "appropriate behavior" for their new social roles (Sarbin, 1968, p. 546). Anybody who lives in a society learns to expect or to anticipate certain actions from other people and learns that other people will expect certain actions from him.

Although school rules and regulations are ideally uniform throughout the Columbus Public Schools, the transfer student may find that the new school places different emphasis in the enforcement of such rules and regulations. Thus he will be faced with a totally new set of role demands and expectations. Gross, Mason, and McEachern (1958) suggest that the different role expectations applied to the incumbents of a focal role by a specific body of role definers will be crucial in explaining variations observed in behavior. Therefore, success or failure of transfer students in adjusting to their new school environment will be in large part a function of the degree of consensus concerning their role. It will be a function of the degree of consensus concerning this role that actually exists among the incumbents of the significant roles (teachers) with which the students interact.
Since people will play the same social roles in a great variety of social situations, particular experiences of socialization learned in one social situation may lead the individual to accept standards counter to those which are widely accepted in another social situation. (Cameron, 1950; Gross, Mason, and McEachern, 1958; Sarbin 1968). The overt behavior resulting from such conditions may result in disruption of classroom activities, fights, tardiness, and poor study habits. In such cases the services of the guidance counselor are called upon.

In secondary schools there is an ongoing process of socialization. Counselors may be viewed as paid functionaries representing established values (Grinspoon, 1967). A student is supposed to acquire a commitment to the norms of the school which he attends. According to Grinspoon (1969), a black student transferring from a predominately black school to a predominately white school often suffers culture shock. Such a student may be intimidated in the white institution. Since the student must now internalize the social norms of the new school, he is expected to accept as correct the application of these norms to specified situations. Therefore, in the socialization process censure and rewards insure a commitment to these norms.
People, according to Sarbin (1968), may become dissatisfied with themselves and ineffective in social interaction under any of the following conditions. One, people who feel uncertain and vague about the role expectations which others hold for them experience frustration and strain. They just do not know what is expected of them or what they should do. Thus whatever they do decide to do, leaves them feeling uneasy and frustrated. Two, a person who finds himself in a situation where the people with whom he must interact do not agree among themselves on what he should do will be ineffective when interacting with them. They cannot decide what behavior is appropriate, in other words, there is "role dissensus" or a "lack of consensus" (Sarbin, 1968; Turner, 1956; Goffman, 1959; Biddle and Thomas, 1966). Three, ineffective social interaction may result when a person holding very firm beliefs about his appropriate role behavior finds himself in conflict with others holding equally firm but conflicting beliefs about his own appropriate role behavior. There is incongruity then between the role performer's own expectations for his role and the role expectations held by those who must interact with him. If a transfer student experiences role conflict as ambiguity in any of these three forms then one would expect him to have difficulty adjusting to the new school.
The presence or lack of consensus on role expectations raises some interesting questions for this research. When a Columbus Plan or general transfer student approaches a counselor with a school related problem, the counselor must be ready to examine the relationships the student has with other students and his teachers. How much experience have they had with that transfer student? Is the student in the same or different "cultural subsystem"? Does the student's audience (other students and teachers) view his behavior as improper?

Recently it has been reported in a survey of the Columbus Plan (January 1976) that student adjustment problems were a major reason for students transferring back to their original school. The individual adjustment problems were not specified in this report. But it is very likely that these adjustment problems are related to some type of environmental stress. The student with adjustment problems has to deal with three specific and interrelated factors. First, he has to deal with the objective situation to reduce or eliminate its stressful characteristics. Second, he has to deal with the tension and negative emotions which are aroused in him by the stress. And third, he has to deal with the secondary and derivative problems.
Purpose

The indication of success or failure of a transfer student in a new school environment has been very difficult to determine. One can only attempt to piece together various research studies that have been completed in an attempt to develop some type of picture about what a possible population has to adjust to. Trying to relate various social factors that effect student satisfaction and success in adapting to a new school environment is the primary purpose of this research. Where does role conflict develop, and how does group acceptance, role expectations and role consensus effect student adjustment and academic success?

Significance of the Problem

This problem addresses itself to the orderly transition and movement of students throughout an entire school system. Since the counselor is the primary person involved in administering to this flow of students, it is necessary for him or her to become knowledgeable about the various social subsystems and to be able to perceive them when the new students enter their school. In our perceptual world of existence, one of the keys to successful counseling is to perceive the world in which the client lives (Gutsch and Peters, 1973).
It is not the aim of this research to deal with artificial groups. This is a field study designed to deal with and identify natural groups. The counselor in a public school system has no choice but to work with the students the way that they are found in his particular school. As stated earlier, pupil adjustment is a major cause of students transferring back to their original schools in the Columbus Public Schools. It seems appropriate then that this research should deal with this problem for there are other transfer students that cannot go back to their old school. The hypotheses permit examination of the interrelations of the environment, perceptions and expectations which surround and include the student during the period of adjustment to a change of schools. It is important for a counselor to be actively involved with this students. R.M. Frumkin (1970) has stated that role conflict and role ambiguity should be studied among high school students in his comments on the article by Tosi and Tosi entitled, "Some correlates of role conflicts and role ambiguity among Public School Teachers" (1970).

**Hypotheses**

1) If the articulated values of the transferring student and his perceived values of the new high school group are compatible, then he will be more satisfied with
his new school.

2) If the transferring student prefers his new high school peer group, then he will be more satisfied with his new school.

3) If the transferring student perceives dependence on his teachers, the he will experience less role conflict.

4) The greater the frequency of communication between the transferring student and his teachers, the less role conflict will be experienced by the transferring student.

5) Various social predictors (listed in Chapter Three) in combination with one another will be more predictive of student satisfaction in a school than any one single predictor.

6) Various social predictors (listed in Chapter Three) in combination with one another will be more predictive of student academic success than any one single predictor.

7) The more consensus there is between the student and his teachers on the expectations for the student's aspirations and personal characteristics, the more satisfaction he will feel as a member of the new high school.

8) The more consensus there is between the student and his teachers on the definition of the student's role, the more highly his performance (grades) will be rated.
Definition of Terms

The concepts used in role analysis will be one of the ways used in this research to study interaction between transfer students and their environment. Role analysis assumes that "individuals (1) in social locations (2) behave (3) with reference to expectations (Gross, Mason, and McEachern, 1966, p. 17).

Role is a set of activities or potential behaviors one performs in terms of his relationship to others and the system as a whole (Douglas, 1976). Or a "set of expectations about behavior for a position in a social structure," (Rizzo, House and Lirtzmans, 1970, 155).

Social position is a location in a social systems. There are two different types of positions. An ascribed position is one which is assigned to an individual without reference to innate differences or abilities. An achieved position is assigned to an individual based upon competition and individual performance (Linton 1936, p. 113-114).

Focal position is the position being studied. In this study it is the transfer students new to the high school.

Counter position refers to a position which has a relationship with the focal position. For this study teachers occupy the counter positions.
Role sector refers to the relationship of the focal position to a single counter position (Gross et al., 1966, p. 67).

Systems model is the relationship of the focal position to several counter positions and the relationship between the counter positions. Figure 1. shows the role set used for this study.

(Figure 1. A systems model for transfer students)

Role expectations are evaluative standards applied to an incumbent of a position (Gross et al., 1966, p. 67). This term can be used two different ways. First it can be used in a predictive sense in that a person can think something will probably happen and second, it can be used in a normative sense in that it becomes an evaluation of what a person should do.

Student satisfaction will be defined as a score on the School Satisfaction instrument listed in Appendix D.
Student adjustment will be defined by the combination of the score on the School Satisfaction instrument and the type of grades the student receives from his teachers.

Limitations

Since this is an ex post facto research project, it is not possible to manipulate the independent variables. This research project deals with a special population, therefore, it is not possible to generalize to the entire population. But there is a need to analyze the social interaction factors surrounding a transferring student population and this far out weighs the ability to generalize.

There are so many variables present when human beings interact that it is impossible to take them all into account. Therefore, this research is only taking into account those variables that have been shown to be important in various organizational research studies. Also time constraints and general program requirements have made it impossible to go into depth in several psychological areas.

This research deals with some of the dynamic relationships that directly or indirectly affect pupil adjustment when students interact with teachers and fellow students in the new high school.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to show the relationship between this study and previous endeavors relevant to this area. A review of the fundamentals of role analysis and how it applies as a methodology for this research will also be included.

The present chapter is organized so that the following sections cover the main points relevant to this review.

Need for students to interact
Types of systems
Behavior and environmental relationships
Role conflict and role ambiguity
Socialization requirements
Role enactment
Microscopic role consensus
Environmental assessment
Summary
Need for Students to Interact

George Herbert Mead (1934) spearheads the social psychological interest in "symbolic interaction" which he holds to be the key to the integration of society and the "social person." Mead traces the processual aspects in the development of the social person. The individual comes to acquire a social personality as he learns to communicate symbolically. And as he learns to adopt the perspective of others toward himself, he is also learning to regulate his own activity symbolically by defining his "self" and his acts in appropriate ways. These appropriate ways are the roles of society. Through participation in the complex of differentiated and interrelated roles which make up any society, the individual develops his distinctly human capacities and identities. Mead points out that "self" and "society" are intimately connected through the concept of role.

Types of Systems

To complete this field of study it will be necessary to analyze the particular segment of society that is being dealt with as an integrated system. Goodenough (1965) developed terms to deal with just this type of problem. He separates rights and duties from a person's social position. He did this because he could see that these elements are easily distinguished and easily
separated in analyzing society or social behavior. Goodenough hypothesized that a social position could be equated with the terms "social identity." In a person's status there are many identity relationships. Here identity relationships are statuses. These statuses incorporate "right-status" and "duty-status." Following this line of reasoning leads to a role encompassing all the right and duty statuses given to an individual with any specific identity. But this same person will have many identities because his positions vary within the same society.

Gross, Mason, and McEachern (1966) used the terms role sector to describe the expectations on behavior held by the focal role and one counter role. In this study, for example, one role sector involves the expectations held by the transfer student and the teacher(s). Merton (1957) introduced the term role set to define an entire system of related roles. Again in this dissertation, the roles of transfer student, teacher, and peer group define the significant role set. Role set interaction is not bounded by classroom activities and may occur in and out of the classroom.

Gross, Mason, and McEachern's situated activity system concept is more appropriate to the analysis of role set interaction which falls within a specific bounded setting. In this study, the observations and questionnaires were
not designed to focus upon the situated activity system of the classroom alone. This is, however, a possible area for future research.

It is fairly easy to place a transferring student into his two different systems when he arrives at a new school. The student may still be interacting with his old group of friends, and he will be beginning to interact with his new group. For that initial two month period, the student will perceive himself to be in both systems.

Nadel (1957) suggests that social integration occurs through the 'summation of roles.' Individual roles, through their internal structure, result in an integrated system. The more roles a person plays the tighter the system will be. What is being suggested here by all of the authors mentioned is the simple fact that a person will try to make this "integrated system" or "summation of roles" manageable.

Manageable, for this research, will be how the student copes with the new system. Is he satisfied with his new school?

**Behavior and Environmental Relationships**

Lewin (1936) conceptualized behavior as a function of people interacting with their environment. If a counselor were to disregard all the environmental influences, the areas where he might cause change would be
restricted. Bandura (1974) has said that the environmental context is a significant influential determinant of behavior. Parsons (1969) found that people change dramatically in their responses to different environments, situations, and conditions. Bela Baker and T. R. Sarbin (1956), in an article entitled "Differential mediation of social perception as a correlate of social adjustment," come to the conclusion that social retardation of the delinquent is a consequence of his inability to make new differentiations. Therefore, psychologists should address themselves more frequently to the problem of differential mediation of social-perceptual achievement within defined groups.

One aspect of this research will be to look at the effects on a student when differences in values are perceived between the old and the new reference groups.

These social perceptions may be viewed as role expectations. Role expectations comprise not only a person's rights and privileges in a given situation but also his duties and obligations in that situation. Role expectations for the individual who is an occupant of a social position are determined by a relationship with persons who occupy other positions in his immediate social structure. So these role expectations are collections of cognitions, beliefs, subjective probabilities, and elements of knowledge. These components specify the
relation of complementary roles. Sarbin (1974) sees role expectations as the conceptual bridge between social structure and role behavior. Therefore, an occupant of a position not only is expected to perform certain acts but also is judged by a qualitative component. What is the effect on a student when he is judged? This is another aspect of this research.

Where does distortion and inadequacies of development in a client occur? Norman Cameron (1950) studies the aspect of self-reaction. He looks at the behavior of an individual in direct relation to himself as a social unit. Normal persons have a great diversity in their social roles. An average person must accept the fact of discrepant and mutually contradictory role-taking in everyday life. In a pluralistic society the ability to shift from one role to another is an acquired skill. It is mandatory to acquire this skill. But a person has to know what the demands of the new role are. If he does not, role ambiguity and role conflict can develop.

Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity

Role conflict will be defined by Kahn, et al. (1964) for use in this chapter. He states that role conflict is the simultaneous occurrence of two (or more) sets of role pressures such that compliance with one makes more difficult the compliance with the other.
Tosi and Tosi define role ambiguity in terms of the availability and/or perception of information which treats the responsibilities and activities of the subjects position (1970, p. 1072).

Stouffer (1951) states that in any social group there will be norms governing behavior. If these norms are clear and unambiguous then the individual has no choice but to conform or take the consequences of his action which could result in group resentment. Stouffer suggests that one major cause of group resentment results from the problem an individual has when he attempts to play two roles simultaneously. Unfortunately, filling two roles is not always simple because role conflict may occur due to the relative incompatibility of expectations between the two roles. Getzels and Guba (1954) conclude that actors in focal positions see role conflict to be a function of the number and magnitude of incompatible expectations either previously held by them or placed on them by others.

In developing their ideas on the theory of role conflict, Gross, Mason, and McEachern (1966) use the concepts of legitimacy and sanction, and the personal orientation towards legitimacy and sanction held by role incumbents. Role conflict occurs "...when an incumbent of a focal position perceives that he is
confronted with incompatible expectations" (1958, p. 248). A legitimate expectation is one which the incumbent feels he has the right to hold. An illegitimate expectation is one which the incumbent does not feel he has the right to hold. Sanctions occur when an incumbent is confronted with rewards or punishments which can be either internal or external. He can apply sanctions to himself (internal) or others can apply sanctions to him (external). Parsons (1951) has a slightly different view of what constitutes a legitimate expectation. He suggests that any institutionalized role expectation is legitimate.

Gutch and Peters (1973) have examined this problem from a client's state of dissonance.

A moral judgment that is in conflict with an individual's existing societal conscience will create for him a state of dissonance, while a moral judgment that agrees with his conceptualized societal conscience will ultimately result in harmony or peace of mind (1973, p. 17).

Sarbin holds that "role conflicts occur when a person occupies two or more positions simultaneously and when the role expectations of one are incompatible with the role expectations of the other." (1954, p. 228). Role conflict may also involve contradictory expectations held by two or more groups of relevant others regarding the same role (Sarbin, 1974, p. 540; Jacobson, Charters, and Lieberman, 1951, p. 22; and Seeman, 1953, p. 373).

It is very important for a child not to be in a
position where he or she is judged by people who are demanding different role performances or who hold contradictory expectations. A child will judge himself in light of what he perceives to be the way in which others judge him (Erikson, 1968).

Kahn, et al. (1964) described what he considered to be four basic types of role conflict. First, there is the inter-sender conflict. Here different messages from two or more persons are delivered to the same focal person. Second, role overload occurs when too much work is given the focal person to handle and therefore excessive stress is encountered. Third, person-role conflict occurs when the focal person has something to do which is against his better judgment. Fourth, there is the inter-role conflict which happens when work interferes with family life (Kahn, et al. 1964, pp. 57-60).

This study is concerned with inter-sender conflict. Can students be identified who are receiving conflicting messages from different teachers? One is not concerned with role-overload because students generally think they are given too much work in class. Person-role conflict is important because students, when they interact with other students, may find that their peer group wants to do something that is against their better judgment.
Many problems are encountered when trying to measure role conflict. One of the most important is discovering the source of conflicting messages. Wolfe and Snoek have identified many extraneous variables which must be recognized. They have stated that: "personality factors play an important part in determining both experience and reaction to role conflict. Second, it is apparent that the person’s perception and experience of role conflict is influenced by many factors in addition to the actual environmental condition" (Wolfe and Snoek, 1962, p. 110).

Two major factors that cause stress in the environment are being considered here. The first which is role conflict has been discussed. The second one is role-ambiguity. Kahn, et al., state, "In an absolute sense role ambiguity exists when the information available to a person is less than is required for adequate performance of his role" (Kahn, et al. 1964, p. 94). They go on to differentiate between two types of ambiguity. "The first results from lack of information...This type of ambiguity concerns the tasks the individual is expected to perform...The second kind of ambiguity manifests itself in a persons concern about his standings in the eyes of others and about the consequences of his action for the attainment of his personal goals" (Kahn, et al. 1964, p. 94).
Tosi and Tosi (1970) in studying role conflict and ambiguity among teachers supported Kahn, et al. (1964) in their findings. They found role conflict to be negatively correlated with teacher job satisfaction. Specifically, "....as teacher perception of role conflict increased, the degree of reported job satisfaction decreased" (Tosi and Tosi, 1970, p. 1072). They did not find that role ambiguity was related to job satisfaction.

Donald M. Wolfe and J. Diedrick Snoek (1962) studied tensions and adjustment under role conflict. They saw a person's behavior stemming from a field of forces. Some forces have their origin in the requirement of the external environment.

One of the factors involved in adjustment to role conflict was the involvement of interpersonal relations. "Interpersonal relations" was meant to refer to a stable pattern of interaction between the focal person (in this case the student) and his role senders (students and teachers). They characterized the patterns of those relationships along several dimensions which are being used in this study. They are: (1) power or the ability to influence, (2) respect for expertness, (3) trust, (4) a sense of responsibility, (5) attraction or liking, (6) dependence, and (7) communication. The kind of pressures that are exerted in the industrial world depend to some degree upon the nature or relations between the focal
position and the role senders. It should be the same in
the school setting. The kind of pressures that are
exerted on the student by the teachers and other students
depend on the relations that exist between them.

We hope to substantiate in the school settings the
same type of findings that Wolfe and Snoek found in the
industrial settings, and that is that the greater the
frequency of communication between the role senders and
focal person the less likely those senders are to present
the focal person with serious conflicts (1970, p. 117). The
other finding is that as conflict increases, the
level of the focal person's satisfaction in the job goes
down. In the school setting we will be looking at the
possibility that when a student perceives conflict his
satisfaction with the school will decrease.

A role conflict situation in a school cannot
possibly help a student. The result of role conflict
leads to a state of dissonance and this state leads to
problems in communication. The student's reaction in this
area can be viewed as a reaction to role conflict. Kahn
et al. (1964) have shown that role conflict results in
deterioration of bonds of trust, respect, and a likeing
for one's role senders. This decrease in the frequency of
communication with other people is actually a protection
against this role conflict. Kahn, et al. have been able
to identify specific reactions of incumbents of focal
positions who have high functional dependence on incumbents of counter positions. When this situation arises, role conflict leads to intense inner conflict, dissatisfaction with the job, a general feeling of futility, and a weakening of interpersonal bonds. In the proposed study students may be susceptible to the same problems as the subjects in the Kahn, et al. study since they have to be dependent on teachers who occupy the power positions in the students' particular role set.

**Socialization Requirements**

William Goode (1960) takes a closer look at the problem of role conformity and socialization in an article entitled "Norm Commitment and Conformity to Role-Status Obligations." According to Goode (1960) conformity to a set of norms is not a simple function or norm commitment. A person who is encountering particular experiences of socialization may find himself being led to accept norms counter to those which are more widely accepted in his society.

One of the things that we are examining in this dissertation is the question that when a student perceives differences in norms between his old and new peer group is he experiencing conflict in situations that involve his fellow peer group?
When a counselor finds a student failing in a role obligation, it may be that the student has chosen from among several alternative norms and that those people around him (his alters) are censuring him because they feel that he has not applied the appropriate norm in a particular role context (Goode, 1960, p. 251). Norms themselves are not independent sources of power. It is people who have spontaneous censorship who hold the power to force norm conformity in a relationship.

What is found in this socialization process is that students are expected to conform to certain role expectations. Gross, Mason, and McEachen (1958) find that within the area of role expectations, there may be considerable variation. In their study they deal with adults in narrowly defined situations and reach the conclusion that conformity to situations occurs even when there is disagreement on role expectations. However, this only happens if the person is evaluated highly by his peers or if there is a loss of respect for this person.

**Role Enactment**

There are many factors which can effect role enactment. Taking the role of a student as an example, one can find that role expectations are unclear or vague to a particular student, or that there is some type of an agreement on role expectations held by one subgroup of
students while the same role expectations contradict those held by another subgroup of students. Or again referring to one student in relation to one other one may find that there is disagreement on the expectations which each hold for the other. The student in the focal position may distort the expectations he is receiving from others or he might simply misunderstand them in some way. According to Gross et al. (1966), this is seen as the difference between the optimal amount of information needed about the role expectation and the amount actually available to the role incumbent.

Spiegel (1954) points out that roles are central to all human relationships. They are consciously or unconsciously assumed. They are assigned, and more important they are accepted or declined.

Ruth E. Hartley (1960) presents data on new reference group acceptance. She assumes that as a guide for his own behavior the individual accepts the standards and norms characteristic of his reference group. She tests to see if the greater the perceived difference in norms between the individual's established group and his new group (in which he holds membership) causes him to less readily accept the new reference group. She concludes that those who perceived large differences in norms between their old and their new group tended to be among those who were chronically dissatisfied with their new situation.
This is what we will attempt to substantiate among high school students.

There is no doubt that youths have very well defined reference groups. Dinkmeyer (1966) states that a youth's desire for identity is evidenced in such customs as similarity of dress and behavior, gestures, and patterns of speech. There is no doubt that they want others to know to which group they belong. In an article entitled "An Analysis of Conflicting Social Norms," Stouffer (1949) sums up this point when he says that in any social group there exists norms and a strain for conformity to these norms.

Microscopic Role Consensus

In Gross's, et al., superintendency study, they asked a general question about microscopic role consensus. "The question....is whether or not agreement on expectations is related to other conditions which can be thought of as consequences of this agreement?" (1966, p. 212). In dealing with this general question they developed two hypotheses dealing with the satisfaction of position incumbents and with how these position incumbents evaluate one another.

Their first hypothesis was: "The more consensus they have on the expectations for their own and the other's positions, the more gratification members of a group will
derive from the occupancy of their positions" (1966, p. 213).

The authors developed a job satisfaction scale to measure the superintendent's satisfaction with his position. They argued that "...whether or not a superintendent is satisfied with his job will depend to a considerable extent on his relationship to his school board, because the board is the superordinate to whom he is directly responsible (1966, p. 214). In this case their prediction was unconfirmed. They were only able to find support for the proposition that satisfaction is related to consensus within a group of incumbents of the same position. One reason for not finding satisfaction related to consensus between the two positions was that there were no direct measures of satisfaction with their relations with one another that corresponded to the measure of consensus between incumbents of the two positions. That is one problem that should be resolved in this research.

The evaluation hypothesis used by Gross et al. was related to consensus for approximately the same reasons as it was for the satisfaction hypothesis. When incumbents of two positions agree on what is expected of one another, their behavior will tend to conform to each other's expectations. This leads to the following hypothesis:
"The more consensus there is between the incumbents of two positions on their definitions of each other's roles, the more highly they will rate one another's performance" (1966, p. 216).

Even though this hypothesis is comparable to the satisfaction hypothesis, the authors felt that the evaluation relationship should hold no matter what the relationship is between satisfaction and consensus. The reason for this is whether or not something is pleasing to a person can be independent of filling cognitive criteria.

What is important and relevant to this research is not their initial hypothesis, but the second prediction they made on the basis of their evaluation hypothesis. School boards who have consensus with their superintendents will rate them highly. They did find that there was a significant correlation between consensus within a board and its rating of the superintendent on his job performance. They found that the more consensus the board has, the more likely they are to rate their superintendent highly.

In the Gross et al. study both the satisfaction and the evaluation hypothesis held for variables descriptive of the board, but not for variables descriptive of the superintendent.

Gross et al. explained this by saying that the school board performs its functions almost exclusively in the
presence of the superintendent. The superintendent performs his functions outside the interaction situation with the board. With this in mind the findings for this study should be just the reverse. Everything the students do takes place in the interaction situation with the teachers. Therefore in this research the satisfaction and evaluation hypothesis should hold for variables descriptive of the transferring student.

**Environmental Assessment**

Moos (1974) advocates a classification of social environments. A systematic description of the social environment is necessary in order to evaluate subjects' responses. Where such responses indicate behavioral differences these may be accounted for by situational variables.

Research on client problems related to anxiety led Hunt (1965) to suggest that the interaction between individual differences and situational variables were the determinants of behavioral variations. Sherif and Cantrel (1947) also emphasized the importance of the social environment suggesting that there is a continuous relationship between the individual and his social environment.

Regulatory mechanisms which operate on individual behavior include public opinion, punishment, rewards,
competition and social cooperation. These environmental properties may account for more of the variance in behavior than does the measurement of trait qualities or even biographic and demographic background and data (Insel and Moos, 1974).

Bandura (1974) also links the individual's behavior to the environment. For him the individual is conditioned by learning through paired experiences. The individual's self-reinforcing functions are a result of self-evaluation reactions and external outcomes. Bandura feels that external consequences exert the greatest influence on behavior when these consequences are compatible with those that are self produced. So the importance of the environment cannot be overlooked.

Another study which is relevant to this research is Pervin and Rubin's (1967) research with college student environment interaction. Although their study dealt with the college setting the principles and procedures they use are applicable to the research. They start with the premise that students select a college whose image fits their own needs. The authors feel that a lack of fit would somehow lead to some kinds of dissatisfaction with the college. So they investigated how discrepancies between the student's perception of himself and of his college related to dissatisfaction with that college and with eventually dropping out. They hypothesized that the greater the
discrepancy between the way a student sees himself and his image of the college, the more he will be dissatisfied with college and thus drop out of it. This dissatisfaction is related to nonacademic rather than to academic affairs. Their findings confirm their hypothesis.

A similar situation is developing under the Columbus Plan. Students now have the latitude and the freedom to choose the type of school which they want to attend. Counselors should now concern themselves with the problem of identifying why some students choose to return to their previous schools. This research takes the research of Pervin and Rubin (1967) and Hartely (1960) and applies it to secondary level education. By identifying the role sector and examining the role expectations, we can examine the student-environment fit in depth. Role expectations for students in a classroom setting evolve around what type of aspirations the teacher sees for any particular student.

Alan Wicker (1974) confirms the importance of social environmental fit in the prediction of human behavior.

If one wished to predict whether the person would remain in the setting entered, it would be desirable to obtain the degree of approval rating of the behaviors from the regular setting occupants. The closer the correspondence between the individual's liking for the behaviors and the average approval of the behaviors by setting occupants, the more likely it is he would remain in the setting (Wicker, 1974, p. 612).
Summary

Role analysis is important because it is a way to classify the environment in which human interaction takes place. The expectations which individuals hold for themselves and for others influence their behavior. The location of an individual is important because this effects how others will react and interact with him. The role concept allows us to place more emphasis on the cultural and the social dimensions that come to play in a school. It is possible that the way in which a student behaves may be the result of the many different roles which he is called upon to play.

By using a role sector to analyze the position of a student, it is possible to examine the degree of consensus on the student's success in the school. It adds another dimension to what is happening in the area of student-environment interaction. The role sector allows the researcher to examine and to reveal the intricate communication network that surrounds the students and that leads to a positive or a negative development of the student's perceptions of his new location and reference groups.

This leads us to the final problem which is of great concern to the counselor. The role conflict which occurs in a school always seems to find its way into the counselor's office. It comes from the referral of a
problem student by a frustrated teacher. Or more directly, a student comes through the door and announces to the counselor that he or she does not like the school.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

This chapter will be composed of five sections. In the first section selection of instruments will be covered, where they were previously used, and why they were chosen for this research. The second section will describe the sample used in this study, the categories of these subjects, the limitations of this sample, and to which universe this research will apply. The third section will cover variables that were selected for inclusion in this study. The fourth section will describe the procedures used for collection of this data. The fifth section will describe the research design and the various computer programs used to analyze the data that was collected. And finally, a statement will be made pertaining to the methodology in general.

Selection of Instruments

Every transfer student was asked to complete four instruments and each one was interviewed by one of the counselors in the Junior-Senior High School. The interview covered areas which included school description, sources of role definition, relations with teachers,
perceptions of role conflict, and role ambiguity, sources of satisfaction, plans and aspirations and personal requirements for being at the particular school. This questionnaire was modeled after the one used by Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1964).

The variables of role conflict and role ambiguity were taken from these interviews.

The principal of the building had decided that even though this was a special project it would be made part of the normal follow up evaluation done on new students who enter the school. Normally a new student would be seen for only ten to fifteen minutes a month after they had entered the school. Using the instruments in this project extended the interview time to at least forty-five minutes. And because of the principal's cooperation it was possible to include just about every new transfer student to the school. Since there was a difference in the amount of time a student spent with the counselors, they were asked if they would go through the more indepth interview. In only two cases did the student chose not to participate in the project. The students in each case were assured that all the information would remain confidential. First, the nature and purpose of the research was explained to the students and then they were given four questionnaires to answer. These questionnaires were the Group Acceptance Questionnaire, Measurement of the Student's Level of
Aspirations, Ratings of the Self on Personal Characteristics, and the Measurement of School Satisfaction. In most cases the subjects were able to finish answering the instruments in one-half of an hour.

The Group Acceptance Questionnaire

The Group Acceptance Questionnaire was developed by Ruth E. Hartley (1960). It was first used in a series of studies involving the factors associated with acceptance of a new secondary group as the new reference group. It focuses in on the factors associated with the dynamics of acquiring a new reference group. As with the previous studies, here one is concerned with the relationship of the perceived congruity between the mores of an individual's established group and those of the new group to the acceptance of the new group as a reference group.

This questionnaire is based on the assumptions that a subject will accept as guidelines for his own behavior the standards and norms characteristic of his reference group. This assumption has been supported by Hartley (1960), Newcomb (1948), Rosen (1957), and Siegel (1957). It follows that adolescents have an established hierarchy of reference groups. The accepting of a new group demands that the subject reevaluate those previously established groups and place them in competition for his loyalty. Therefore, the individual's decision is subject to the
balance of forces acting on him.

In previous studies (Hartley, 1957, 1960) it was found that after a period of two months the subjects had sufficient time to familiarize themselves with the school, but it was a short enough time so that differences between those subjects who would accept and those subjects that would reject the groups would be most evident. Hartley (1960) has found that differences tended to become less marked with the passage of time.

Two scores were derived from the questionnaire. A gross difference score was obtained by assigning a value of zero to answer A, one to answer B, and two to answer C and totaling these responses. Answer A was the statement: there is no difference or a very slight difference between the two groups in this respect. Answer B was: there is a moderate difference between the two groups in this respect. Answer C was: there is a large difference between the two groups in this respect. If a subject received a larger score, it meant that there was a greater perceived difference between the new group and the subject's old established groups. The gross preference score was obtained by assigning a value of zero to the D response and a value of one to the E response. By totaling these items and dividing them by the sum of D's and E's that the student marked, it represented a ratio of school oriented preferences to all of the possible preferences. Answer D
was: I personally prefer the attitude of students at my new school. Appendix A shows a copy of the questionnaire.

The Level of Aspiration Instrument

The Level of Aspiration Instrument reports the degree of desired participation in the school on the part of the student. There are eight items that the student responded to by having him mark the most appropriate choice on a five point scale. The choices were: I would not want to..., I am not especially anxious to..., I have some desire to..., I would very much like to..., and I am extremely anxious to.

Vroom (1960) used a similar scale that was labeled psychological participation. He used the scale to measure "the extent to which the individual feels that he influences joint decisions made with his superior" (Vroom, 1960, p. 24). In this study one is looking at the student's adjustment to a new school setting, therefore, the measurement of aspirations is aimed at what the student wants to participate in. The items are:

1. Be elected to student council in this school
2. Take every opportunity to advance yourself
3. Take a more important role in the student activities in the school
4. Establish a good reputation among peers
5. Receive recognition for good work in class
6. Receive recognition for extra curricular
activities

7. Establish a good reputation among teachers

8. Someday be remembered as an important person in the school

This same instrument was modified slightly and was given to the teachers in the building. The teachers were asked to rate each student on the above statements. In order to examine consensus, it was felt that the degree of consensus on this instrument would help satisfy that criteria. Two questions need to be answered here. Consensus on what and consensus among whom? Otherwise the research procedures and findings would be characterized by ambiguity. One is interested in examining the degree of consensus for this expected behavior and attributes identified from the personal characteristics instrument of the transfer students and how the teachers see these same behaviors and attributes. This analysis is restricted to a consideration of consensus within a school and consensus between transfer students and their teachers. Trying to account for why there are different expectations in behavior between students and teachers is not the purpose of this research, but examination of the results as they relate to academic success and school satisfaction is the purpose of this research. Appendix B presents the instrument completed by the teaching staff.
Personal Characteristics Instrument

The Personal Characteristics Instrument was also used by Gross et al. (1966). The purpose here is to also examine consensus on personality characteristics between the students and their teachers. Does this have any effect on a student adjusting to a new school setting? The Personal Characteristics Instrument is presented in Appendix C.

Gross et al. (1966) has suggested that there are at least two procedures possible to secure data for the analysis of consensus on role definitions. First, one can, "focus on the degree of agreement among role definers on which one or which range of alternatives the incumbent of a position should adapt in a particular situation. The second is to focus on their consensus on a single evaluation standard that might be applied to him" (Gross, et al. 1966, p. 101).

The second way for analysis was chosen because it allows for a greater number of role segments to be examined to find out if there is conformity to these expectations for behavior and attributes. The question being asked is whether or not agreement on expectations is related to other conditions which can be thought of as consequences of this agreement?
School Satisfaction Instrument

This instrument was constructed containing items dealing with satisfaction with "the way your school functions." The individual students answered the items according to a scale that allowed students four choices. They could answer very well satisfied, fairly well satisfied, fairly dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied. This instrument was developed from the job satisfaction instrument used by Gross et al. (1966) in their superintendency study. A similar type instrument dealing with job satisfaction was used by Vroom (1960). Tosi and Tosi (1970) used this instrument to examine role conflict and role ambiguity among public school teachers. Douglas (1976) used the same instrument to examine social psychological correlates of teacher absenteeism.

The scale used in this study deals specifically with school satisfaction. In the previous studies it seemed that one of the most important variables was that of satisfaction. Vroom (1964) found in the literature that satisfaction has been related to turnovers and safety records. It has been generalized in the following statement, "Job satisfaction levels may be related to general effectiveness with which an organizational system can operate" (Tosi and Tosi, 1970, p. 1074). In this study school satisfaction and success may be related to whether or not students perceive conflicting situations.
The Interview

In order to take a close look at role conflict and role ambiguity, a questionnaire was developed from Kahn et al. (1964). Kahn's questionnaire was used as a model to develop a questionnaire that would accommodate the nature of the subjects in this research.

The role conflict that is dealt with in the questionnaire is focused on two distinct areas. First, there is the objective role conflict. Wolfe and Snoek (1967) found this to exist when the pressures exerted by the role senders are in opposite directions. Second, subjective role conflict results from the type of experience that occurs when conflict is aroused as a result of a set of role pressures. This may be seen by the student as what is the difficulty in satisfying the divergent demands of various role senders. This is where the student's perception is very important. The interview questionnaire is listed in Appendix E.

Selection of the Sample

The subjects in this research were comprised of all general transfer students and all Columbus Plan transfer students. By using the new pupil transfer in forms it was possible to identify all new students that had entered Independence Junior-Senior High during the 1976-1977
school year. The transfer students were taken from all secondary grade levels. The subjects consisted of thirty general transfer students and twenty-nine Columbus Plan transfer students. It was just a matter of luck that the numbers of the type of transfer student came out close. Seventh graders were excluded from the sample because of the big change that occurs from going from an elementary to a secondary school setting. They would not only be changing groups, but also changing the type of school systems. They are adjusting to a change from having one teacher to having seven teachers. In total there were thirty-four females and twenty-five males. Of the general transfer students eighteen were black and forty-one students were white. All the Columbus Plan students were black. The interviews took place from November 1976 to May 1977.

The data collection itself took place just before and right after the schools were shut down because of the unusually cold winter. It is possible that the data is subject to variation due to the peculiarity of the system at that time. The affects of the delay were felt through the rest of the school year and into the present school year.
Variables

The variables used in prediction and multiple regression analysis for school satisfaction and success were obtained from the sample of fifty-nine students from Independence Junior-Senior High School. The identified variables follow:

(A) From the Inventory Questionnaire Interview

1. sex
2. type of transfer
3. attitude toward school
4. relations with teachers
5. frequency of contact with teachers outside of class
6. trusting teachers for help
7. feelings of role ambiguity
8. role expectations with teachers
9. use of school handbook
10. perceived role conflict in general
11. perceived role conflict among staff
12. source of role conflict
13. source of resolution for role conflicts
14. teachers communicate satisfaction
15. source of satisfaction
16. source of dissatisfaction
17. school perceived as helping the student toward goals
(18) parental involvement with student  
(19) grade point average  
(20) grade level  

(B) From the Group Acceptance Questionnaire  
   (21) A single score that indicates the degree of difference between the student's old group and his new group at the school.  
   (22) A single score that indicates the student's degree of preference for the new school group.  

(C) From the Level of Aspirations Instrument  
   (23) A single score that indicates the degree of aspirations the student has for achievement in the school. Both the student and his teachers took this instrument. A score indicating the degree of consensus was obtained from comparing their results.  

(D) From the Personal Characteristics Instrument  
   (24) A single score indicating a rating of oneself. Again both the student and his teachers took this instrument. A score indicating the degree of consensus was obtained from comparing both their results.  

(E) From the School Satisfaction Instrument  
   (25) A single score which gives the degree of satisfaction the student felt for the particular school.  

Collection of the Data  
The collection of data for this research fit right into the counselor's normal routine at the school. New students are normally seen by a counselor after their first six weeks
at the school. This was lengthened so that the counselors saw the students about two to two and one-half months after they were enrolled. The time the counselors spent with the students was longer than normal because the old interview took about fifteen minutes. To collect all the information that was needed for this study it took the counselors about forty minutes to a whole period and sometimes a period and one-half. The students filled out the questionnaire right in the counselor's office. The counselors that were involved found the interview forms very helpful in getting more information on how the students were adjusting to the school and they found that they were alerted to potential problem areas. There were only two cases where it turned out impossible to get both the interview forms and questionnaires completed in one sitting. These were completed on two different days. In each case a fire drill interrupted the process.

Those students who participated in this project were told that they would be cooperating in a project that was dealing with how new students were adjusting to this high school.

**Statistical Analysis**

The new data collected for this study was analyzed by using a multiple regression analysis. The program was selected from the Statistical Package for the Social
Sciences manual.

The purpose for using multiple regression is to analyze the relationship between the dependent variables and the identified independent variables so that one can predict the successful adjustment of a transferring student to a new school. The multiple regression is being used to examine and to evaluate the contribution of specific variables and sets of variables on the student's acceptance of his new school. The independent variables for this regression came from both the interview schedule and the various testing instruments that the students completed during their session with the counselor. These variables consisted both of metric and non-metric scales. By using stepwise inclusion of the variables, the computer enters the variables in single steps from best to worst. The variable that explains the greatest amount of variance in conjunction with the first variable will be entered second. This continues until the statistical criteria is no longer met.

To examine the effect of interpersonal relations by perceived role conflicts Chi-Square was used to find out the probabilities of those relationships. The same thing was done with communication with role senders and perceived conflict, and the effect of role conflict and school satisfaction.
Chi-square, as a test of statistical significance, enables one to determine whether a systematic relationship exists between two variables. All frequencies are computed as if no relationship exists between the variables listed in row and column totals. The expected cell frequency is compared to the actual values found. The reason for choosing chi-square is because the variables used in examining the relationships in question are at the nominal level. There is no need to consider the order or distance in these categories.

To examine the relationship that students have regarding the degree of difference they see between their old and new groups and their degree of preference for their new group, the Pearson-product-moment correlation was used. The variables in this case are at the interval level which satisfies the criteria for using this method as the most appropriate measure of association.

To examine the correlations between evaluation variables and consensus within teachers and between teachers and their students, one needs to examine the formulas developed by Gross to deal with microscopic consensus among the incumbents of a single position. The object is to obtain a measure of the amount of agreement among the individuals in a group. Two formulas for computing variance were developed. The first one includes the size of the group and the second one takes size out or
represents an estimate unbiased by the size of the group. The first one is called $V$ and the second one is called $V_1$.

\[ V = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (x_i^2)}{N} \quad \quad V_1 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (x_i^2)}{N - 1} \]

Variance Formula
Figure 2.

$V$ represents consensus within the group that leaves size in. $X_i$ is the score assigned the response of the individual $i$, $x_i$ is this score in deviation form and $N$ is the number in the group. Since these groups when they are broken up into role sectors are small, which of the two formulas used will make a difference in the variance score. Gross et al. chose to keep size in because they felt that the size of the group is, "inseparably related to the amount of agreement among group members" (Gross et al. 1966, p. 168). Included in this study is $V$ and $V_1$ with the thought that $V_1$ can be used as a variable to explore relationships between the size of the group of teachers and consensus. Size of a group is important to small group functioning (Hare, Borgatta, Bales, 1955, p. 666).
The next problem is how to measure for a single expectation item for the amount of consensus between the response of the focal position and the response of the counter positions. If one just measured the difference between the student's response and the mean of the teacher's responses, one would not be accounting for variability among the teachers. The way to do this was again outlined by Gross et al. Use a measure of the dispersion of teacher responses about the student's response. To do this $V =$ the variance of the teacher responses and $M =$ the square of the difference between a student's response and the mean response of all teachers, then $D = V + M$. Thus $D$ will be an overall measure between position consensus. For the mathematical deviation of this formula see Appendix F.

These three scores $V$, $V_1$, and $D$ will be the basis for analysis for the general areas dealing with consensus. These will be used for consensus on the Level of Aspirations Instrument and the Personal Characteristics Instrument as they relate to the School Satisfaction Instrument and academic success.

Summary

The analysis is divided into four distinct parts, but they all build on each other. First, the variables are catalogued that appear in the environment. Second, do they
appear in combinations that would discriminate along the lines of role conflict and school satisfaction? Third, can the variables be used together as greater predictors than any single variable by itself? And finally, are the complex consensus variables exerting an influence on student satisfaction and academic success?
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter will present the analysis of the data. The first section will cover a breakdown of how the students fall into the various categories that contain the identified variables that are under examination. Then the three variables will be analyzed in relation to the questions in this research.

The purpose of this research is to investigate the significant variables in the environment that will affect school satisfaction and success if a student is transferring into a school. In reviewing the literature, it has been suggested that group acceptance, role conflict, and role ambiguity and consensus will directly or indirectly affect satisfaction towards an organization and in this case the word organization means school (Kahn et al. 1964, Tosi and Tosi, 1970). From role analysis literature consensus has been shown to have an effect on satisfaction (Gross et al., 1966).

To examine the variables of role conflict, role ambiguity, and group acceptance certain questions need to be first asked. What are some of the common types of
conflict encountered in school? How prevalent are these conflicts? Where do the students learn what rules they are to follow? This type of information was obtained from the intensive focal interview.

When asking students where did they learn the rules for the school, not surprisingly 73% of the students said, "teachers." Table 16 in Appendix G presents the complete breakdown for this question. Students also have the opportunity to learn the school rules from the student handbook. This handbook contains all the written rules and regulations that the students are expected to follow. Only twenty-five out of the fifty-nine students interviewed said that they had ever looked at the handbook.

Role Conflict

To obtain information on how prevalent are role conflicts in the school, students were asked the following questions: Have there ever been times when some people around you have different opinions about what you should be doing or how you should do it? Has there ever been a time when one person wants you to do something and someone else wants you to do another thing? Eighty-five per cent of the students questioned had experienced some kind of conflicting demands in the school. Table 17 in Appendix G shows the complete breakdown for these questions.
After the students answered those questions, they were asked to describe incidents that caused the role conflicts. When they described the conflict two things could be determined. First, where the conflicts originated and second, who they were among. These conflicts revealed that twenty-two per cent of the subjects had experienced conflicting demands made by two or more teachers. This would leave a question open as to how familiar the staff at the school was with the various policies. This demonstrates the objective conflict described by Wolfe and Snoek. It is evident that the environment which exists around these students has pressures in it that are asking the student to move in opposite directions. As an example: One student was given extra work to do for the teacher after class and had to stay in that class after the bell to complete it. The same student was then graded down in the next class for being late even though the student always had an excuse. This student was informed by the second teacher that she should inform the first teacher that her class was also important.

**Role Ambiguity as Expectations**

If a student is experiencing role conflict it can be caused not only because two different people in his role set want him to do something different, but also because
his expectations for various situations may be unclear or because those people in his role set have different expectations for him. The questions that dealt with this area were: Do you feel that you are as clear as you would like to be about what you have to do in your school? For example, do you know the school rules for the library, study halls, and lunch periods? The students were forced into a choice of either they were clear or they were not clear. Thirty-four per cent were unclear about their expectations in the school. Then they were asked to make a judgment about their degree of clearness. Only 15.3% could say that they were very clear about everything they had to do in the school. The majority of the students answered fairly clear, 69.5%. The rest of the students, about 15.6%, felt that they were not as clear as they should be.

If the subjects had unclear role expectations, the student was then asked where was the source of resolution for the unclear expectation. Of the thirty students who related resolving a problem, thirteen of them or forty-five per cent would go to a teacher for help. Table 18 in Appendix G shows the complete breakdown for this question.

The next important question dealt with classroom expectations. The subjects were asked: As far as you know, does the teacher usually let you know when he or she
expects or wants you to do something in class? Nine students felt that they were unclear about expectations in class. Table 14 in Appendix G shows the breakdown for answers to this question.

There was a big change when students were asked about teachers being able to communicate satisfaction about student performance in class. The question that was asked the students follows: Do you feel that you know how satisfied the teacher is with what you do? Here the perception by the students yielded the following results: 52.6% of the students felt that the teachers did not communicate how satisfied they were with each student while 47.4% felt that the teachers did communicate satisfaction.

**Frequency of Interaction and Role Conflict**

Students will differ with one another in their degree of dependence on teachers for material, services, and the like. Table 1 demonstrates that when the students feel that they depend on teachers conflicts tend to be infrequent, and that conflicts arise when students feel that they are less dependent on teachers in a functional sense. It is possible that a student feels that he cannot afford to offend his teachers (possibly because of strong parental involvement) and that he must depend on the good will of the teacher to stay out of trouble at home.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feelings about positive relations with teachers</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No feeling</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 28.08 with 2 degrees of freedom

When students were asked to comment on how they felt about having a positive relationship with a teacher, which was explained as being able to talk to the teacher on a friendly basis, 34.5% felt it was important, 54% had no particular feelings about it, and 11.5% were willing to state that it was of no importance at all. When one examined this question in relationship to the questions regarding perceived conflict among teachers, the results indicated that a very strong relationship existed. These results would indicate that there is a strong relationship between the importance of having a good interpersonal relationship with one's teachers and whether or not one experiences a role conflict. These findings would coincide with Wolfe and Snoek's finding about the relationship of dependence and role conflict. They felt, "...a high degree of dependence usually implies relatively..."
frequent interaction and thus the likelihood of effecting solutions to conflicts when they do arise" (1962, p. 117).

Does the same thing happen in school that happened in the industrial organization study involving communication? Wolfe and Snoek (1962) found evidence to support the point that with a feeling of dependence comes frequent interaction and therefore the likelihood of finding joint solutions to conflicts if they do arise. Table 2 presents these results:

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of contact outside of class</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>P &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 5.705 with 2 degrees of freedom

The findings for the students again seem to support the general concept put forth by Wolfe and Snoek. "The greater the frequency of communication between the focal person and his role senders, the less likely those senders are to present the focal person with a serious conflict" (1962, p. 117).
For students in school this means that the more contact a student has with his teachers outside the class, the less likely he will be to experience serious role conflict.

**Perceived Group Differences and Satisfaction**

This next section covers an investigation of the relationship of perceived congruity between the mores of a student's established groups and those of his new membership group to the satisfaction he feels for the school. Newcomb (1948) found that a perceived gap in values and standards between established groups and a new group was inhibiting the acceptance of the new group for some college-age subjects, and "the congruity among norms of established and new groups appears logically to be an important catalytic element involved in the transformation process" (Hartley, 1960, p. 89).

If a student perceives congruity among norms of his established and new groups, will it effect the degree of satisfaction he feels at his new school? The more he perceives congruity in the norms of his new group the more satisfaction he will feel for the school. Both the School Satisfaction Instrument and the Group Acceptance Instrument use interval level measurement. Since these instruments are interval level, it is possible to use Pearson's correlation to examine the measure of
association indicating the strength of the linear relationship between the two variables of school satisfaction and the perceived difference between the two groups. The Pearson (R) is -.35 which indicates an inverse relationship between the two variables. A student who perceived very little difference between his old and new group was in fact more satisfied with the school than a student who perceived large differences between his old and new groups. The significance level for a two-tailed test was $P < .01$. These findings correspond with the data that was collected by Hartley (1960). Their data suggests that those of their subjects who perceived large differences in norms between their old and new groups tended to be among the chronically dissatisfied.

**New Group Acceptance and Satisfaction**

If a transferring student did in fact prefer his new group, then this should also affect his satisfaction with the school. There should be a positive relationship between acceptance of his new group and satisfaction with the school. The correlation between the two variables was .31 ($P < .01$). Again these findings cooberate the fact that the same relationships that were found among college students in the Hartley study are prevalent among transferring high school students at this particular school.
Teacher Effect on School Satisfaction

If the established groups and new groups could effect the degree of school satisfaction felt by a student, what about the teachers impact on the student? If the student felt that positive relations with teachers is important, then how teachers feel about students should effect their feelings of satisfaction with the school.

First, we examined the relationship between how satisfied the student was with the school and how teachers viewed the level of aspirations for each student. The Pearson correlation was .25 ($P < .05$). This is not as particularly strong as the other findings, but it does indicate that a relationship exists in the area of how teachers view what the student is aspiring to and how satisfied the student is with his new school. The $R = .25$ indicates that the higher the aspiration level of the student as seen by his teachers correlates significantly with greater satisfaction the student feels towards the school.

The same thing occurred with the relationship between how teachers viewed the personality characteristics of the students and student satisfaction with the school. The correlation was $- .19$ which indicated an inverse relationship in the scoring. Students with high satisfaction scores received lower personal characteristic scores from teachers, but low scores indicated positive
personal characteristic ratings by teachers. The significance level was .079 which indicated it was not significant, but it shows a tendency that could be interpreted to mean that a student feels the attitudes that are felt by the teachers around him.

**Significant Predictors in Combination**

Examination of the first regression analysis (Table 3) indicates that seven variables entered into the equation before their entrance no longer shows them to be stable on an individual basis, but one more variable was included because of its significance to this study. The order in which these variables entered into the equation was determined by first running a stepwise multiple regression program. But since five of the possible variables were coded as dummy variables, they did not enter into the equation at the same time. To correct for this problem it was decided that if one vector entered at a position then all the vectors in that variable would be entered at that time. The order of the variables that accounted for variance would be kept and it would provide for the stability that is needed to look at these variables as predictors of school satisfaction and success.

The best single predictor for satisfaction with the school is a student viewing the school as helping him towards meeting his goals. (Multiple R = .449, R Square =
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mult. R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F for Stability</th>
<th>F for Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School helping</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>13.384**</td>
<td>13.384**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School helping Group Gross Difference</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>10.581xx</td>
<td>13.192xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School helping Group Gross Difference Source of Satisfaction</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>8.411xx</td>
<td>7.280xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School helping Group Gross Difference Source of Satisfaction Personal Characteristics Source of Role Conflict</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>5.345xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School helping Group Gross Difference Source of Satisfaction Personal Characteristics Source of Role Conflict Race</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>4.929xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3 (Continued)

Summary Table for Multiple R, R Square Included F, F for Increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mult. R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F for Stability</th>
<th>F for Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School helping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Gross Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Role Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Type</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>4.513xx</td>
<td>5.277xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Role Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Type</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>1.5336</td>
<td>4.742xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Indicates P < .05  
xx Indicates P < .01
The correlation between school satisfaction and the perception of school as helping a student toward his goals was 0.449 (P<.001). Those students who perceived the school as helping were more satisfied with the school in general than those who were not. The R Square shows that this variable alone counts for 20% of the variance.

Although role conflict has been correlated with low job satisfaction in the school setting, it seems that perception of the school as a helping organization and one's perception of the local peer group is much more important to the transferring student. In combination, the school as a helping organization and one's perception of the differences between old and new peer group accounted for 33.7% of the variance with an F for increase of 13.19 (P<.01). The group gross difference score correlated significantly with school satisfaction (-.342, P<.004). This meant that the greater the perceived difference between the two reference groups the less satisfaction the transfer student felt for the school. It was entered into the equation as a very stable variable with an F of 10.581 (P<.001).

The third variable that entered the equation was the source of dissatisfaction with the school. In combination with the other two variables they accounted for 47.6% of the variance. Since all the vectors were brought into the
equation at one time, it is necessary to also examine the effects of each vector individually. Table 4 shows a mean score for each vector and a Schéffe test for significance was used to examine the differences in the scores. From Table 4 it is evident that when the source of dissatisfaction in the school was found among people (students, teachers, or self), the student scored lower on the school satisfaction instrument. Dissatisfaction with one's self yielded the lowest score. Dissatisfaction with students was next, and dissatisfaction with teachers was third. The student's scores in all three areas were significantly different ($P<.001$) from the school satisfaction scores who perceived no identifiable source of dissatisfaction in the school. Students who were dissatisfied with activities at the school also scored significantly higher ($P<.001$) on the school satisfaction instrument. This means that even though a student was dissatisfied with the activities he was more satisfied with the school in an overall sense than was a student who was perceiving his source of dissatisfaction among students, teachers, or one's self.

The fourth variable entered was the students perception of himself on the Personal Characteristics Inventory. In combination with the other variables 51.6% of the variance was accounted for. It came in with an $F$ of 3.892 which is significant at the .05 level. The $F$ for
TABLE 4

Mean differences for groups on school satisfaction for
source of dissatisfaction in the school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>2.546</td>
<td>2.607</td>
<td>3.050</td>
<td>3.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.550**</td>
<td>.595**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.504**</td>
<td>.549**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.443**</td>
<td>.488**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.0447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Indicates P<.01
N = 59

The Scheffe Test for significance in differences between
means was used to examine the differences in the scores
(Kennedy, 1977).

\[
\text{Scheffe Test} = \sqrt{(K - 1)(F \text{ ratio})} \times \sqrt{\frac{2\text{MS residual}}{N}}
\]

K = The number of groups.
C = F ratio for the degrees of freedom at the specific
significance level.
MS = Mean square residual.
N = Total number of cases.

increase was 7.176 (P<.01). The F ratio it came in with
shows stability, but not as much as the previous three
variables.

The correlation between a student's perception of
himself and his general satisfaction with the school was
-.1403 (P<.145) which is not significant, but it indicates
a tendency toward a student to be dissatisfied with
himself and the school at the same time.
The source of role conflict enters at the fifth level and in combination with the other variables is significant \( (F = 5.345, P < .01) \). It entered the equation with an F of 3.09 which is not significant. Therefore its stability can be questioned when it is combined with the other variables. The total variance was 57.8%.

Role conflict in combination with the other variables was significant. Therefore a closer examination of the four possibilities will be made. The mean scores for each vector are listed in Table 5. Using the Schéffe Test for significance indicated that when a student did not depend on teachers for what his role definition is in the school, he scored significantly higher on the school satisfaction instrument \( (P < .01) \). The same thing occurred when he relied on both students and teachers. When students relied on teachers alone for their role definition in the school, they were the least satisfied with the school.

Since the general emphasis of this research is on role conflict, it was decided to enter the source of role conflict as the first variable in this second regression equation. The reason for doing this comes from the fact that role conflict in previous studies (Wolfe and Snoek, 1962, and Tosi and Tosi, 1970) was shown to have a definite impact on job satisfaction. The only difference between this second regression equation in Table 6 and the
TABLE 5

Mean differences for groups on school satisfaction for source of role definition in the school that was found in the regression equation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>2.7467</td>
<td>2.8400</td>
<td>2.9286</td>
<td>2.9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0933</td>
<td>.1819*</td>
<td>.2033**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0886</td>
<td>.1100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates P<.05
** Indicates P<.01

The Schéffe Test for differences between means was used to test for the significance of the differences (Kennedy, 1977).
### TABLE 6

Summary Table for Multiple R, R Square, Included F and F for Increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F for each variable</th>
<th>F for all variables in combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Role Conflict</td>
<td>0.2485</td>
<td>0.06175</td>
<td>2.2379</td>
<td>2.2379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Role Conflict School helping</td>
<td>0.5186</td>
<td>0.26921</td>
<td>14.195 **</td>
<td>4.6048**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Role Conflict School helping Perceived group difference</td>
<td>0.63893</td>
<td>0.40823</td>
<td>11.511 **</td>
<td>6.7606**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Role Conflict School helping Perceived group difference Source of dissatisfaction</td>
<td>0.71424</td>
<td>0.51015</td>
<td>2.7703 *</td>
<td>5.4966**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Role Conflict School helping Perceived group difference Source of dissatisfaction Personal characteristics</td>
<td>0.74525</td>
<td>0.55540</td>
<td>4.479 *</td>
<td>5.4966**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Role Conflict School helping Perceived group difference Source of dissatisfaction Personal characteristics Transfer</td>
<td>0.7550</td>
<td>0.57007</td>
<td>1.467</td>
<td>5.1833**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
first regression equation is that the source of role conflict is entered first. Since the type of role conflict is a non-metric variable it was coded as a dummy variable and all the possible choices were entered at one time. At no step in the regression did the type of role conflict prove significant when it was used in combination with the other variables. When it entered the equation it accounted for 6.2% of the variance with a F ratio of 2.238 which was not significant. The other variables were relatively unaffected by entering the source of role conflict first. Table 10 shows the stepwise entrance of each variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F for each variable</th>
<th>F for all variables in combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Role Conflict</td>
<td>.78340</td>
<td>.61372</td>
<td>4.746*</td>
<td>5.56074**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School helping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Group difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of dissatisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates significance at P<.05 level
** Indicates significance at P<.01 level
When the school satisfaction scores were broken down by the type of role conflict encountered, it was evident that the type of conflict did effect how the student felt about the school. If a student perceived there were conflicts between his fellow students, he scored significantly lower on the school satisfaction instrument than he did if he perceived conflicts between his teachers (P<.05), teachers-students (P<.01), and no conflict at all (P<.01). Table 7 presents this data. This finding tends to indicate the importance of the peer group over the teachers in the student's environment.

**Regression Analysis for Grade Average**

A stepwise regression was used to determine the order in which the variables entered the equation. The first three variables that entered the equation had significant F scores. The last four variables did not enter the equation with significant F scores, but it was decided that they should be left in the equation because of their relevance to this research. After the order of the variables were determined all vectors of the dummy variables were entered at the same time. Table 8 presents these results. The first variable to enter the equation was the Personal Characteristics rating done by the teachers about their particular students. It accounted for 52.6% of the variance and had an initial F ratio of 62.3 (P<.001). It had a correlation with grade point
TABLE 7

Mean differences for groups on school satisfaction for sources of role conflict perceived to exist in the school that were found to be relevant in the regression equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Student-Student</th>
<th>Teacher-Teacher</th>
<th>Teacher-Student</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>2.6444</td>
<td>2.8417</td>
<td>2.9308</td>
<td>2.9284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Student</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.1973*</td>
<td>.2864**</td>
<td>.2840**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Teacher</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.0891</td>
<td>.0867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.0024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates P<.05

** Indicates P<.01

The Schéffe test for differences between means was used to test the significance of the differences (Kennedy, 1977).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mult. R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F for Stability</th>
<th>F for Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics</td>
<td>.72568</td>
<td>.52662</td>
<td>62.297xx</td>
<td>62.297xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics</td>
<td>.75791</td>
<td>.57442</td>
<td>6.178xx</td>
<td>37.11789xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Role Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>.80241</td>
<td>.64386</td>
<td>4.12 x</td>
<td>18.8021xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics</td>
<td>.82927</td>
<td>.68769</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>13.48722xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Role Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>.85184</td>
<td>.72563</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>11.059xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Role Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Role Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8 (Continued)

Summary Table for Multiple R, R Square
Included F, F for Increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mult. R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F for Stability</th>
<th>F for Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Role Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>.85658</td>
<td>.73373</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>10.3345xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Role Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Role Conflict Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.86766</td>
<td>.75283</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>10.3090xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

xx Indicates P < .01
x Indicates P < .05
average of -.876 ($P < .00001$). The correlation of -.876 indicates that a student perceived as having good personal characteristics is receiving higher grades and that those students rated as having poor personal characteristics are receiving lower grades.

The second variable to enter the equation was the group preference choice that the students made concerning their old and new reference groups. Together with the personal characteristics score they accounted for 57.5% of the variance. The combined F was 37.1 ($P < .01$). The correlation between group preference and grade average was $R = -.078$. This indicates that those students who received higher grades did not care about the new reference group as much as those students who received lower grades.

The third variable to enter the equation was the source of resolution for unclear role expectations in the classes. Combined with the other two variables, the accounted for 64.4% of the variance. The F ratio was 18.8 ($P < .01$). Since this variable was entered with three vectors, it is necessary to examine any significant differences between all the possible areas. The students had a choice of saying that they relied primarily on teachers, students, themselves, or did not have to resolve conflicts (if they perceived no conflicts needing resolution). To determine the significant differences
between means it was necessary to use the Schéffe test for differences between means. Table 9 presents the results of these tests.

What Table 9 shows is that students who did not have to resolve conflicts had significantly higher grades than those students who had to resolve conflicts by using teachers ($P < .01$), fellow students ($P < .01$), or depending on themselves to make a decision ($P < .05$). It seems natural that a student who does not perceive conflicts in his environment would have more time to concentrate on studies and would therefore be receiving better grades.

The fourth variable to enter into the equation was the source of role definition. This variable in combination with the other three accounted for 68.8% of the variance. The combined $F$ was 13.49 ($P < .01$). The students could be categorized in one of four possible areas. They could use teachers as their primary source for role definition. They could use students as their primary source. They could say they use a combination of both or they could have answered other (meaning they used a source outside the school). The results indicate that a student who uses a combination of both students and teachers received significantly higher grades than transfer students that used only fellow students ($P < .01$), and than students who derived their role definitions from outside the school ($P < .01$). Transfer students who used teachers as their
TABLE 9

Mean differences for groups on grade point averages for source of resolution for unclear role expectations in school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>112.17</td>
<td>126.67</td>
<td>132.00</td>
<td>162.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers | .00 | 14.50 | 19.83 | 50.71**
Students | .00 | .00 | 5.33 | 36.22**
Self | .00 | .00 | 30.88** |
None | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 |

* Indicates P<.05
** Indicates P<.01

The Scheffe test for differences between means was used to test for significance of the differences (Kennedy, 1977).
primary source for role definitions also had higher grade averages than transfer students that used fellow students (P<.01) and used sources outside the school (P<.01). Table 10 presents the complete findings.

These findings support an intuitive feeling that a student would be more successful grade wise if he were using the teacher as a source of information for what he should be doing in school. Likewise, a student that uses a combination of both students and teachers and discriminates wisely on what everyone is saying would be more successful. As an example: One student while being interviewed stated that some of his fellow students indicated to him not to do some work for class because it was not necessary. The teacher never grades it so it is a wasted effort.

The fifth variable to enter the equation was the variable labeled source of role conflict. The combined variance with this variable included was 72.6% with an F for increase of 11.05. Since there were four categories included under its heading, the differences in the means were also tested for significances by using the Schéffe equation.

Those transferring students who perceived conflict between fellow students received higher grade point averages than those students who were unable to define the conflict in their environment (P<.05). Those students
TABLE 10

Mean differences for groups on grade point averages for source of role definition in the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>111.60</td>
<td>115.20</td>
<td>153.40</td>
<td>163.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students  | .00 | 3.6 | 41.8** | 51.97** |
Other     | .00 | .00 | 38.2** | 48.37** |
Teachers  | .00 | .00 | 10.17   | .00    |
Both      | .00 | .00 | .00     | .00    |

** Indicates P<.01

The Schéffe test for differences between means was used to test for the significance of the differences (Kennedy, 1977).
who perceived conflict between teachers also received significantly higher grades (P<.05). The only explanation for this can be that those students who are perceptive of this conflict are also taking precautions to avoid them or are aware of how to handle them. Table 11 presents the breakdown for this question.

Race as a variable was the sixth to enter the equation. It in combination with the other variables accounted for 73.4% of the variance. The combined F was 10.33 (P<.01). It entered with an F of 1.369 which was not significant. So the stability of this variable can be questioned. The correlation was -.15850 which indicates that non-white transferring students are receiving lower grades than their white counterparts.

The last variable to be entered was that of attitude. Combined with the other variables, 75.3% of the variance was accounted for. The combined F was 10.31 (P<.01). The F to enter the equation was 3.4 which was not significant. Attitude did not correlate very highly with grades (R = -.096).

It seems from this regression equation that role conflict and how it is perceived and resolved effects the general academic success of a transferring student during his first year at a new school. This finding parallels what Kahn et al. has stated about the job performance and the effects of role conflict. They are related.
TABLE 11

Mean differences for groups on grade point average for source of conflicts categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Unable to Define</th>
<th>Teacher-Student</th>
<th>Teacher-Teacher</th>
<th>Student-Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>131.25</td>
<td>133.31</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>158.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Define</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.26.75*</td>
<td>27.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Student</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>24.69</td>
<td>25.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Teacher</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Student</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates P<.05

The Scheffe test for differences between means was used to test for the significance of the differences (Kennedy, 1977).
Summary

Even though role conflict did not prove to have the greatest effect on the variance of the school satisfaction instrument in relation to the other variables which were chosen for inclusion to the regression equations, its significance was important when analyzed on an individual basis. It could be that there was too much overlapping of variables.

Academic performance was significantly effected by the role conflict variables included in that regression equation. And how a transferring student chose to resolve these conflicts effected grade point average and the source of conflicts, and the source for their role definitions effect grade point average.

Role Consensus Effects for the Personality Characteristics Instrument Ratings on School Satisfaction

There are two major questions being dealt with in this section: First, does role consensus among teachers on the personal characteristics inventory effect how satisfied the student is with his new school? Second, does role consensus between the teachers and the transferring student effect how satisfied the student is with his new school.

To examine the correlations between the teacher's evaluations on the student's personal characteristics and consensus among the teachers identified in the role for
each transferring student, the variance of each of the
teacher's scores for the student was determined. Then an
average variance score was figured from all the individual
variances for each group of teachers. The number that was
obtained indicates the degree of consensus among the
teachers for how they viewed the personal characteristics
of each transferring student. The resulting "V" was then
correlated with that student's response on the school
satisfaction instrument. The resulting Pearson
correlation ($R = .02^4$) indicated that no relationship
existed between consensus among teachers and student
satisfaction with the school. Controlling for group size
did nothing to change the results ($R = .0079$).

But when the amount of consensus between the teachers
and their students was examined, the results were
drastically different.

To determine the degree of consensus between the
student, in the focal position, and the teachers, in the
counter positions, it was necessary to use the formula
developed by Gross et al. (1966), $D = V + M$. Where "D"
represents the overall measure of between positions
consensus, "V" represents the consensus between the
counter positions and "M" equals the square of the
difference between the students response and the mean
response of all of the teachers in that role set. Again
this finding was then correlated with the student's degree
of satisfaction with the school. The finding for the relationship of between position consensus on the personal characteristics instrument and the degree of satisfaction the student felt toward the school indicated that there was a strong negative correlation \( R = -0.236, P < 0.035 \). This meant that the greater the consensus was between a student and his teachers on the student's personality characteristics the more satisfied the student was with his new school. Table 12 shows this finding.

**TABLE 12**

Correlations between the "satisfaction variable and consensus among teachers and between the teachers and their new students on the personality characteristics instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consensus on Personality Characteristics</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>V1</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student's degree of satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.236 ( P &lt; 0.035 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ V \] = Consensus among teachers

\[ V1 \] = Consensus among teachers group size taken out

\[ D \] = Consensus between teachers and students

The answers to the two questions posed at the beginning of this section would indicate that role consensus among teachers on the personality characteristics of the student does not effect how satisfied the student is with the school. But role consensus between teachers and students does effect how
satisfied the student feels toward the school.

**Role Consensus Effects for the Level of Aspirations Instrument on School Satisfaction**

The same mathematical procedures were used to determine consensus among teachers on the level of aspirations instrument. This answer was then correlated with the student's score on the school satisfaction instrument. The size of the group was corrected for and that answer was correlated with the student's score on the school satisfaction instrument. Again in each case no relationship was found to exist (R = -.0317 and R = .0105).

But when the between position consensus was computed and then correlated with student satisfaction, again a significant relationship was found (R = -.312, P<.008). This negative correlation meant that the more the student and his teachers agreed on the student's level of aspirations the more satisfied the student was with the school. Table 13 presents this data.

Role consensus among teachers on the level of aspirations instrument for the student does not effect the school satisfaction of the student, but role consensus between teachers and students does effect how satisfied the student is towards the school.
TABLE 13

Correlations between the "satisfaction" variable and consensus among teachers and between the teachers and their new students on the level of aspiration instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Vl</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student's degree of</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.0105</td>
<td>-0.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(P&lt;0.008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V = Consensus among teachers

Vl = Consensus among teachers without group size

D = Consensus between teachers and students

Role Consensus Effects for the Personality Characteristics Ratings for Grade Point Averages of the Transferring Student

In this section the same type of questions are being examined as in the previous sections. First, does role consensus among teachers on the personality characteristics inventory effect the grade point average of the newly transferred student? Second, does role consensus between the teachers and the students effect the grade point average of the students?

The same mathematical computations are made here as they have been made in the last two sections. "V" is the average variance score figured from all the individual variances for each group of teachers. This number indicates the degree of consensus among teachers for the variable in question. "Vl" is a corrected score taking
out group size. "D" is the degree of consensus between teachers and the particular student in that role set.

The same pattern of findings occur here as they did in the previous sections. First, no relationship existed between role consensus among teachers and the student's grade point average ($R = .009$). Taking out group size made no difference ($R = .003$). But there was a strong relationship when consensus was examined between the teachers and the student ($R = .396, P < .0009$). Table 14 presents the entire relationship.

**TABLE 14**

Correlations between grade point average and consensus among teachers and between the teachers and the new students on the personality characteristics instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$V$</th>
<th>$VI$</th>
<th>$D$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point Average</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.396 ($P &lt; .009$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$V$ = Consensus among teachers

$VI$ = Consensus among teachers taking out group size

$D$ = Consensus between teachers and student

The strong negative correlation in "D" means that the more consensus there was between teachers and students on the personality characteristics of the student the higher the student's grades tended to be.

So, role consensus among teachers on the personality characteristics of the student did not effect student's
grades, but consensus between students and teachers did effect grades.

**Role Consensus Effects for the Level of Aspirations**

**Ratings on Grade Point Averages of the Transferring Student**

The questions being asked in this section are: First, does consensus among teachers on the level of aspiration instrument effect the grade point average of the students in question and second, does consensus between teachers and the student effect the grade point average of the student?

The same mathematical computations were performed here to obtain a "V" (the degree of consensus among teachers), a "Vl" (the degree of consensus among teachers corrected for group size) and a "D" (the degree of consensus between teachers and the student in that particular role set).

The pattern of findings for this section deviated from what was found in the previous three sections.

First, consensus among teachers on the level of aspirations instrument had a high negative correlation with the student's grade point average (R = -.244, P<.031) and this increased slightly when group size was controlled for (R = -.25, P<.027). Second, the strongest relationship existed when the second question was examined. Does consensus between teachers and the student
effect the grade point average of the student? The correlation for "D" was $R = -0.464$, $P < 0.00011$. Table 15 presents all the data together.

**TABLE 15**

Correlations between grade point average and consensus among teachers and between the teachers and the new students on the level of aspirations instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consensus on Level of Aspirations</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point Average</td>
<td>$-0.24$ ($P &lt; 0.03$)</td>
<td>$-0.25$ ($P &lt; 0.027$)</td>
<td>$-0.464$ ($P &lt; 0.00011$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V = Consensus among teachers

VI = Consensus among teachers controlling for group size

D = Consensus between teachers and students

Up to this point it seemed that students were not aware of or at least were not effected by the degree of consensus among the teachers that occupied the counter positions in the role set, but they were effected by the interaction consensus between themselves and their teachers. This manifested itself in lower school satisfaction and lower grades.

But in this section the findings would indicate that the students are aware and effected by consensus among teachers. This would seem highly unlikely in lieu of the previous findings.
It is possible that a student who receives low grades from a teacher will be viewed by that teacher as having a poor level of aspirations.

It may be questioned whether or not the grades of the student that are given by the teachers can be considered a consequence of the consensus the teachers have expressed about the personality characteristics or the level of aspiration instrument for the student.

It could be that consensus in this case is a consequence of the teacher's evaluation of the student. The difference between examining the effects of consensus on school satisfaction and consensus on grades received is that satisfaction implies affective criteria and grades implies cognitive criteria.

In this last case, teachers are evaluating the level of aspiration of the student and then evaluating the student academically.

One explanation for this is that the student performs academically almost exclusively in the presence of teachers. If the student is not performing well enough for the teacher to draw any conclusions on the student's level of aspirations, it is quite possible the student is not performing well enough to receive well defined grades which would then tend to be lower grades because of missed or incompleted work. This would explain the high degree
of correlation between "V" and the students grades.

The same type of argument could hold true for the strong consensus relationship between "D" the consensus between teachers and student and grades. If there is no communication between teacher and student for what the student is aspiring to, then likely the student is not communicating academically either.

**Consensus Effects: Summary**

In summarizing these sections on consensus, two main observations can be made.

It was shown for student satisfaction that when there was consensus between the student and his role set of teachers on the students' personal characteristics and level of aspirations that the student was more satisfied with the school. This would indicate that teacher judgments of a student have a strong influence on the student's feelings toward the school when combined with how the student sees himself.

It was shown for the student's academic evaluation that when there was consensus between the student and his role set of teachers again the student was more successful academically. If the student and his teachers are communicating enough on the social-personal level, it would seem then that the academic communication would also occur and the student would know what his teacher's
classroom demands are.

Consensus among teachers had no effect on satisfaction or grades except for the level of aspirations instrument and that was explained earlier. The most possible explanation for this is that teachers as a combined group do not function that way in front of the students so that students would not be aware of a lack of consensus on things like rating of students except in some rare cases. These findings are consistent with what Gross et al. (1966) found about people in positions where they function in the presence of another group.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Three sections will comprise this final chapter. These three sections are: (a) the summary of this research study; (b) the discussion of these findings and their implications; and (c) the conclusions and recommendations for further research that is needed to more fully understand the dynamics that effect the adjustment of a transferring student.

Summary

The general purpose of this study was to relate various social factors that effect student adjustment and success in adapting to their new school environment. The predictive factors for school satisfaction were:

(1) School perceived as helping the student meet his goals.

(2) No perception of the peer group being different.

(3) Activities were a source of satisfaction in the school.

(4) Positive self concept.

(5) No perceived conflict among teachers or students.

(6) Race - white.
The predictive factors for academic success during transition were:

1. Positive self concept.
2. Preference for the new high school peer group.
3. No unclear role expectations.
4. Used both students and teachers for role definitions.
5. The ability to define role conflicts between teachers when they do occur.
6. Race - white.
7. A positive attitude toward school.

The review of the literature covered seven areas: (a) Types of integrated systems, (b) behavioral and environmental relationships, (c) role conflict and role ambiguity, (d) socialization requirements, (e) role enactment, (f) microscopic role consensus, and (g) environmental assessment. In each of these areas references to adjustment problems were emphasized. During the review of the literature omissions in previous research and comments by authors stating work in this area still needs to be done provided an excellent rationale for this present study. Furthermore, after reviewing the literature a connection between role consensus and role ambiguity and role conflict became very evident.

This study was conducted at a public high school where it was possible to interview all but two transfer students
during the course of a year. The subjects that participated in this study included not only the transfer students themselves, but all the teachers connected with each individual student. The grade levels covered were the 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th. There was no twelfth grade in the school at this time.

The sample consisted of fifty-nine subjects and sixty teachers, but most of the teachers were involved with more than one student. The subjects were interviewed and administered the instruments from January 1977 to June 1977. This research was made part of the orientation and follow-up process of working with the new students to the building.

The following rationale was used in the selection of instruments for data collection. First, the interview was devised to obtain the self-report data that was needed for potential adjustment problems and stress in the building. Second, two instruments were selected, based on previous studies, to assess the personal make-up of the individual student. It was necessary to choose instruments that could be filled out by the student himself and then by that student's teachers so they could evaluate the student. The personal characteristics instrument and the level of aspirations instrument (devised by Gross et al. 1970) in Appendix B were chosen for that purpose. Finally, two
instruments were chosen to assess the amount of group acceptance, perceived group differences, and school satisfaction that the subjects were experiencing. They were: (a) a Group Acceptance Questionnaire developed by Hartley, 1960 (Appendix A) to assess the perceived differences between old and new groups and to assess one's preference for the old or new group; and (b) a School Satisfaction Scale that was modified from a job satisfaction scale developed by Gross et al. 1960 (Appendix D).

All of the data was recorded on IBM cards and was analyzed using various SPSS programs (see statistical analysis, Chapter IV).

Discussion and Implications

As a descriptive study the results represent a selection process between variables where relationships could be established. The conclusions that are drawn are intended to be meaningful in helping to predict human behavior in the decision making process.

This study replicated ideas that were presented in portions of studies by Kahn et al. (1964), Wolfe and Snoek (1962), Tosi and Tosi (1970), Gross et al. (1966), and Hartley (1960). None of these studies considered a high school student population. Therefore, research of this kind on a population of high school students is a
In the area of student satisfaction, two specific questions were asked. First, if a transferring student perceived large differences in norms between his old and new student peer group, he was less satisfied with the school. This finding for high school students was consistent with Hartley's (1960) finding for college students. Second, if the transferring student preferred his new high school group, then he was also more satisfied with his new school. Again this was consistent with Hartley's (1960) findings for college students.

The effects of role consensus were consistent with Gross et al. (1958) findings on examining microscopic role consensus. When one position (in this case the student) functions almost exclusively in the presence of a counter position (teachers) the interaction situation is the focus for the definition of consensus. The findings in this study confirm that consensus between positions had an effect on both school satisfaction and academic success while consensus within positions (outside the interaction process) had no effect. When the student and his teachers had consensus on the two instruments, the student was more satisfied and received higher grades than when there was a lack of consensus.
Conclusions

Upon examining the significant predictors that in combination with one another would identify a student who was satisfied with his new school, it was found that a student who perceived the school as helping was the single most significant variable. This came from the interview. It would seem logical that a straight forward question like that would correlate highly with school satisfaction.

The second most important variable was the student's perception of very little difference in norms between his old high school group and his new high school group. If the group norms are compatible, it would seem that very little adjustments would need to be made by the student. Thus, he would encounter very little frustration and confusion.

The third variable proved to be the student's source of satisfaction in the school. As long as the student sought activities or enjoyment outside the school he was satisfied with the school. If his choice was fellow students or working with teachers he was less satisfied with the school. This could be attributed to the fact that role conflicts were perceived to exist between students and between teachers. Therefore, if a student looked toward teachers or fellow students for satisfying interactions, the student would often find himself
frustrated.

The fourth variable was that the student had a positive self concept. The student's score on the Personal Characteristics Instrument was used to make this determination. This is rather straightforward. If a student is not satisfied with himself, how can he be satisfied with anything around him.

The fifth variable really confirms indirectly what the third variable indicated. As long as the student did not perceive any role conflicts between teachers or students he was satisfied with the school. When this variable was examined in depth, it was also found that if the student perceived a conflict between a teacher and a student, he was still fairly satisfied with the school but less satisfied than if he perceived no conflict at all.

The sixth variable was race. The schools population was basically white (80%). The white transfer student tended to be more satisfied than the black transfer student.

The seventh variable was the type of transfer. But since Columbus Plan transfer students were all black, there is an interaction between these two variables. But it is also possible that the expectations the student brought to the school made a difference. That is why this variable was left in. Columbus Plan students came to the school expecting to get a better education, while the other
students came because their parents bought a house or rented in the area.

The last variable to enter as a predictor was the source of role definitions for the student. The more satisfied student tended to be the one who considered himself to be independent or looked to both teachers and students together to determine how he should act and behave in the school.

Examining significant predictors for academic success during the first year at a new school, the single most important variable was a positive self-concept. Intuitively, if a person thinks he can succeed, he can.

The second variable was a preference for the new high school group norms. Hartley (1961) posed the possibility that the new group may be considered a tool for achievement. Acceptance of a new reference group was positively associated with the preference for the norms of the new group.

The third variable was no unclear role expectations in class. Intuitively if a student knew what was expected of him in class, he has much more of a chance at being successful in that class.

The fourth variable was the source of role definition. The student with the higher grade point average used a blend of both teachers and students for role definitions
in the new school.

The fifth variable was the perception of role conflicts. The student that was able to perceive role conflicts between teachers and between students tended to get higher grades. It could be that the student who was sensitive enough to perceive conflicts then knew how to avoid them and be more successful in school.

Race was the sixth variable to enter as a predictor. White students tended to get higher grades than the black students.

And finally a student that expressed a positive attitude toward the school, in that he found the school helping him advance toward his goals, was a more successful student academically.

Recommendations

The recommendations from this study will be presented in two sections. The first section will cover the recommendations for further research in this area. Second, a set of recommendations and procedures for counselors will be presented to determine how new students are adjusting to their new environments.

This dissertation presents a descriptive study that has substantiated many concepts that have been researched for business, industry, and teachers in school—all part of the working community. While it has provided some
answers for students in secondary school settings, it has generated even more questions. Presented here are suggestions of areas for further research:

(1) The group preference area should be expanded to the other measures of need-satisfaction and value-cogruity.

(2) The interrelationship of the student's three value systems should be examined: the subject's own, that of his established group, and that of the new group.

(3) With proper funding the role consensus research could be expanded to include more role definition instruments and include samples from an entire school system.

(4) Student adjustment to a new school should be examined from a much more indepth intra-personal psychological use of factors besides the organizational environmental factor standpoint.

(5) The measures of school satisfaction and success should not only be taken for one school but should be compared to that of other schools.

(6) A comparative study of student adjustment should be conducted in schools of various racial and economic composition.

After reading the literature in Chapter II and analyzing the findings in Chapter IV of this study, it
would seem that there are steps that counselors could take to reduce adjustment problems of incoming transfer students.

(1) School officials should allocate time to counselors so that they can work with students during the two month adjustment period.

(2) Schools should institute the group preference questionnaire so that counselors can work with new students in identifying and working through problem areas. The counselors that worked in this project found it to be a very useful tool for that purpose.

(3) A student profile could be created to predict which students may have potential problems in adjusting to that particular school.

(4) Conscious efforts should be made to reduce role conflict among teachers within a given school. Rules have to be uniformly enforced.

(5) Efforts should be made to increase student participation in activities in the school. This area was a very important variable for student satisfaction.
GROUP ACCEPTANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Below is a list of kinds of behavior which may vary between one group and another. We would like to know if there is a difference between students at your new school and your old school friends. If there is a difference we would like to know which way of behaving you prefer. Please note both parts of the instructions below.

II. For each item please mark the answer sheet in the space to the left that represents what you think, according to the following scale:

A - there is no difference or a very slight difference between the two groups in this respect.
B - there is a moderate difference between the two groups in this respect.
C - there is a large difference between the two groups in this respect.

III. For every item which you answer B or C on the answer sheet, also fill in D or E on the answer sheet, whichever is appropriate according to the description below.

D - I personally prefer the attitude of my old high school friends.
E - I personally prefer the attitude of students at my new school.

IV. Questions:

Please circle the letter that represents what you think.

A B C D E 1. How one behaves toward friends of the same sex.
A B C D E 2. How one behaves toward friends of the opposite sex.
3. One's attitude toward people older than one's self, parents, teachers, employers, etc.

4. The importance of dress and grooming.

5. Attitude toward one's studies.

6. The kind of language one uses.

7. The importance of having high ambitions or goals.

8. Showing that one is keeping up with the latest fads.

9. The degree of interest one shows in sports.

10. The attitude one has toward religion.

11. The kinds of things one talks about.

12. Preferences in types of music.

13. Where one goes on dates.

14. Where one hangs out during any spare time.

15. The interest one shows in school affairs.
Measurement of Level of Aspirations

(b) How desirous are you of doing the following things:

1. I would not want to . . . .
2. I am not especially anxious to . . . .
3. I have some desire to . . . .
4. I would very much like to . . . .
5. I am extremely anxious to . . . .

Place the number of the statement that best describes what you feel to be the right response for each of the sentences below.

_______ Be elected to student council in the school.
_______ Take every opportunity to advance yourself.
_______ Take a more important role in the student activities in the school.
_______ Establish a good reputation among peers.
_______ Receive recognition for good work in class.
_______ Receive recognition for extra curricular activities.
_______ Establish a good reputation among teachers.
_______ Someday be remembered as an important person in school.
Measurement of Level of Aspiration

Student's name: ________________________________

Place a number from the choices in Part I in front of the statements in Part II that best describes what you feel is the right response for the student listed above.

Part I. Levels of Aspirations: Choices

1. He/she would not want to ....
2. He/she is not especially anxious to ....
3. He/she has some desire to ....
4. He/she would very much like to ....
5. He/she is extremely anxious to ....

Part II. Statements regarding aspirations:

____  Take every opportunity to advance himself/herself.
____  Take a more important role in the student activities in the school.
____  Establish a good reputation among peers.
____  Receive recognition for good work in class.
____  Receive recognition for extra curricular activities.
____  Establish a good reputation among teachers.
____  Someday be remembered as an important person in the school.
Rating on Personal Characteristics

For each of the following characteristics would you please circle the statement which most nearly applies to you.

1. **Personal Appearance**
   A. An attractive personal appearance
   B. About average in personal appearance
   C. Do not make an especially good personal appearance
   D. Make a poor personal appearance
   E. No answer

2. **Practicality**
   A. Exceptionally hard headed and practical
   B. Very practical
   C. Fairly practical
   D. Rather impractical
   E. Very impractical

3. **Clearness of expression**
   A. Exceptional ability to express ideas clearly
   B. Above average ability to express ideas clearly
   C. Average ability to express ideas clearly
   D. Do not express ideas clearly
   E. Has great difficulty in expressing ideas clearly

4. **Intelligence**
   A. A person of intellectual brilliance
   B. A person of superior intelligence
   C. A person of average intelligence
   D. Usually intelligent, but not bright in some things
   E. Not very intelligent at all
   F. No answer

5. **Working with other students**
   A. Works exceptionally well with other people
   B. Works very well with other people
   C. Gets along well with other people
   D. Sometimes creates friction when working with other people
   E. Does not seem to be able to work with other people well at all
Rating of Students on Personal Characteristics

For each of the following characteristics would you please circle the statement which most nearly applies to ____________________________.

1. Personal Appearance
   A. An attractive personal appearance
   B. About average in personal appearance
   C. Do not make an especially good personal appearance
   D. Make a poor personal appearance
   E. No answer

2. Practicality
   A. Exceptionally hard headed and practical
   B. Very practical
   C. Fairly practical
   D. Rather impractical
   E. Very impractical

3. Clearness of expression
   A. Exceptional ability to express ideas clearly
   B. Above average ability to express ideas clearly
   C. Average ability to express ideas clearly
   D. Does not express ideas clearly
   E. Has great difficulty in expressing ideas clearly

4. Intelligence
   A. A person of intellectual brilliance
   B. A person of superior intelligence
   C. A person of average intelligence
   D. Usually intelligent, but not bright in some areas
   E. Not very intelligent at all

5. Working with other students
   A. Works exceptionally well with other people
   B. Works very well with other people
   C. Gets along well with other people
   D. Sometimes creates friction when working with other people
   E. Does not seem to be able to work with other people at all
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6. **Persistence**

A. Voluntarily uses every energy to finish a task
B. Seldom deterred by difficulties
C. Usually finishes a task before leaving it
D. Tends to leave difficult tasks unfinished unless encouraged to continue
E. Easily deterred by obstacles, often gives up even if encouraged to continue
APPENDIX D
Measurement of School Satisfaction

Please place a number on the line at the left which best indicates your satisfaction or dissatisfaction with your present school. Use the scale below:

Very well satisfied  Fairly well satisfied
(4)  (3)
Fairly dissatisfied  Very dissatisfied
(2)  (1)

1. How satisfied are you with your present school when you compare it to your previous school?

2. Are you satisfied with the progress you are making towards the goals you set for yourself in your present school?

3. Are you satisfied that the teachers in your school give proper recognition to your work as a student?

4. How satisfied are you with your present grades?

5. How satisfied are you with your peers at school?

6. How satisfied are you with the amount of time with which you must devote to your school work?

7. How satisfied are you with your teachers?

8. On the whole are you satisfied that the school accepts you as a fellow student to the degree to which you feel you participate in school activities?

9. How satisfied are you with your present participation level when you consider the expectations you had when you came to your present school?

10. How satisfied are you with your present school in the light of your career expectations?
APPENDIX E
Focal Interview--Intensive Study

Section 1: Description of School

1. How would you describe your school to someone who
   known absolutely nothing about it? (Clean-dirty,
   quiet-noisey, strict-easy)

2. What are the major activities at your school?

Section 2: Source of Role Definition

3. From who do you know what you are supposed to do in
   school? (Teachers, students, both)

4. Did the Student Handbook help determine your
   activities in school? Yes No

5. Who is the teacher or advisor you go to for help?
   (Name of person)

6. Are their any other people in the school who are
   important to you personally with whom you might
   discuss your likes or dislikes of this school?
   (Besides person named in Question 5)

Section 3: Relations with Counter Positions

7. Now I would like to ask you a series of questions
   about certain people in the school. I would like
   you to tell me how important each of these people
   are in determining what you do in school.

   Teachers - very important, fairly important,
             not too important, not important at all

   Administrators - very important, fairly important,
                  not too important, not important at all

   Counselors - very important, fairly important,
            not too important, not important at all
8. Suppose you were having some sort of difficulty in school. To what extent do you feel each of these persons would be willing to go out of his or her way to help you if you asked for help?

Teachers - alot, some, little, no

Counselors - alot, some, little, no

Administrators - alot, some, little, no
Perceptions of Conflict and Ambiguity

1. Do you feel that you are as clear as you would like to be about what you have to do in your school? (Stress activities rules)

2. Which of the following alternatives best represent how clear you are?
   a. I am very clear/quite clear on most things.
   b. I am fairly clear.
   c. I am not too clear.
   d. I am not at all clear.

3. How clear are you about what the people around you expect of you?
   a. I am very clear/quite clear on most things.
   b. I am fairly clear.
   c. I am not too clear.
   d. I am not at all clear.

4. Is there any particular thing in school in which you are uncertain about what people expect of you?

5. Can you tell me about it?

6. Have there ever been times when some people around you have different opinions about what you should be doing or how you should do it? (Get names)

7. If yes, can you tell me about it?

8. What do you do when that generally happens?

9. Has there ever been a time when one person wants you to do something and someone else wants you to do another? (If happens, get names)

10. If yes, what do you generally do when this happens? (Who do you listen to?)

11. As far as you know, does the teacher usually let you know when he or she expects or wants you to do something in class? (If not, get names)
Perceptions of Conflict and Ambiguity (Continued)

12. Do you usually feel that you know how satisfied the teacher is with what you do? A. A lot B. Fairly C. A little D. No

13. How clear are you about the limits of what you can do in class? (Know what assignments are important, when to stop talking, being tardy)
   a. I am very clear
   b. I am fairly clear
   c. I am not too clear
   d. I am not clear at all

14. Are you uncertain about what is expected of you by any particular person in this school?

Sources of Satisfaction:

1. What do you look for in a school?

2. What are some things that would make a school bad for you?

3. What aspects of this school do you find most satisfying? Academic, Activities, or Social Life?

4. What aspects of this school do you find least satisfying? Academic, Activities, or Social Life?

Plans and Aspirations:

1. What does your family want you to be?

2. What do you visualize as your career?

3. To what extent do you feel you are reaching your goals?

Personal Requirements of being at the school:

1. What sort of personal characteristics do you feel a person ought to have in order to be a good student?
Interrelationships Among the Three Microconsensus Measures, V, M, and D

One can partition an individual teacher's deviation from his student's score in the same way that the analysis of variance technique can take an individual's deviation from the total mean and partition it into two components. So, for a score with teachers \( i \), one can have

\[
(x_{ij} - Y_i) = (x_{ij} - \bar{x}_i) + (\bar{x}_i - Y_i)
\]

where \( x_{ij} \) equals a score for member \( j \) of teacher group \( i \), \( \bar{x}_i \) equals the mean score for all members of that teacher group \( i \), and \( Y_i \) equals the score of student \( i \).

Equation (1) indicates that the variation can be broken down into two parts, the deviation of a teacher in the group score from the mean of that group and the variation of the mean of the teacher's group response from the student's response. Squaring both sides of (1) gives:

\[
(x_{ij} - Y_i)^2 = (x_{ij} - \bar{x}_i)^2 + (\bar{x}_i - Y_i)^2 + 2(x_{ij} - \bar{x}_i)(\bar{x}_i - Y_i)
\]

Equation (2) represents the squared deviation of member \( j \) (teacher \( i \)) from the student's response. Within each teacher group there will be \( m_i \) (=number of members of the teachers group \( i \)) of these deviations. Summing over all members within a particular teacher group, there is
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{m_i} (x_{ij} - \bar{x}_i)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} (x_{ij} - \bar{x}_i)^2 + n_i (\bar{x}_i - \bar{y}_i)^2 \]

\[ + 2 (\bar{x}_i - \bar{y}_i) \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} (x_{ij} - \bar{x}_i) \]

(3)

Since \[ \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} (x_{ij} - \bar{x}_i) \]

is the sum of deviations of all teacher group members around its own mean, the final term of (3) becomes zero.

Finally,

\[ \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} (x_{ij} - \bar{y}_i)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} (x_{ij} - \bar{x}_i)^2 + m_i (\bar{x}_i - \bar{y}_i)^2 \]

which corresponds to \[ m_i D = m_i V + m_i M \]

or

\[ D = V + M \]
### TABLE 16
Primary Source of Role Definition in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Role</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 17
Source of Objective Role Conflict as Perceived by the Transferring Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Teacher</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Student</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Student</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Define</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Conflict</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 18

**Source for Role Conflict Resolution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 19

**Role Expectations in Class**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Clear</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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