8-1973

Latent Conflict in the Classroom

Joel H. Henderson  
*Western Michigan University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses](https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses)  
Part of the [Educational Sociology Commons](https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/educational_sociology)

Recommended Citation  
https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/4077
LATENT CONFLICT IN
THE CLASSROOM

by
Joel H. Henderson

A Thesis
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Master of Arts

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
August 1973
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my thesis committee, Dr. Stanley Robin, Dr. Michael Walizer, and Dr. Paul Wienir, for their invaluable help, with a special thanks to Dr. Walizer. I would also like to thank Sam Anema of the computer center, members of the faculty, staff and fellow students in the Sociology Department who provided their services, advice and support. Without the Fellowship and Assistantships from The Graduate College and the Sociology Department, I would not have been able to complete this thesis. Finally, I would like to thank my family who certainly deserves a degree of their own - with a special thanks to my wife, Marilyn, who suffered through the typing, and my children, Demra, David and Trip.

Joel H. Henderson
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>THE PROBLEM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Study of Conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict in the University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>THEORY</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociological Treatment of Conflict</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Discussion of Authority Relations</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alienation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>HYPOTHESES</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of Hypotheses</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Discussion of Control Variables</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Characteristics</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contextual Control Variables</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>RESEARCH DESIGN AND MEASUREMENT OF VARIABLES</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population and Sample</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means of Collection</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion of Measurement Instrument Used</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>FINDINGS</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Sample</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Conflict</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests of Hypotheses</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serendipitous Findings</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Issues</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>71-75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A - Letter to Instructors</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B - Instructor Questionnaire</td>
<td>77-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX C - Student Questionnaire</td>
<td>84-89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX D - Tables</td>
<td>90-95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE PROBLEM

The Study of Conflict

The purpose of this study is to examine social conflict. More specifically, latent conflict in the classroom will be the focus of this study. Three classes of variables will be discussed: 1. teacher characteristics, 2. student characteristics, and 3. contextual variables. These variables will be examined as to their ability to explain variation in latent conflict in the classroom.

The following discussion will focus on conflict in education as a "social problem." Previous literature will be examined as to the theoretical and empirical importance of the concept of conflict in social research and a general framework for this study will be developed.

Conflict has been defined as: all relations between sets of individuals that involve an incompatible difference of objective, i.e., in its most general form, activities on the part of contestants to obtain what is available (in whole or in part) to only one (Dahrendorf, 1959:135). Latent conflict is defined as: the possession by two or more groups of incompatible differences of objective. In other words, the potential to participate in conflict relationships.

This is a departure from definitions of conflict that insist upon violence as a necessary condition (Broom & Selznick, 1968:36). This departure is for two reasons. First, on-going violence is very
difficult to study and, second, because conflict can be conceived of as progressing from the benign to mortal. The study of the evolution of latent conflict to overt conflict is certainly necessary and valuable, but beyond the scope of this paper. It appears reasonable to assume that "latent conflict" and its processes are related to overt conflict. Thus, the study of one will provide information for the processes involved for the other. Hereinafter "conflict" will be used to mean "latent conflict."

A large category of "practical" reasons for studying conflict has recently become very important in terms of "campus conflicts." These conflicts can manifest themselves in many forms. For example, riots, strikes, parlimetary discussions, formalized debates, etc., have been witnessed. Although recently the intensity and violence of conflict on college campuses has subsided, the phenomenon provides an interesting arena in which to study conflict.

Conflict in the University

There are numerous examples of the results of conflict in colleges and universities. One of the major campus uprisings came in September of 1964, at the University of California at Berkeley. This is used as a starting point because (Draper, 1965:13):

"It had everything in terms of American superlatives: the largest and ongest mass blockade of a police operation ever seen; the biggest mobilization of police forces ever set up on any campus; the biggest mass arrest ever made in California, or of students, or perhaps ever made in the country; the most massive student strike ever organized here. It was, in sum, by far the most gigantic student protest movement ever mounted in the United States on a
single campus."

This does not imply that this is the first instance of conflict on a college campus; rather, it is the way the conflict was manifested that is the point (Vaughn, 1969; Bayer, 1969). One of the first student revolts in the United States took place at Harvard College in the spring of 1766 over the butter served in the commons. From that point in time student demonstrations have changed both in methods and issues (Vaughn, 1969:2-4). A worldwide historical analysis of student unrest illustrating this variety is presented by Vaughn (1969). In the 1950's, petitions, resolutions, editorials, and letters in the school publications were utilized by students to voice their dissent. In the late 60's, these means were used on virtually every campus in the United States (Bayer, 1969:3). Nevertheless, the Berkeley experience provides some illustrations of the importance of studying conflict: costs in terms of personnel, time, and energy; as well as the belief that for a large group of people change was necessary.

The reports concerning Berkeley also provide insight into the usefulness of the classroom as an arena for studying conflict. In the reports on Berkeley (Draper, 1965:3-4, 182, 186) it is stated by student leaders that such things as size of school and class give a feeling of impersonality and powerlessness; that the curriculum is inadequate and irrelevant in several areas; that the school is a diploma factory which causes an inability to pursue intellectual concerns; that large lecture sections are inadequate because of an
inability to have teacher-student interaction and because the lectures in these situations are inadequate; that because of the diploma factory or knowledge factory characteristics, students are forced to compromise their personal ideals and goals; that the educational process is governed more by the laws of supply and demand than by ability or anything else; etc.

Since the idea of a multiversity type of knowledge factory includes most of the above points, quoted below is what appears to be a reasonably full definition of this term (Draper, 1965:191-2):

"...In the context of a dazzling circus of 'bait,' which obscures our vision of the machinery, we get a four-year-long series of sharp staccatos: eight semesters, forty courses, one hundred twenty or more 'units,' ten to fifteen impersonal lectures per week, one to three oversized discussion meetings per week led by poorly paid graduate student 'teachers.' Over a period of four years the student-cog receives close to forty bibliographies; evaluation amounts to little more than pushing the test button, which results in over one hundred regurgitations in four years; and the writing of twenty to thirty-five 'papers' in four years in this context means that they are of necessity technically and substantially poor due to lack of time for thought. The course-grade-unit structure, resting on the foundation of departmentalization, produces knowledge for the student-cog which has been exploded into thousands of bits and is force-fed, by the coercion of grades. We all know what happens when we really get 'turned on' by a great idea, a great man, or a great book: we pursue that interest at the risk of flunking out. The pursuit of thought, a painful but highly exhilarating process, requires, above all, the element of time."

In short, it is claimed that students are "dissatisfied."

There are some who feel that this "dissatisfaction" can best be termed alienation. In addition, alienation has been related to classroom factors. Once can scarcely pick up an account of conflict at Berkeley without alienation being considered as an important
factor, although there are some exceptions (Heirich, 1970:5; Draper, 1965:155). The events at Berkeley were more or less repeated at Columbia (Cox Commission Report, 1968:21-22, 32) and San Francisco State (Becker, 1970:27,28,58,64; Cross, 1969; Smith, 1969) as well as many other universities (McGehee, 1969; Schaefer, 1969). In addition, Lipset and Wolin (1965) and Miller and Gilmore (1965:226) present evidence for the relationship between alienation and classroom factors. Altbach (1968:76-80) also provides an extensive bibliography of material dealing with Berkeley and Columbia. Additionally, he presents a bibliography of material concerning student alienation for those interested in pursuing these subjects.

McKenna (1971) also presents support for student dissatisfaction and its relation to classroom factors. He attributes student unrest to: 1. dull and irrelevant curriculum and non-motivating teaching methods; 2. students' lack of involvement in the decision-making process; and 3. poor relations between student and teacher. Although his is not an empirical study, it is in line with much of the literature on this issue.

Although some students appear to have been concerned with educational issues in their protests (and these issues are certainly apparent in the classroom situation) there is another set of issues that appear equally important. Reference is often made to social/political issues. These issues were civil rights, the war, the university's relationship to the community, the student's right to engage in political activity, ROTC on campus, etc. Many of these
issues were articulated by the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley, as well as through many other universities. In general, a major concern of the students revolved around the power structure. The students wanted power; they wanted to be in on the decision-making process. Bayer (1969:21) also reflects this desire for power. Thus it appears that we may be able to explain some of the conflict in classrooms in terms of authority relations.

The institutionalization (legitimization) of student evaluation of teachers, as well as student demands for a "say" in hiring and promotion of teachers, reflects the conflict the students are aware of with respect to classroom issues. We have also seen evidence reflecting the concern of students in course content and testing procedures (Bourgs, 1968). There have also been changes in the university structure and education programs. Ombudsman offices were formed, students were allowed to act on committees, and administrators communicated with student committees (Lunsford, 1967). On the other hand, many of the concerns of the students remain unresolved. The above discussion suggests that there may still be dissatisfaction on educational issues and that these dissatisfactions may be related to classroom issues.

Although there is a great deal of evidence relating educational issues to conflict, there is some disagreement on this matter. For example, Draper (1965:152-3) claims that the social/political issues and student concerns with these issues cause a dissatisfaction with the school and, in this way, the universities become the arena for
conflict. There are other authors who feel that the conflict on some of the college campuses was caused by a small group of agitators (Truman, 1968). Although this study does not concern itself with student uprisings per se, hopefully it will shed some light on the degree of conflict that exists in the classroom and the explanation of this conflict.

The preceding has attempted to show the importance of understanding conflict in higher education. In recent years the school has become a major arena for conflict. Bayer (1969) undertakes an empirical examination of the costs of conflict in the universities. In general, he finds that conflict intensity has ranged from extremely latent to overt violence. The damage resulting ranges from an assessed dollar amount to unmeasurable social upheaval. The changes in schools has verged on the dramatic. The persons involved or influenced include students, parents, teachers, administrators, and society as a whole.

Conflict in classrooms is not always of a general nature. There is ample evidence that conflict in terms of violence has occurred in the classroom (Wilson, 1968). For example (Wilson, 1968:47), "The New York City Board of Education revealed that assaults by pupils on staff members numbered about the same in 1967 as in 1966 - roughly a little more than one a school day for the entire system."

Although explanations of this violence tend to be individually based (Wilson, 1968), there are educational therapy orientations which suggest the classroom may be in need of change. That is, educational
therapy utilizes a new teaching environment with smaller classes, individualization of curriculum, etc.

In conclusion, one need only look at the destruction and change that have been happening in our systems of education to realize the practical importance of how knowledge of the workings of conflict may be utilized. In higher education we have seen students killed, buildings burned, people socially destroyed, as well as innovations in student rights, curriculum changes, student administrative participation, and human rights. Thus it is obvious that conflict exists in the university setting and it is an important area of concern.
THEORY

Sociological Treatment of Conflict

The sociological treatment of conflict is diverse. Some theorists, in setting up analytic models of society or social behavior, barely mention conflict, e.g., Parsons and Shils (1951) in Toward A General Theory of Action. However, in Parsons and Shils, the idea that conflict does exist is implicit by the very nature of the pattern variables and functional imperatives. Others treat conflict as a functional element in group processes, e.g., Coser (1956) in The Functions of Social Conflict. Still others consider conflict as the essential "cause" of structural change, e.g., Dahrendorf (1959) and Marx (Bottomore & Rubel, 1964).

Marx and Dahrendorf both consider conflict to be the primary means of effecting structural change (social change). The two theories are, in some respects, quite similar but Dahrendorf has attempted to supersede Marx and thus eliminate some of the questionable tenets of Marx's theory. Marx posited that classes were "economic groups" determined by their relation to control of means of production. These "classes" were "destined" to clash and in this way give rise to new relationships of ownership or production which, in turn, gives rise to a "new society." Marx states (Bottomore & Rubel, 1964:13):

"...This economic theory is to show how the sociological data embodied in such exceptions as class, class interest, class behavior, exchange between classes, work out through the medium of economic values, profits, wages, investment, etc., and how they generate precisely the economic process..."
that will eventually break its own institutional framework and at the same time create the conditions for the emergence of another social world."

In addition, Marx (Bottomore & Rubel, 1964:184-5, 200) suggests that there is a specific pattern to the progression. He claims that a proletariat is born out of the relations of production and goes through various stages of development. But, with its birth, the struggle with the bourgeoisie has begun.

In the first stages of development the laborers form an incoherent mass which is scattered over the whole country; that is, these laborers are broken by their intercompetition. In this stage any unifying of these laborers that is accomplished is a product of the bourgeoisie to satisfy this bourgeoisie's own political ends. Marx then suggests that the interests and conditions of the proletariat's life are more and more equalized as machinery obliterates all distinction of labor. This will result in all laborers having their wages reduced to the same low level. The next stage is brought about by the increasing improvement of machinery. This will make the worker's livelihood more and more precarious. Here the individual collisions between workmen and owners that have been a result of this progress will begin to take on a class nature. This, in turn, will result in the unification of the working class into unions and organizations to further their own interests and its end result will be riots and revolt. Marx concludes with the observation that this must result in the political supremacy of the working class. In short, this progression appears to be the embodiment of
Marx's dialectic. Where the bourgeois philosophy with its control of means of production is the thesis, our of which arises an opposing class (the proletariat) which is the antithesis, and ultimately comes conflict via revolution and the new society - this being the synthesis. Marx's dialectic could also be applied to the classroom situation, and in this arena the question to be answered is - has a synthesis taken place? That is, it has been shown there has been severe disruption verging on revolution on the college campuses. This disruption has resulted in many changes, some of which may be related to classroom relations. Thus the question - has a synthesis taken place? If such is the case, there should be little or no conflict. Although this is stretching Marx, in a very limited way it suggests an explanation for a lack of conflict, if such is found to be the case. (Another possible explanation is lack of appropriate measurement.) Marx gives a much more in-depth analysis of this progression, but the general idea remains the same.

In Marx's theory, the ownership or control must ultimately reside in the hands of the workers. Since Marx predicted no time for the evolution (revolution) we cannot say he has been disproved, but many of his reasons for predicting this change have been shown to be untrue. For example, the payment of workers has not been reduced to starvation rates and there is not an absolute division of workers and owners, etc.

Dahrendorf begins his extension of conflict theory with a re-definition of class. He does not, however, change the notion of
class conflict being the primary, if not only, cause of structural
change. Dahrendorf (1959:238) defines class as:

"2.7...such organized or unorganized collectivities
of individuals as share manifest or latent interests a­
rising from and related to the authority structure of im­
peratively coordinated associations. It follows from the
definitions of latent and manifest interests that social
classes are always conflict groups."

Thus we see that Marxian class becomes only one type of class and
Marxian conflict only one type of conflict. Here Dahrendorf has suc­
cceeded in freeing himself from an economic deterministic model while,
at the same time, allowing it to explain as much conflict as it can.
Dahrendorf, as Marx, is concerned with class conflict and both claim
conflict will cause social change. For Dahrendorf (1959:238), this
change is defined as:

"2.10. Any deviation of the values (normative struc­
ture) or institutions (factual structure) of a unit of
social analysis at a given point of time (T + n) from those
of a preceding point of time (T) shall be called structure
change, insofar as it involves the incumbents of positions
of domination."

In short, Dahrendorf's theory (1959:238-9, 240) also involves an
evolutionary process.

"3. The formation of conflict groups of the class
type follows a pattern that can be described in terms of a
model involving the following partly analytical, partly
hypothetical steps:

3.1. In any imperatively coordinated association, two,
and only two, aggregates of positions may be distinguished,
i.e., positions of domination and positions of subjection.
3.2. Each of these aggregates is characterized by com­
mon latent interests; the collectivities of individuals
concerning to them constitute quasi-groups.
3.3. Latent interests are articulated into manifest in­
terests; and the quasi-groups become the recruiting fields
of organized interest groups of the class type.
3.3.1. Articulation of manifest interests and organization of interest groups can be prevented by the intervention of empirically variable conditions of organization."

"4.2. Group conflict of the class type effects structure changes in the association in which it occurs.  
4.2.1. The radicalness of structure change co-varies with the intensity of class conflict.  
4.2.2. The suddenness of structure change co-varies with the violence of class conflict."

The above discussion attempts to show the role of conflict in social change and, hence, the theoretical importance of its study. Dahrendorf's formulations go beyond this presentation, but his extension does not negate the presented progression but, rather, qualifies it. Marx's theory (in terms of progression of economic groups to conflict stages) is quite similar in that there is a progression of a group through stages before manifest conflict occurs.

Authority relations is a general concept in Dahrendorf's theory of class conflict. For Dahrendorf, it is authority relations that determines "class." Marx has not given authority relations the central place that Dahrendorf has. Nonetheless, the relations of production, which is central to Marx's class concept, are a form of authority relations. The question arises as to how authority relations are involved in the classroom.

A Discussion of Authority Relations

The literature related to authority relations in the classroom is diverse. Waller, in 1932, (Brookover & Erickson, 1969:81-2) stated not only do authority relations exist in the classroom, but they are a fundamental element in conflict between teachers and
students. He claims that teachers and students confront themselves with an original conflict of desires and, although this conflict can be reduced or hidden, it almost certainly must remain to some extent. Brookover and Erickson (1969:81-3) bring Waller's statement up to date by also considering this domination/subordination relationship relevant to conflict in the schools. They state:

"...The dual composition of the school as a total institution sets up a social system in which a contest is likely to develop. Similar to the prison or hospital situation, the students develop their own informal social groups, if not a formal organization, with student statuses, roles, and norms of behavior. The students' definition of appropriate behavior may be different from the norms and expectations held by the teachers who are assigned as the controllers of the social institution...

The institutionalized relationship between all teachers and the pupils in the school often produces a contest...

...In some situations, behavior in accord with the student expectations is required even though it may involve opposition to or avoidance of the expectations of the teachers."

Goslin (1965:21) states: "...In the first place the relationship is typically one of status inequality, the teacher legitimately being permitted to make more specific demands on the behavior of the student than vice versa....We would predict that students tend to exert a greater reciprocal influence on the teacher role the farther up the educational ladder they go." He goes on to discuss some possible implications of the status differential and the stabilizing of the student-teacher relationship. His discussion seems to imply that if the teacher is perceived by the student to "over use" his authority that there will be a severe disruption in the student-teacher relationship. The author also provides an in-depth
discussion of the relation of authority relations to creativity.

Becker (1964), in an article that deals with a conflict of class values between students (their outside socialization) and teachers, suggests much the same as Goslin. First, he suggests that there are authority relations in the classroom (this is primarily implicit) and, second, that separate interpretations of what these relations are or should be can cause "problems" in the classroom. It should be noted that Becker's article is concerned with primary and secondary school children, but the reasoning remains the same, although the degree of conflict in colleges may be slightly reduced to the extent that students are there on a "voluntary" basis. Since college is the accepted means for mobility for many of its students, the word "voluntary" may not be appropriate. Sexton (1967:68) discusses the authority relations in schools and she, too, is primarily interested in the "compulsory education" realm, but she explicitly states that there is a carryover into the universities and, further, she predicts that given a lack of an effective student movement that most students will submit to the increasing authority that is bound to come. Similarly, Parsons and Friedenberg acknowledge the existence (Parsons, 1968:195) and some of the implications (Friedenberg, 1968:216) of authority relations in the teacher-student relationship. Although these articles are not dealing with the college populations, the implications appear extendable.

Brookover and Gottlieb (1964:328,348-51,434) cite a study by Anderson of what is termed domination and integration, where
domination refers to autocratic control of the classroom and integration a democratic control of the classroom. The findings suggest that exposure to the different types of authority produce different behavior. The nature of the behavior may vary according to educational levels and thus will not be presented here. Dreeben (1970) provides an interesting indirect justification for examining the authority relations in the classroom and their relation to other variables. That is, he mentions that this relationship exists and that he will not focus upon it. This study will attempt to examine students' perception of that authority they are submitted to as well as its relation to conflict. Thus, this study will possibly shed light on this specific aspect of authority relations.

The preceding has been an attempt to provide a brief review of the literature concerning the theoretical importance of authority relations, with particular focus on the schools. It seems apparent that there is general consensus that the classroom consists of authority relations and that differences in students' perception of the authority they are being subjected to will evoke differences in terms of conflict.

Alienation

Although Dahrendorf and Marx are similar in some respects, Marx presents a concept that may be useful in the examination of conflict in this study. The concept referred to is alienation. Bottomore and Rubel (1964:5,27) present a discussion of Marx's use of alienation
that is as follows:

"...in his analysis of the economic structure of capitalism, he describes wealth in the form of capital as another mode of alienation; the rule of capital was 'the domination of living men by dead matter.'"

"...alienation, the separation of man from himself and from his neighbours, the divorce between man as a citizen and man as a worker, the projection of the social forces of man on to an external power which is an incarnation of arbitrariness and injustice..."

Marx's utilization of this concept revolves around its function in the evolution of "class consciousness" ("interest group" in Dahrendorf's terms) and as a cause of this evolution (the misery associated with lack of control). Although Marx does not claim alienation is a cause of conflict (the cause of conflict is the relations of production), it is obviously instrumental in the manifestation of conflict.

One of the indications (or elements) of alienation is a feeling of powerlessness. As stated earlier, student demands have centered on question of power; therefore, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that alienation will be an important variable in understanding conflict.

However, there appear to be several problems related to the concept of alienation. Foremost of these is the problem of definition. Schacht (1970) presents a discussion of the historical development of the concept of alienation in the sociological literature. He illustrates the various definitions and uses of the concept. Unfortunately, some of these uses and definitions are incompatible both logically and empirically. He states:
"If one were to go by the various general contexts in which the term is used in recent sociological literature, it might seem that four different basic uses of the term, or types of alienation, emerge: interpersonal alienation, work alienation, politicoeconomic alienation, and socio-cultural alienation. Closer examination reveals, however, that each of these designations comprehends a variety of different and often quite independent phenomena..." (Schacht, 1970:194)

"...As such, it would be understood neither to designate a particular variable or pattern among other specific attitudinal and behavioral configurations, nor to stand as a theoretical construe such as might be used in their interpretation and explanation. Of course, relations might be established between certain of the phenomena comprehended by it..." (Schacht, 1970:196)

Thus there is an implication that "alienation" is not a useable concept. But, it appears that a possible solution is to understand that one's measuring instrument greatly delimits the definition of alienation being used.

One attempt to clear up the definitional problem related to alienation is made by Seeman (1959:783-91). What follows will be Seeman's definitions and a note on each.

1. POWERLESSNESS: "as the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements, he seeks."

Seeman goes on to explain why he uses expectancy of the individual and connects his usage with that of Rotter et al (1961). Finally, Seeman emphasizes that his usage is limited to man's relation to the larger social order.

2. MEANINGLESSNESS: high alienation is when "the individual is unclear as to what he ought to achieve - when the individual's
The foregoing usage of alienation is in terms of the ability to predict behavior outcomes, whereas the powerlessness usage is in terms of the ability to control behavior outcomes. Seeman says that these are logically independent.

3. NORMLESSNESS: "the anomic interaction, from the individual's point of view, may be defined as one in which there is a high expectancy that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve given goals."

The above definition given by Seeman is his attempt to restate Durkheim's concept of anomie as used by Durkheim and Merton.

4. ISOLATION: "The alienated in the isolation sense are those who, like the intellectual, assign low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society."

This definition is also related to Merton's work. Where normlessness would correspond to Merton's "innovator," isolation more closely corresponds to the adjustment pattern of rebellion.

5. SELF-ESTRANGEMENT: "One way to state such a meaning is to see alienation as the degree of dependence of the given behavior upon anticipated future rewards..."

Seeman attributes the use of alienation in terms of self-estrangement to Fromm, Mills, Hoffer, and Riesman. He suggests that examples of self-estrangement are the worker who works only for his salary, the other-directed type, and the housewife who cooks simply to get it over with.
In summary, Seeman has attempted to take the descriptive use of alienation and define the different areas with which the concept has been linked. He has done this in terms of values, behaviors, and expectations, with the purpose of providing conceptual clarity.

Dean (1961:753-8) defines alienation in terms of three major components. The first of these is powerlessness. He credits Hegel and Marx with establishing this concept and Weber with extending it. That is, Weber claimed that the scientists, civil servants, professors, etc. (in addition to factory workers) were also separated from control over their work. The second component is normlessness - this is derived from Durkheim's anomie. Dean utilizes DeGrazia's interpretation of anomie. DeGrazia (Dean, 1961) interprets anomie, as Durkheim formulated it, as made up of three characteristics: a painful uneasiness or anxiety, a feeling of separation from group standards, and a feeling of pointlessness or that no goals exist. Dean also states that MacIver has described anomie as an absence of values which give purpose to life, etc. There is a second type of normlessness which is conflict of norms. This conflict of norms is illustrated by such things as cooperative and competitive norms in the same social situation (this is sometimes true of classrooms). Dean concludes that normlessness may very well have several facets (this appears true by his definition). The final component is social isolation. This is defined as "a feeling of separation from the group or of isolation from group standards" (Dean, 1961). This appears to be the same as the second characteristic of anomie, but
Dean only says that social isolation is derived from the anomic concept. Finally, Dean's study is an attempt to show a relationship between alienation and certain traits – age, community background, etc. He finds no substantial evidence for this and concludes one explanation might be that alienation is not a trait but may manifest itself in certain situations (a situation-relevant variable).

Evidence for the societal alienation definition is also presented by Pappenheim (1959). He presents an historical development of the concept alienation. He attributes its philosophical origin to Hegel and Fichte, and its incorporation into sociology is attributed to Marx. But, Pappenheim points out that conditions of alienation and its recognition by the persons living in the given time period is not so modern. The question becomes one not of when alienation, but what degree alienation. Throughout his analysis, Pappenheim suggests that the "cause" of alienation is the society that the individual lives in. Several other authors (Keniston, 1969:12; Wolfers, 1968:264–71; Bottomore & Rubel, 1964:27) follow the above reasonings and also utilize an historical analysis of the concept alienation. They similarly conclude that alienation is alienation in reference to the greater society.

One definition of alienation that Bottomore and Rubel (1964:27) utilize is: "...the separation of man from himself and from his neighbour, the divorce between man as a citizen and man as a worker, the projection of the social forces of man on to an external power which is an incarnation of arbitrariness and injustice..." This last
definition will be the one utilized in this study and is Bottomore's interpretation of the Marxian use.

In this research, Dean's measurement of powerlessness (Robinson & Shaver, 1969) will be used to measure alienation. The discussion of this measurement instrument will be done in the design section of this paper. It should be noted that Dean (1961) claims that his powerlessness measure is an attempt to capture the meaning of the Marxian concept, however no formal assessment of validity will be presented.

The choice of the Marxian concept of alienation for use in this study is done primarily on two bases: first, the study is attempting to extend the use of alienation from factory worker to the student, and second, the student activism literature suggests that powerlessness is the type of alienation that best suits the intention of these authors.

The final problem is showing the relationship of alienation to the classroom situation. Halleck (1969:121), who considers alienation something to be treated by psychotherapy, presents several "traits" of alienation. Two of these traits, 1. a tendency to live in the present and to avoid commitment to people, causes, or ideas, and 2. an inability to concentrate or study, appear to be closely connected to classroom behavior and they suggest that possession of these traits may result in conflict in certain classroom situations, these situations being those where the teacher is interested in developing study habits, a future orientation, or a historical
perspective. In addition, Kelman (1969:111) claims that the number of alienated college students is small, but for those students who came for treatment the number is great.

Rotter (1961:161-77) provides information concerning the effects of alienation (powerlessness) on learning. He finds there is poorer learning under conditions of powerlessness (low-control). It should be noted that his experiment was done using females from the elementary psychology courses at The Ohio State University.

Seeman's thesis (1967:105-23) is: "that an individual's generalized expectancy for control of his outcome (i.e., his sense of powerlessness) governs his attitude to, and acquisition of, information available in the environment." Seeman finds that alienation and learning (of certain kinds of material - those which are control-relevant) are negatively related. But the correlations are low and thus explain a small amount of variance in the knowledge scores. Seeman also studies the relationship between alienation and behavior avoidance, but his results are considered inconclusive and possibly not relevant to classroom behavior.

Etzioni (1968:879) states: "Alienation, in the terms of reference used here, means a social situation which is beyond the control of the individual, and hence unresponsive to his basic human needs." He posits (1968:870-85) that there are basic human needs, two of which are affection and recognition. He further states that roles that are less fulfilling of these needs will have greater amounts of socialization and social control attached to them. In addition, that
the pressure to change will not be random but greater in roles that are less fulfilling of these needs and in the direction of satisfying these basic human needs. This will hold true in any culture, society, or sub-unit. The proposition, if found to be true, (Etzioni presents some evidence to its validity but suggests empirical testing) could possibly be used to describe the student role and the movement by students to change this role - in turn there would be ramifications for the interpretation of the authority relations in the classroom (the relative alienation in the teacher-student roles). Note, this is only a suggested descriptive device as such a relationship would have to be tested in relation to other roles to go beyond description.

Etzioni also discusses alienation dividing it into reducible and irreducible. One way that alienation is irreducible is when dissatisfaction cannot be eliminated. In addition, Etzioni suggests that alienation can be reduced by a different allocation of power (as well as other things). Although there is no direct link made between conflict and alienation, it appears that such a link is possible, the major difficulty being that of measurement. The connection between alienation and conflict is also suggested, using the term aggression. It would appear that the classroom could be an "inauthentic" situation which would result in conflict being "bottled up."

Conflict

To this point conflict has been broadly defined as two groups having incompatible goals. It is realized that this definition is
all encompassing and all aspects of incompatible goals will not be examined. Rather, differences in goals related to the classroom arena will be utilized to measure classroom conflict.

Dick (1961) has shown that there are differences between the student's expectations of the teacher and student roles, and the teacher's expectations of these roles. He examined four areas of each role (1961:417):

A. Instructor Role
   1. Personal relationships with students
   2. Consideration for students
   3. Teaching skills and effectiveness
   4. Objectivity in grading and evaluation

B. Student Role
   1. Studiousness
   2. Personal academic responsibility
   3. Maturity in classroom demeanor
   4. Academic integrity

The areas showing the greatest differences were: Grading (32%), Studiousness (30%), and Academic Integrity (32%). In addition, he concludes that there is role conflict between teachers and students. Although he does note that there is also role consensus as it is necessary for the existence of the social system. Dick's study was descriptive and did not consider other variables that may be related to role conflict. The present study could be considered an extension of Dick's study as it will examine other variables that may be related to conflict in some of the role areas he utilized.

Lonsdale (1970) strongly suggests that there is conflict between teachers and students. Although he is dealing with engineering
education, his ideas seem extendable. He states three major difficulties: 1. a misunderstanding of educational goals, 2. a semantic gap, and 3. an unknowing disagreement with students on respective role interpretations. Lonsdale goes on to discuss the various aspects of these areas that present problems. An example he gives is the difference between students' ideas of education and teachers' ideas of education. That is, the student's primary concern being grades and a diploma, whereas the teacher is usually more interested in the intellectual aspects of the course. In general, Lonsdale attacks the question as to why there is conflict, and at the same time gives credence to the notion that conflict between teachers and students is a function of certain attributes of the classroom.

The study of conflict (as an interaction process) has, in general, been justified by sociologists of the "formal" school. Sorokin (1928:488), in discussing this school, states, "...but in addition it stresses that the proper object of sociology, as a specific science, is the study of the forms of social interaction, or of social relationship, as contrasted with its contents, as studied by other social sciences."

In short, conflict is a relationship between people or groups and, thus, is in the realm of sociological study. And, although there is a diversity of opinion on the "place" of the classification and study of interpersonal and human relations in sociology, there appears to be a great deal of consensus that conflict or its equivalent should be included as one form of the interaction process to be studied.
HYPOTHESES

In the opening pages of this paper it was stated that three classes of variables would be utilized as predictors of classroom conflict. There are many variables that could fit into this classification, but the theoretical relevance of two of these variables, authority relations and alienation, have been closely examined in the preceding section. In this section, the foregoing discussion will be summarized and hypotheses presented.

Development of Hypotheses

The previous works discussed in the theory section suggest that authority relations (all further use of the authority relations concept refers to student's perception of authority relations) are relations of domination and subordination, or autocratic control as opposed to democratic control. That is, the relative right and ability to make decisions by the parties under consideration. These works also suggest that such relationships in the school setting can and do produce conflict. The use of this variable by the above mentioned authors and its use in terms of the actual authority exercised in the classroom leads to the conclusion that if it is related to conflict it is because of the functions of the classroom. These works suggest the first major hypothesis: the greater the difference in the student's perception of authority relations the greater the conflict.
Dahrendorf's theory of conflict (1959) is built on authority relations. By definition, Dahrendorf asserts that in any group where there are authority relations (superordinate/subordinate groups) there is conflict. In addition, Dahrendorf classifies groups as either being groups with superordinate/subordinate relations or not being such groups. The first hypothesis of this study is an extension of Dahrendorf's model in that it examines what happens to conflict scores when one looks at the difference of perceived authority exercised in the classroom.

It should be noted that this hypothesis is not a test of Dahrendorf's theory of conflict, but, rather, an extension of one of his assertions or assumptions from which he builds his theory. Since Dahrendorf's theory is in terms of conflict between groups having differing amounts of authority (one group in the role of superordination and one group in the role of subordination), it appears reasonable that such a conflict should manifest itself in the teacher-student relationship where such authority relations are perceived to exist.

The use of Dahrendorf's theory in terms of teacher-student relationships appears to be justified by examining one of his typologies of conflict. This typology is presented and discussed by Angell (McNeil, 1965:92). Here Dahrendorf gives father-son conflict as an example of class conflict (i.e., conflict that arises from a superordinate/subordinate relationship).

Dahrendorf appears to indirectly claim that a person's being
subjected to authority relations produces a certain state and this state is unaltered by the degree of authority the person is subjected to. But, it is this author's opinion that the type or degree of authority relations would be alembic in relation to conflict in the classroom. This reasoning is reflected in the literature describing strong concern of the students for control.

This hypothesis presents the problem of reciprocal causation. That is, it becomes impossible to distinguish whether conflict is causing the authority relations or the authority relations are causing the conflict. All that can be done at this point is to acknowledge the problem and interpret the results of this study with this in mind.

The second major concept previously discussed is alienation. In addition to the empirical studies that suggest that alienation and conflict should be related in the school setting, Marx's works also lend support to a second hypothesis. This second hypothesis is: the greater the student's alienation the greater the conflict. That is, Marx presents the most "concrete" connection between alienation and conflict, with alienation appearing to cause conflict (although there is some evidence that they are mutually supportive). Marx suggests that due to the separation of man from the means of production and the "ends" of his work that he will become alienated. That is, he will lose the feeling of control over his existence and that this control will be attributed to the economic/material forces. In addition, as he becomes more alienated he will attempt to stop these forces causing his condition. Thus he will be brought into
conflict with these forces with the ultimate result being revolution.

Marx's concern was with the factory worker and the student role was, for him, a relatively unimportant factor. But today the analogy between the factory and the university is gaining credence. The student activists are voicing many of the dissatisfactions that suggest that the conflict being seen in the school arena is in part due to alienation - in the case of students, a feeling of powerlessness in relation to the conflict of goals of students and those in power in the schools. Additionally, it is hoped that by taking as a definition and measurement of alienation that feeling of being separated from the general society because of a feeling of powerlessness in relation to the general society rather than a situation-specific measurement and definition, that a close connection to Marx's intentions will be accomplished.

Therefore, although Marx presents an indirect theoretical relevance for this hypothesis, the primary justification for its inclusion must rest on the student's self-pronouncement of alienation as a cause of his dissatisfaction which has resulted in conflict.

Although there is evidence for the relationship between both alienation and conflict and differences in authority and conflict, there are many variables that must be controlled in order to examine more accurately the posited relationships.
A Discussion of Control Variables

In keeping with the classification of variables into student characteristics, teacher characteristics, and contextual characteristics, this typology will be used in the discussion of the control variables. Although the discussion of control variables is brief, it should be noted that as a replacement for randomization and experimental design it is extremely important.

Student characteristics control variables

The student characteristics to be utilized as control variables are sex, age, social class, and year in school. The reasons for the selection of these particular variables will follow, but it should be noted that a great many variables have been omitted. The most obvious of these is race, and this is due to legal and social considerations. In addition to race, there have been no physiological variables other than sex included. Several of these variables may be important (i.e., physical health, physical characteristics, etc.). In addition, there have been no psychological variables included (i.e., personality tests, a measure of mental health, various aptitude measures, etc.). Political attitudes as well as various other attitudes and philosophies that are individually held and may effect responses are omitted. The primary justification for the exclusion of both physiological and psychological variables is the time/cost/measurement factors.

The above discussion suggests many variables that could possibly
be important but that are not included. However, since variables included have been selected on the basis of past research in combination with theoretical writings, they will prove to be the important ones.

The importance of social class has been extensively demonstrated in the literature. One of the most direct connections (in terms of this study) is made by Brookover and Erickson (1969:53, 129):

"Although sociologists may have overemphasized the differences between classes in recent decades, it seems quite clear that class is associated with some differences in behavior. The nature of the family system and the concomitant socialization of the children may vary significantly from one class to another. Numerous analyses of public opinion and voting, as well as other types of behavior, have demonstrated significant differences between various social classes."

"In summary, there is a strong relationship between student and school social class, and performance and attitudes. The social class composition of schools is the single most important school factor affecting student performance and attitudes."

Becker (1964:96, 101) also suggests that different patterns of socialization are going to make for a diversity of goals in the classroom - a situation that would certainly influence the conflict scores. Becker's discussion is in terms of social class, but Sexton (1967:56) claims there is a high correlation between race and class.

In addition, Goslin's (1965) discussion is similar to Becker's in that he discusses the influence that parents have on their child's reaction to different types and degrees of authority:

"A number of sociologists and social psychologists have observed that the cultural background of the family group, which in turn is related to its racial, ethnic, and geographical origins, has a significant impact on child rearing practices and therefore on resulting attitudes about education and authority..." (Goslin, 1965:32)
Lipset (1968:39-51) states that students with a certain pattern of attitudes toward activism tend to pick their major accordingly. Lipset also suggests that activists (or people who are likely to bring conflict attitudes into the school arena from their environment) tend to come from the upper class, with a substantial amount from the middle, and substantially less from the lower class (the lower class non-white may be an exception).

Sex is a traditional control variable and needs little if any discussion. But in terms of its relationship to conflict, Berkowitz (1962) may add some information. Berkowitz (1962:267-74) discusses various studies that suggest a relationship between sex and aggression. As most of the studies concern children, the substance will not be presented. However, if one allows the assumption that aggression and latent conflict are related, then sex may be an important explanatory variable. On the other hand, the recent emergence of women's liberation, with the concentration on independence and assertion of rights, may negate the proposed relationship or possibly change the direction of the relationship.

**Teacher characteristics control variables**

The teacher characteristics that are to be included in this study are age, degree the teacher holds, proportion of time spent on teaching, sex, and experience.

The teacher characteristics that will not be included are race, physiological characteristics (such as physical appearance), physi-
cal health, mental health, psychological variables, and various political attitudes and philosophies that are individually held that may effect an individual's reaction to him.

The justification for the inclusion of age is primarily in terms of the generation gap idea. Friedenberg (1969) states that the generation gap is a real and serious conflict of interests between teachers and students. He discusses this issue in terms of compulsory education and the selective service system, the latter being more relevant to the college setting. On the other hand, in the article, "The Young College Faculty Member - A New Breed" (Klapper, 1969), it is suggested that there is only slight evidence that younger faculty members differ from their older colleagues. Thus it appears that under different circumstances different finding concerning the effects of teacher age are found.

The justification for the workload variable is reflected throughout the student activism literature. In addition to this literature, Blocker (1969) claims that dehumanization is attributed to professors doing research rather than concentrating on teaching. He also provides additional evidence for the use of degree the teacher holds by stating that student dissatisfaction is related to the experience of the teacher, especially in the case of graduate student teachers who are overworked and unprepared to handle their dual roles of teacher and student.
Contextual control variables

The last class of control variables to be discussed is the contextual category. Variables of this type that have been selected for inclusion are: 1. number of pupils in the classroom, and 2. level of the course, i.e., 100, 200, 300, 400. It should be noted that there are several variables that have been omitted. For example, the seating arrangements, physical properties of the classroom (i.e., lighting, colors, windows, heat, etc.), and variables dealing with race. These, as well as other variables being excluded, are primarily avoided because of time/cost/measurement consideration.

The contextual variables form a somewhat less traditional category of control variables. These become essential due to the setting of the study. Latent conflict is being measured as conflict that arises out of the specific classroom. Thus it appears necessary to consider other variables that are specific to and arising out of the classroom as possibly having an effect on the conflict.

The first of these variables, size of class, has been studied before and its influence can be seen in such works as Blake (1954), Cohen (1966), and Cannon (1966). Although these studies do not deal with the college classroom, they do reflect the concern of educators with this issue. This same concern is reflected throughout the student activism literature.

The second of the contextual variables, level of course, is the least justifiable from the literature, but since the data is available it will be included. It also may be noted that age and level
of course will probably be highly related, thus providing a possible justification for its inclusion.

In summary, the variables to be included in this study have been presented and their respective functions noted. Hopefully, the reader is now aware of what is going to be done. The questions that are now brought to mind are: population characteristics, sampling procedures, the research design and analysis techniques. This will be the purview of the following pages.
RESEARCH DESIGN
AND MEASUREMENT OF VARIABLES

The design plan of this study can be divided into three general areas: 1. definition of the population and sampling procedures, 2. data collection, and 3. the type of analysis that will be utilized. Each of these is discussed in this section. It should be noted that this study is a survey.

Population and Sample

The population under consideration is the students at Western Michigan University. Cluster sampling is used to obtain a sample. The clusters consist of classes that are listed in the Schedule of Classes for Winter Semester 1973. Excluded from the population are independent research, independent reading, and varsity sports teams (teams that are listed as classes). The questionnaire will be administered to students and teachers in the respective classes that will be sampled. This will be done during the three week period April 1 - 20, 1973.

A random sample of thirty classes will be drawn, using a table of random numbers and the Schedule of Classes distributed by the Registrar's Office. The thirty courses should produce an N of at least 566, which is the recommended figure for the 95% confidence level (Arkin & Colton, 1963:145).

Cluster sampling is necessary in order to obtain information that is relative to the classroom. Obtaining such a sample allows
the use of contextual variables in the analysis.

Data Collection

The collection of data can be broken into two sections:
1. the means of collection, and 2. a discussion of the measurement instrument used.

Means of collection

In collecting the data, three steps will be taken. First, a letter (see Appendix A) will be sent to each of the teachers whose course is chosen. Second, a phone call will be made to each of these teachers, at which time permission will be requested to administer the questionnaire. In courses where such permission is granted, an appointment will be made to administer the questionnaire in a specific class period.

After a time is scheduled, one of three alternatives will be pursued. First, either one of my representatives or this author will go to the class and administer the questionnaire. Second, a set of questionnaires will be delivered to the instructor who then administers the questionnaire. Third, a set of questionnaires will be delivered and the instructors will give them to the students to return at a later date.
Discussion of the measurement instrument used

There are two measurement instruments (see Appendix B and C) - one which will be administered to the instructors and the other which will be administered to the students. Both contain a set of questions that both instructors and students answer. The questions that are different are only those that are demographic characteristics relevant to the two groups.

Although it is believed that an explanation of the measurement of many of the variables (sex, age, level of course, etc.) is not necessary, others (social class, alienation, conflict) are not as clear cut and thus will be discussed.

Social class has consistently presented measurement problems for sociologists as witnessed by the various indicators utilized as measurement. One of the most inclusive and accurate measures is the socio-economic scale suggested by the U. S. Census data. But due to the expected 600-odd respondents and that it is necessary to recode these responses into approximately 253 categories, it was felt that there would not be sufficient time to complete the task. In addition, these pre-established categories are not always the same as the respondent's self-classification, and thus this method seems more amenable to an interview method of data collection.

The measure to be used is based on the census classification, but cutting points are pre-established. The categories range from 0 to 4 in intervals of 1. 0 is designated for the lowest class and 4 is the highest class. The student will circle one of the four
responses which are presented as clusters of occupations.\(^1\) The categories are:

\[
\begin{align*}
4 &= ( \text{Self-employed professional} \\
   &= ( \text{Proprietor of large business (valued at } $100,000 \text{ or more)} \\
   &= ( \text{Top-level executive in a large organization) }
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
3 &= ( \text{Salaried professional} \\
   &= ( \text{Proprietor of a medium business (valued at } $35,000 \\
   &= ( \text{to } $99,999) \\
   &= ( \text{Official or executive (other than top) in large business} \\
   &= ( \text{or top in small business) } \\
   &= ( \text{Farmer having farm worth } $100,000+) \\
   &= ( \text{Salesman earning } $35,000 \text{ or more) }
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
2 &= ( \text{Proprietor of small business} \\
   &= ( \text{Salesman earning under } $35,000 \\
   &= ( \text{Clerical worker) }
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
1 &= ( \text{Semi-skilled worker} \\
   &= ( \text{Service worker) }
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
0 &= ( \text{Unskilled worker} \\
   &= ( \text{Unemployed} \\
   &= ( \text{Sharecropper) }
\end{align*}
\]

Another variable that merits discussion is the alienation measure. The literature review on alienation has shown various definitions which, in turn, have suggested various measurement instruments that could be appropriate. After examining several such instruments, it was decided that Dean's measure of powerlessness as presented by Robinson and Shaver (1969) would be best suited to this study. Dean's scale is broken into three sections: powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation. Each of these is an attempt to measure a different aspect of alienation, with the powerlessness

\(^1\)This measure was obtained from Dr. Cora Marrett and is published, but the exact reference has eluded us.
section being an attempt to measure the Marxian use of alienation (Dean, 1961).

The basis for the decision to use the powerlessness measure is twofold: First, the questions in this scale appear to capture the spirit of Marx's use of alienation, as well as the use of alienation in terms of the individual's relationship to the greater society. The second reason is due to practical considerations. That is, the number of items on the questionnaire had to be restricted. The combination of the above two reasons thus produced the partial use of Dean's scale rather than a utilization of all its components.

A third variable that is central to this paper is the perception of the relative amount of authority exercised in the classroom. This variable will be operationalized in terms of the respondent's perception of his role in the decision-making process. It is believed that this behavioral operationalization of authority will present an adequate measure of said concept. As this author has been unable to find another operationalization of the concept, no precedence can be presented. Nevertheless, authority, in addition to being legitimized power, is concerned with the ability to make decisions. This will be measured by utilizing the following categories:

0 = 50% of the decisions are made by the teacher and 50% by the students.
1 = 60% of the decisions are made by the teacher and 40% by the students.
2 = 75% of the decisions are made by the teacher and 25% by the students.
3 = 85% of the decisions are made by the teacher and 15% by the students.
4 = 100% of the decisions are made by the teacher.
5 = 60% of the decisions are made by the students and 40% by the teacher.
6 = 75% of the decisions are made by the students and 25% by the teacher.
7 = 85% of the decisions are made by the students and 15% by the teacher.
8 = 100% of the decisions are made by the students.

The measure utilized should obtain information on the student's perception of the percentage of decisions made by the respective groups. In testing the hypothesis, categories 1 and 5 will be coded 1; 2 and 6 will be coded 2; 3 and 7 will be coded 3; and 4 and 8 will be coded 4; the 0 category will remain the same. This will provide a measure of the absolute difference of decision-making in the classroom.

The reason for this new measure is to obtain a measure of the student's perception of differences in authority. Since we are testing the hypothesis the greater the difference in authority the greater the conflict, it should make no difference in which direction the difference is, i.e., whether the student or the teacher is making the decision. This is especially the case since the conflict score is determined by differences in teacher-student responses.

The final variable to be discussed is the dependent variable, latent conflict. Dick (1961) has devised an index that purports to measure role consensus between teachers and students in a college population. The items for the conflict score will, in part, be drawn from this index. The changes will be in terms of addition of items suggested by the literature, and changes in wording that would make the questions specific to the classroom under study. More specifically, Dick's index has 55 items, 24 of which are incorporated
into the present questionnaire. Four additional items are suggested by the literature (Items 26 through 29). The final number of items utilized in computing the conflict score will be 28.

The items were selected on the basis of face validity (on how well they appear to reflect classroom issues and teacher-student relationships). It should be noted that the latent conflict being measured is only in the areas of teacher-student interaction and classroom issues. This restriction eliminates differences in such areas as political beliefs and social values. In addition to the elimination of some items, the items used had to be changed in order to make them classroom specific. But the substance of the question is retained. An example may clarify the nature of the changes:

Dick's index item:

IA2. An instructor should make a conscious effort to learn the names of his students.

Revised item:

30. This instructor should make a conscious effort to learn the names of the students in his class.

Finally, a conflict score will be computed by taking the absolute difference between a teacher's response on an item and the student's corresponding response. This difference score will be summed for all items, producing a new variable which is considered a conflict score. The steps of the process are: 1. compute the mean for each group on each item separately; 2. if any respondent has a 9 (non-response) on an item, give him the mean of the respective group; 3. subtract the teacher's response on a specific item from the
student's response and record the absolute value of this difference; 4. sum the absolute differences for all items; 5. create a new variable for each student which consists of the final value obtained in Step 4. This conflict score provides a summary measure on the amount of disagreement between the teacher and student of a specific class over all the items.

It should be noted that any respondents who do not respond to five or more items will be eliminated from the sample. In addition, any non-responses (totaling less than five per respondent) to specific items will be given the value of the mean of the item of the respective group to which they belong.

Although the conflict score will be used as the dependent variable, another summary measure will be used to ascertain if there is conflict in the classroom (a necessary condition in the hypotheses tests). It should be noted that these scores are related to the dependent variable, with the following measure simply being a collapsed version of the conflict score which allows one to ascertain the percentage of persons disagreeing on a percentage of items. The following should clarify the purpose of this measure:

What will be done is to reduce the original 4-0 scale by combining the categories of Strongly Agree and Agree and making this equal to 2; and to combine Strongly Disagree and Disagree and make this equal to 0. 1 will equal Uncertain. The second step in this process will be to examine the teacher's score and the student's score for each item, assigning a 1 if there is a difference and a 0 if there is no difference. The final step will be to sum the scores
for all items of a student and compute the mean. This mean will vary between 0 and 1 in intervals of tenths. Thus, a .1 means there is disagreement on 10% of the items, .2 means there is disagreement on 20% of the items, and so on. It should be noted that these percentages are to be percentages of items disagreed upon either by total disagreement or by one of the parties being uncertain while the other has a definite opinion and will not include differences in degrees of agreement or degrees of disagreement. It is these percentage scores and the relative number of respondents receiving each score that will be reported in examining the degree of conflict present.

One final point should be mentioned. A pre-test utilizing two sociology classes of approximately 20 students each was administered. The pre-test was given to ascertain the time required for administration as well as to find incomprehensible questions. The time necessary for completion of the questionnaire was approximately 25 minutes. There were no major changes necessary in the content of the questions.

Analysis

The final concern of this section is the discussion of the nature of the analysis to be undertaken.

Two hypotheses were previously stated. In addition to undertaking an explanation of the means of testing these hypotheses, this section will first address itself to the examination of a necessary condition implicit throughout this paper.
The condition alluded to is that, indeed, there will be conflict in the classroom. That is, does variation exist in the dependent variable and what is the range of this conflict? This presents special problems in that it is a conceptual (definitional) problem more than a statistical problem. This problem will be examined by utilization of the collapsed conflict score that was presented in the preceding section.

In addition to examining the issue of the existence of conflict, there are two hypotheses that will be tested and discussed.

The first hypothesis, the greater the difference in the student's perception of authority relations the greater the conflict, will be treated as follows: A statistical test utilizing the stepwise regression procedure will be used to ascertain if the authority relations variable contributes a unique significant amount in explaining the variation in the conflict scores. The null hypothesis associated with the first hypothesis is that the student's perception of authority will not provide a significant unique contribution to explaining the variation in conflict scores. The test associated with this null hypothesis will result in the decision concerning the first hypothesis.

In addition to the above-mentioned test, the zero-order correlation and zero-order slope will be reported and discussed in terms of practical significance.

The second hypothesis, the greater the alienation of a student the greater the conflict, will be examined in the same way as the first hypothesis. The null hypothesis associated with it is:
the student's alienation will not provide a significant unique contribution to explaining the variation in conflict scores.

Another consideration of the analysis will be to report and discuss the multiple correlation coefficient. In the preceding section, each of the variables that are to be utilized in the multiple regression (stepwise procedure) have been examined in view of the literature. Thus it appears that a discussion of how well all the variables in combination contribute to explaining the variation in the conflict scores may be helpful.

One final point will be examined. That is, a Spearman rank-order correlation will be computed to ascertain the possibility of a curvilinear relationship. This procedure is only sensitive to ceiling and cellar effect (a type of curvilinearity) and thus does not totally rule out the possibility of various quadratic curves.

Although only the stepwise procedure will be considered a formal test of the stated hypotheses, the other discussions may prove valuable in explicating the nature of the data and thus providing direction for future research in this area.

The specific formulas or computer programs that were used to obtain the desired information and the results of the analysis will be presented in the following section.

---

1 The use of Spearman rank-order correlation to examine the possibility of certain types of curvilinearity was obtained from a lecture given by Dr. Bradley Huitema of the Psychology Department of Western Michigan University.
FINDINGS

The findings section of this paper will cover two areas: 1. the research sample, and 2. data analysis.

Research Sample

In the discussion of the research sample, two points are of concern. First, the presentation of the return rate and, second, a brief description of the research population will be presented.

The return rate has two aspects, these being the classroom returns and the student returns.

Originally thirty courses were sampled. This was modified by attempting to compensate for four courses that were inappropriately sampled. That is, four classes were listed in the population that should not have been. These classes were either independent reading courses, varsity teams, or courses that were eight week courses and were over at the time of questionnaire administration; but were discovered soon enough so that four alternate classes were chosen. In addition to these four courses, there was one other course that was inappropriately sampled, but not discovered early enough to substitute in the sample. Thus, four courses randomly sampled were used as alternates, bringing the total sample to twenty-nine. Four instructors refused to have the questionnaire administered to their classes due to lack of time and, in one course, the instructor did not answer the questions in the conflict index so the entire class had
to be eliminated. The end result was a sample of twenty-four courses out of a possible twenty-nine.

The student return rate was not as high as that for classrooms. It was determined from the Registrar and the instructor of each class what the enrollment for that class was at the time of the administering of the questionnaire. These figures were summed, producing an anticipated N of 821. From this, 116 is deducted due to class non-response rate, and an additional 44 is deducted due to non-response by individuals on key questions. This leaves us with an anticipated N of 661 but, in actuality, the N is 404. Thus, 257 respondents either were absent from class or did not return their questionnaires. This discrepancy strongly suggests that generalization beyond the students who were in class at the time of questionnaire administration may be inappropriate.

The final point of discussion in relation to the research sample is a brief description of the research population. There are various variables one could use to describe the research population. Since cluster sampling was used, this description will be in terms of the percentage of students from each college. See Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>33.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>30.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>404</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is not known how representative these figures are of the distribution of all students in the university.

In addition, the number of courses sampled from the various departments may be useful. See Table II.

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE BY DEPARTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Humanities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Upper Class Electives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education for Women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Social Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-responses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 29 100.00

Once again, it is not known how well the courses sampled represent the population of courses of the university. The specific courses that did not respond are not included. This is due to the promise of confidentiality.

Data Analysis

In this section, the data analysis will be reported. There will be three major areas of discussion: 1. the degree of conflict, 2. tests of hypotheses, and 3. serendipitous findings.
Degree of conflict

It will be remembered that in the preceding section it was stated that it would be necessary to ascertain if, indeed, there is conflict in the classroom. The means used to test this necessary condition were previously stated and the findings are shown in Table III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF ITEMS ON WHICH THERE IS DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN STUDENTS AND TEACHERS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS IN EACH DISAGREEMENT CATEGORY*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.5 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.5 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>9.2 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>28.2 (114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>33.7 (136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.5 (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.2 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0% (404)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*actual number of students is reported in parentheses.

This distribution certainly shows that there is disagreement between students and teachers on certain aspects of the classroom issues and on certain aspects of teacher-student interaction processes. It should also be noted that in terms of the dependent variable as used in the analysis that variation also exists. This is reflected in the standard deviation of 7.342, a mean of 29.921, a variable of 53.909,
and an actual range of 45 (the possible range is 113).

**Tests of hypotheses**

The first hypothesis is: the greater the difference in the student's perception of authority relations the greater the conflict. This test was made utilizing the Stepwise Computer Program of Western Michigan University. Due to the limitations of the program, two runs were necessary. That is, the computer was unable to take all of the variables at one time.

The first run consisted of eleven variables. An F value of 1.82 was used for entering a variable, and an F value of 1.81 was used for omitting a variable. The predictor variables used were: student's age, student's social class, student's perception of authority, student's year in school, student's alienation score, degree teacher holds, teaching experience of teacher, percentage of time teacher spends on classroom activities, teacher's age, amount of students in the class. The dependent variable was conflict, and the results of this analysis are shown in Table IV.

**TABLE IV**

RESULTS OF STEPWISE ANALYSIS - FIRST RUN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable*</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>Increase of Coefficient of Determination</th>
<th>Standard Error of Estimate</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>7.246</td>
<td>11.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>7.214</td>
<td>4.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+2+3</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>7.204</td>
<td>2.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+2+3+4</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>7.193</td>
<td>2.292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 = experience of teacher  3 = workload of teacher
2 = degree teacher holds   4 = student's year in school
It should be noted that four variables are retained using this procedure, but it is necessary to recheck the F values associated with these variables based on 4 and 399 degrees of freedom. An F value of 2.38 is necessary to retain a variable at the .05 level of significance. Thus, only the degree a teacher holds and experience of teacher are retained. Utilizing this procedure we fail to reject the null hypothesis associated with the authority relations variable. And it is concluded that the student's perception of authority relations does not contribute a significant unique amount in explaining the variation in conflict scores based on these data.

The second run of the stepwise program utilized in testing the first hypothesis consists of nine variables. An F value of 1.92 was used for entering a variable, and an F value of 1.91 was used for omitting a variable. The predictor variables were: sex of student, level of course, student's perception of authority relations, student's alienation, degree teacher holds, experience of teacher, percentage of time teacher spends on classroom activities, teacher's sex. The dependent variable is conflict. It should be noted that in addition to variables not entered in the first run, the variables stated in the hypothesis were included in order to see if the omitted variables may be having a suppressing effect. Also, variables that were found significant, or close to significant, were included in order to see if the new variables would change the previous findings. The results of this analysis are presented in Table V.
TABLE V
RESULTS OF STEPWISE ANALYSIS - SECOND RUN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable*</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>Increase of Coefficient of Determination</th>
<th>Standard Error of Estimate</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>7.246</td>
<td>11.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>7.186</td>
<td>7.6433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+2+3</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>7.170</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 = experience of teacher
   2 = level of course
   3 = degree of teacher

From this table it can be seen that the two variables that were previously significant remain significant, and one of the new variables is also significant, i.e., level of course. In this run it is again seen that authority relations is not significant and, thus, our previous conclusion remains unchanged. It is concluded that, based on this data, authority relations does not contribute a significant unique amount to explaining the variation in conflict scores. Since the partial correlation coefficients cannot be obtained from the stepwise program, the STATPACK program of Western Michigan University was used to obtain these figures. From Tables VI and VII it can be seen that the magnitude of the partial correlations associated with the variables stated in both hypotheses is negligible, as predicted from the stepwise computations.

The second hypothesis, the greater the alienation of a student the greater the conflict, will be tested in the same manner as the first hypothesis. By re-examining Tables III, IV, V, VI and VII, it is ascertained that, again, there is failure to reject the null
### TABLE VI

PARTIAL CORRELATION MATRIX - FIRST RUN*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.0882</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1291</td>
<td>0.0892</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6392</td>
<td>0.0392</td>
<td>-0.0811</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.0433</td>
<td>-0.0528</td>
<td>0.0456</td>
<td>-0.0892</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.0336</td>
<td>0.0218</td>
<td>0.0377</td>
<td>-0.0329</td>
<td>0.0093</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.1061</td>
<td>0.1083</td>
<td>-0.2764</td>
<td>0.1972</td>
<td>0.0462</td>
<td>0.1394</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0879</td>
<td>-0.0184</td>
<td>0.2248</td>
<td>-0.1729</td>
<td>-0.0840</td>
<td>-0.0806</td>
<td>0.3419</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.0592</td>
<td>-0.0500</td>
<td>0.0970</td>
<td>-0.0664</td>
<td>-0.0475</td>
<td>-0.0854</td>
<td>0.3639</td>
<td>0.2165</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.0474</td>
<td>0.0022</td>
<td>-0.1613</td>
<td>0.1446</td>
<td>0.1051</td>
<td>-0.0416</td>
<td>-0.0809</td>
<td>0.7874</td>
<td>-0.0949</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0836</td>
<td>-0.0634</td>
<td>0.2343</td>
<td>-0.1525</td>
<td>-0.0400</td>
<td>-0.0495</td>
<td>0.5335</td>
<td>-0.3759</td>
<td>0.0613</td>
<td>0.2126</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**

1 = student's age  
2 = student's social class  
3 = student's perception of authority  
4 = student's year in school  
5 = student's alienation score  
6 = conflict (dependent variable)  
7 = degree teacher holds  
8 = teaching experience of teacher  
9 = percentage of time teacher spends on classroom activities  
10 = teacher's age  
11 = amount of students in the class  
12 = teacher's age  

**NOTE:** These are the partials between stated variables with all other variables in the analysis held constant.
TABLE VII
PARTIAL CORRELATION MATRIX - SECOND RUN*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.0162</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.1420</td>
<td>-0.0900</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.0658</td>
<td>-0.0802</td>
<td>0.0134</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0404</td>
<td>0.1113</td>
<td>0.0533</td>
<td>0.0176</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.1829</td>
<td>0.2313</td>
<td>-0.2008</td>
<td>0.0214</td>
<td>0.1049</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2487</td>
<td>-0.0395</td>
<td>0.1181</td>
<td>0.0463</td>
<td>-0.1522</td>
<td>0.3585</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-0.0680</td>
<td>-0.2119</td>
<td>0.1079</td>
<td>-0.1068</td>
<td>-0.0727</td>
<td>0.4485</td>
<td>0.2990</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2816</td>
<td>0.0157</td>
<td>-0.0207</td>
<td>0.1419</td>
<td>0.0626</td>
<td>0.0523</td>
<td>-0.2813</td>
<td>0.4491</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*KEY: 1 = sex of student  
       2 = level of course  
       3 = student's perception of authority  
       4 = student's alienation score  
       5 = conflict (dependent variable)  
       6 = degree teacher holds  
       7 = experience of teacher  
       8 = percentage of time teacher spends on classroom activities  
       9 = teacher's sex

NOTE: These are the partial correlations between the stated variables with all other variables in the analysis held constant.
hypothesis. Thus it is concluded that the student's alienation does not contribute a significant unique amount in explaining the variation in conflict scores. Once again, this conclusion is based on the data of this study.

Although there is no support for the hypotheses of this study based on the partial correlations-stepwise procedure, it is possible that the variables of these hypotheses are antecedent variables. To examine this possibility, the zero-order correlations were computed using the STATPACK Program of Western Michigan University. By examining Table VIII, it is clear that neither the authority relations variable \( r = -.004 \) or the student alienation variable \( r = .02 \) are acting as antecedent variables. In addition to the lack of practically "high" zero-order correlations, these correlations are not statistically significant. The F value associated with authority relations equals .01 and the F value associated with student alienation equals .16. Although it was stated in the preceding section that the slopes associated with these variables would be discussed in terms of practical significance, due to the lack of statistical significance this discussion is unnecessary. And, thus, it appears that there is no basis for assuming the relationships stated in either hypothesis exist based on the data obtained in this study.

Even though the above discussion strongly suggests that there is no linear relationship, the possibility of curvilinearity remains. To ascertain if such is the case, the STATPACK Program of Western Michigan University was used to obtain the Spearman Rank-Order Correlations. By viewing Table IX, it can be seen that such is not
TABLE VIII
CORRELATION MATRIX - FIRST RUN*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.0726</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0764</td>
<td>0.0475</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6351</td>
<td>-0.0037</td>
<td>-0.0823</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.1155</td>
<td>-0.0425</td>
<td>0.0182</td>
<td>-0.1313</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.0685</td>
<td>0.0379</td>
<td>-0.0040</td>
<td>-0.0501</td>
<td>0.0200</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.0798</td>
<td>0.0774</td>
<td>-0.1101</td>
<td>0.0326</td>
<td>-0.0042</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-0.0223</td>
<td>0.0225</td>
<td>0.0630</td>
<td>-0.0352</td>
<td>-0.0055</td>
<td>-0.1688</td>
<td>0.5193</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.1323</td>
<td>0.0132</td>
<td>0.0536</td>
<td>-0.1079</td>
<td>-0.1280</td>
<td>-0.0940</td>
<td>0.6179</td>
<td>0.5025</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0098</td>
<td>0.0088</td>
<td>-0.0280</td>
<td>0.0485</td>
<td>0.0416</td>
<td>-0.1684</td>
<td>0.4423</td>
<td>0.8287</td>
<td>0.3731</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-0.0365</td>
<td>-0.0039</td>
<td>0.0931</td>
<td>-0.0631</td>
<td>-0.0041</td>
<td>0.0078</td>
<td>0.4996</td>
<td>0.0420</td>
<td>0.3094</td>
<td>0.1105</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*KEY: 1 = student's age  
2 = student's social class  
3 = student's perception of authority  
4 = student's year in school  
5 = student's alienation score  
6 = conflict (dependent variable)  
7 = degree teacher holds  
8 = teaching experience of teacher  
9 = percentage of time teacher spends on classroom activities  
10 = teacher's age  
11 = amount of students in the class
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0550</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1134</td>
<td>0.1161</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7457</td>
<td>0.0676</td>
<td>-0.0075</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.0579</td>
<td>-0.0104</td>
<td>0.0176</td>
<td>-0.0841</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.0027</td>
<td>0.1094</td>
<td>0.0286</td>
<td>-0.0039</td>
<td>0.0206</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0513</td>
<td>0.1721</td>
<td>-0.0169</td>
<td>0.1263</td>
<td>0.0543</td>
<td>0.0883</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0426</td>
<td>0.0745</td>
<td>0.1381</td>
<td>0.0239</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
<td>-0.1410</td>
<td>0.3820</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.0175</td>
<td>0.0753</td>
<td>0.1516</td>
<td>-0.0233</td>
<td>-0.0014</td>
<td>-0.0405</td>
<td>0.5907</td>
<td>0.4647</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0885</td>
<td>0.0512</td>
<td>0.0122</td>
<td>0.1089</td>
<td>0.0497</td>
<td>-0.1457</td>
<td>0.3883</td>
<td>0.7755</td>
<td>0.3416</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0307</td>
<td>0.0656</td>
<td>0.1484</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td>0.0476</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
<td>0.5745</td>
<td>0.0693</td>
<td>0.4381</td>
<td>0.1815</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*KEY: 1 = student's age  
2 = student's social class  
3 = student's perception of authority  
4 = student's year in school  
5 = student's alienation score  
6 = conflict (dependent variable)  
7 = degree teacher holds  
8 = teaching experience of teacher  
9 = percentage of time teacher spends on classroom activities  
10 = teacher's age  
11 = amount of students in the class*
the case. The Spearman correlation associated with alienation equals .02, and the Spearman correlation associated with authority relations equals .028.

The final point of discussion is the magnitude of the multiple R. Since all variables could not be included in one regression equation, an exact figure is impossible. But by utilizing Table V, it is possible to see what the multiple R is with the variables found to be statistically significant by the stepwise procedure. This value is: R = .23. As previously stated, this value would rise slightly if all the variables were to be included. Nonetheless, in total, the variables degree the teacher holds, experience of teacher, and level of course explain about 5% of the variation in conflict scores.

Serendipitous findings

Utilizing the stepwise regression analysis (see Table V), it was found that there are three independent variables that are significant at the .05 level of significance. These variables are: degree the teacher holds, level of course (100, 200, 300, 400), and experience of the teacher. In combination, these three variables explain 5.3% of the variation in conflict scores.

In general, a zero-order correlation of at least .098 is necessary in order to obtain statistical significance at the .05 level of significance. This is computed by utilizing the F formula presented by Blalock (1960:304). There are three relevant zero-order correlations that obtain statistical significance (see Table VIII), i.e., the experience of the teacher, r = -.168; age of the teacher, r = .168;
and the level of the course, \( r = .145 \).

### TABLE X

THEORETICAL AND SERENDIPITOUS FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>REGRESSION COEFFICIENT</th>
<th>STANDARD ERROR OF REGRESSION COEFFICIENT</th>
<th>CORRELATION COEFFICIENT</th>
<th>ITS F VALUE (DF 1,***)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority Relations</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Course</td>
<td>1.177</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>8.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Alienation</td>
<td>.0251</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Teacher Holds</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Teacher</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>11.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload of Teacher</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Teacher</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>11.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilizing the stepwise procedure, the relationships change. Using this procedure, the degree the teacher holds becomes significant; the experience of the teacher remains significant; and the level of the course remains significant. Thus, a suppressor variable was operating in relation to the degree the teacher holds. In addition, the variable of age of teacher is eliminated even though experience of teacher is retained. These two variables are highly correlated \( (r = .82) \) and, since experience of teacher has a slightly higher
zero-order correlation, it is retained. A more detailed examination is not presented because of the small amount of variation explained by these variables. The findings below can be found in Table X.

The zero-order correlation for degree teacher holds is: \( r = .001; \) the slope = .008; F value = 0.00. Note: this variable becomes statistically significant utilizing the stepwise procedure.

The zero-order correlation for teacher's experience is: \( r = -.168; \) slope = -.554, F value = 11.78.

The zero-order correlation for the level of course is: \( r = .145; \) slope = 1.177; F value = 8.69.

It is only these three predictor variables that obtain statistical significance, but for a complete table of zero-order correlations and Spearman rank-order correlations see Appendix D.

In summary, it has been found that there is no support for the two hypotheses of this study. It has also been found that several of the predictor variables originally suggested as control variables are related to latent conflict to the extent that the relationships are statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. It should be noted that practical significance is suggested but cannot be conclusively determined without a replication study.

Since the first sections of this paper provided a suggestion that the relationships stated in the hypotheses should exist, the findings of this paper need explanation. Therefore, a discussion of the findings and their implications will be undertaken in the final section of this paper.
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The attempt to extend Dahrendorf's use of authority relations and conflict has failed. In addition, the attempt to extend Marx's concept of alienation from farm workers to students has not yielded the expected results. There are two areas which may provide the reasons for the unexpected findings. These are: 1. theoretical, and 2. errors introduced in some phase of the data collection. Each of the possibilities associated with these areas will be discussed in the following section.

Theoretical Issues

Two theories were discussed and concepts from each were used in formulating the two hypotheses of this study. In addition, a great deal of literature was reviewed that provided support for the stated hypotheses. The question remains - what went wrong?

In the beginning of this paper the question was raised as to whether there was conflict in the classroom. In relation to this question, the Marxian dialectic was introduced as a possible explanation for the amount of conflict found in the classroom. The amount of conflict is relative; therefore, the cutting point of conflict/no conflict is a judgment. It was determined in the findings that some conflict was evident. In terms of the Marxian dialectic, an antithesis may be building. That is, it is possible that either no revolution (synthesis) occurred at Western Michigan
University due to the student movements of the past, or that after a synthesis had taken place it was not the final synthesis and a new antithesis is formulating. It should be noted that in terms of the standard deviation and range it could be concluded that there is relatively little conflict. In this case the possible high conflict score (possible range) is 113, whereas the actual conflict range equals 45 with a maximum of 58. There is a standard deviation of 7.342 and a variance of 53.909. Thus it appears that it should be concluded that a definitive answer to the question of conflict/no conflict cannot be determined from this data, although it does appear that there is a reasonable amount of variation that could be explained.

First, it should be noted that the hypotheses were attempts of extension of the theories and, thus, the theories, per se, are not to blame for the unexpected findings. That is, the findings do not in any way suggest the theories to be in error. If anything, the findings may provide indirect support for the theories. That is, in relation to Dahrendorf, he explicitly states that the relationship between authority relations and conflict cannot or should not be quantified. It was stated earlier in this paper that this author believed that Dahrendorf was claiming that being subjected to authority relations and the nature of the relations would produce a psychological state of conflict. The findings suggest that Dahrendorf's assertion is correct inasmuch as the inability to show a relationship by using quantification can be interpreted as support.
The findings in relation to the alienation hypothesis can be similarly interpreted. That is, Marx has most definitely separated the students and workers (the lumpen-proletariat and proletariat, respectively). In so doing, it is implied that the two groups will have different relationships in various areas. Thus, in terms of alienation and conflict, he seems to have been correct.

In addition to the theorists mentioned, a great deal of literature was suggestive of the stated hypotheses. But, here again, the hypotheses were extensions of findings rather than replications. That is, on authority relations, such authors as Waller, Brookover and Erickson, Goslin, Becker, and others agree that authority relations are a part of the classroom and as such can produce conflict. This is quite similar to Dahrendorf's argument and the attempt at extension through quantification simply proved unfruitful. On the other hand, Sexton has claimed that it is quite possible that students on reaching the university will submit to the authority. The findings could possibly be interpreted as supporting Sexton's assertions.

The literature review on the alienation variable and its relation to conflict was of a somewhat different nature. That is, the literature (other than the student activism literature) did not show a direct relationship to student alienation and conflict. Authors such as Halleck, Rotter, Seeman, and Etzioni posit a relationship between alienation and learning and thus, once again, the attempt to extend or embellish upon these statements has failed.

The student activism literature was somewhat divided - some
claimed conflict was a function of the educational process, while
others said that its roots were in the socio-political realm. Still
others claimed it was a combination of both. Although this litera-
ture provides support for the stated hypotheses, it also provided
support for the control variables. It is this ambiguity that may be
useful in setting the guidelines for future research.

From many of the authors cited in the opening section, sugges-
tions of alienation being highly related to conflict, as well as
authority structures being related to conflict, are presented. But
it is here that a major problem in this study may lie. That is, did
our measures adequately capture the nature of the concepts as per-
ceived by the various interested parties.

Data Collection

There are various issues in data collection that may provide an
explanation of the findings of this study. These issues are:
1. measurement, 2. population or sample, 3. questionnaire administra-
tion, and 4. statistical problems. The following will be a discus-
sion of these issues in relation to this study.

Measurement most definitely has an intense effect on the re-
sults of a study. An important question is whether the nature of
conflict as determined by the student activism literature and other
works was captured by the conflict index utilized in this study.
This measurement problem is equally valid for all of the concepts
used and, in this respect, the measurement of each concept should be
examined (the question of validity). At this point the issue is
raised simply as a possible explanation for the findings and as a guide to further research in this area. A strong possibility in this area could be an item analysis. Another possibility is to include the socio-political measures in the conflict score in future studies.

The population and sample can also have an effect on the results of a study. In this case, only one school was used from which to draw a sample. Thus it may be something unique to Western Michigan University that has produced the findings. It also has been shown that the return rate was not what was expected. And, it may be that students who do not come to class, and thus did not respond, would change the findings.

A third possibility is the administering of the questionnaire. It will be recalled that this process was not uniform for all classes and, thus, not the same for all students. This possibility is closely connected with Campbell and Stanley's (1963) notion of rival hypotheses due to experimental design. According to these authors, the survey is the weakest experimental design and such elements as history and maturation are also left uncontrolled.

The final alternative explanation to be discussed is in terms of the statistical analysis. In this area a strong possibility may be unreliability of the measuring instruments. This problem is most severe in terms of the conflict scale and authority relations measure. For it is in these cases that no reliability information is available.

A second statistical possibility is curvilinearity. An attempt
to ascertain if such was the case was made utilizing Spearman rank-order correlations. Nonetheless, it is possible the data could be fit to one of many quadratic curves.

A final possibility is that there is strong interaction taking place. This possibility was not examined in this paper due to time, lack of main effects, and technique restrictions.

In sum, this section has attempted to show that although the hypotheses were not supported, there are rival hypotheses other than the null hypotheses. But, it should be noted, based on this study, it must be concluded that there is no support for the posited relationships.

Implications

It has been found that there is no support for our hypotheses. On the other hand, several of the control variables have been found to be statistically significant. It is these findings that suggest areas for further study, and the question arises - what are the implications of these findings as well as our non-significant findings? A discussion of non-significant findings in terms of implications is very difficult. One may examine the conclusions and decide that with certain corrections the area of study undertaken should be pursued. Or, it may be decided that the findings are "correct" and the study needs to be completely revised or simply accepted. In any case, it should be noted that in the student activism literature there was an important diversity among authors as to
whether conflict was related to classroom issues or socio-political influences; and it appears that this question could provide a guide for future research.

Even though some of the relationships did reach statistical significance, their practical significance is minimal. It will be remembered that the three statistically significant variables explained 5.3% of the variation in conflict scores. Also, the stepwise procedure is sometimes utilized as a variable reduction procedure. In so doing, the variables found significant should be re-used on another population and/or sample to test the stability of the relationship. Although this should be kept in mind while examining the implications of the findings, two of the findings are consistent with the student activism literature. These are degree the teacher holds and experience of the teacher. That is, throughout the literature it has been suggested that students are dissatisfied with teachers who they do not feel are competent. Inasmuch as the two variables can be said to measure this competence, there is support for this statement.

The final variable, level of course, is not mentioned in the literature and this finding is puzzling. However, since the correlation is not very high one may argue that the relationship (as well as the other two) is not an important relationship.

In conclusions, the primary guides for future research are:
1. re-check the validity and reliability of the measurements,
2. introduce new concepts and variables into the analysis (possibly using a multi-disciplinary approach), 3. utilize other experimental designs in examining the question and, 4. further investigate the
possibility of interaction and curvilinearity.

The findings of this study do suggest that conflict exists in the classroom, and the phenomenon still appears to be an important area of study. If anything, this study implies that much more work could be done in the area of conflict in the schools.
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Appendix A

Letter to Instructors

March 22, 1973

Dr. ______________________

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan, 49001

Dear Dr.

I am presently working on my Master's thesis under the direction of Dr. Michael H. Walizer in the Sociology Department. The study is concerned with the attitudes of teachers and students.

You and one of your classes have been randomly selected to be included in the research sample. Data will be collected by means of a questionnaire. The time for completion of the questionnaire will be much less than one class period.

Dr. Walizer and I would be grateful if you would facilitate the collection of data for this study by allowing the questionnaire to be administered in _____

This letter will be followed by a phone call within the next week in order that any questions you have can be answered. At the same time necessary arrangements for the data collection can be agreed upon.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Joel H. Henderson

Dr. Michael H. Walizer
Appendix B

INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: The following is a questionnaire that will be used in research I am conducting. The questionnaire has instructions associated with various sections. Each question on the questionnaire has a corresponding space on the IBM answer sheet. Please mark the appropriate answer on the answer sheet using a soft pencil.

PLEASE SKIP QUESTIONS 1 THROUGH 6. LEAVE THESE SPACES BLANK ON THE ANSWER SHEET.

QUESTIONS 1 THROUGH 6 - SKIP.

START WITH QUESTION 7 ON THE ANSWER SHEET.

7. What is the highest level of the degree(s) you presently hold.

0 = BA
1 = More than 1 BA
2 = MA
3 = More than 1 MA
4 = PhD
5 = More than 1 PhD

8. Are you presently a graduate student.

0 = Yes
1 = No

9. How many years (round to the nearest year) teaching experience do you have (at any level of education).

0 = 0 through 1
1 = 2 through 3
2 = 4 through 5
3 = 6 through 7
4 = 8 through 9
5 = 10 through 11
6 = 12 or more

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
10. Have you been engaged in doing research this semester.

0 = Yes  
1 = No

11. Is research your primary concern.

0 = Yes  
1 = No

12. Out of the total number of hours worked per week, what percent are directly devoted to classroom related activities, i.e. preparing lectures, grading papers, student conferences, etc.

0 = 0 - 5%  
1 = 6% - 20%  
2 = 21% - 35%  
3 = 36% - 50%  
4 = 51% - 65%  
5 = 66% - 80%  
6 = 81% - 95%  
7 = 96% or more

13. Out of the total number of hours worked per week, what percent were devoted to research.

0 = 0 - 5%  
1 = 6% - 20%  
2 = 21% - 35%  
3 = 36% - 50%  
4 = 51% - 65%  
5 = 66% - 80%  
6 = 81% - 95%  
7 = 96% or more

14. Out of the total number of hours worked per week, what percent were devoted to other activities such as departmental meetings, committees, outside lectures, etc.

0 = 0 - 5%  
1 = 6% - 20%  
2 = 21% - 35%  
3 = 36% - 50%  
4 = 51% - 65%  
5 = 66% - 80%  
6 = 81% - 95%  
7 = 96% or more

GO TO NEXT PAGE.
15. What was your age at your last birthday.

- 0 = Up to and including 21
- 1 = 22 - 25
- 2 = 26 - 30
- 3 = 31 - 35
- 4 = 36 - 40
- 5 = 41 - 45
- 6 = 46 - 50
- 7 = 51 - 55
- 8 = 56 or more

16. How many pupils are enrolled in this class.

- 0 = 0 - 10
- 1 = 11 - 15
- 2 = 16 - 20
- 3 = 21 - 25
- 4 = 26 - 30
- 5 = 31 - 35
- 6 = 36 - 40
- 7 = 41 - 45
- 8 = 46 or more

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
Below are some statements regarding public issues with which some people agree and others disagree. Please give us your own opinion about these items, i.e., whether you agree or disagree with the items as they stand.

Please mark the appropriate number on your answer sheet as follows: Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3; Uncertain = 2; Disagree = 1; Strongly Disagree = 0.

START WITH QUESTION 17 ON THE ANSWER SHEET.

17. I worry about the future facing today's children.

18. Sometimes I have the feeling that other people are using me.

19. It is frightening to be responsible for the development of a little child.

20. There is little or nothing I can do towards preventing a major "shooting" war.

21. There are so many decisions that have to be made today that sometimes I could just "blow up."

22. There is little chance for promotion on the job unless a man gets a break.

23. We're so regimented that there's not much room for choice even in personal matters.

24. We are just so many cogs in the machinery of life.

25. The future looks very dismal.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
The following statements should be answered in relation to this specific class, the teacher of this class, and the students of this class. Each question has a corresponding space on the answer sheet. Please mark the appropriate number on your answer sheet as follows: Strongly Agree = 4; Agree = 3; Uncertain = 2; Disagree = 1; Strongly Disagree = 0.

START WITH QUESTION 26 ON THE ANSWER SHEET.

26. This course would be best organized on a student self-paced basis.

27. The teacher-student relations during this class should be more formal than informal.

28. The teacher-student relations after class should be more formal than informal (this still refers to the relations with the teacher and the student in this class).

29. The grades in this course would best be computed primarily from take-home problems.

30. This instructor should make a conscious effort to learn the names of the students in this class.

31. This instructor should take a personal interest in the students in this class.

32. I think it is a good idea for this instructor to occasionally come to class early and chat informally with students before the class period begins.

33. This instructor should be very careful to develop a relationship with the students in this class such that they will not be afraid of him.

34. I think it is a good idea for this instructor to encourage the students in this class to come to his office for informal chats.

35. I think it is important that this instructor conscientiously keep his office hours.

36. When a student goes to talk with this instructor the instructor should be very careful not to give the student the impression that he (the student) is taking up too much of the instructor's time.

37. This instructor should be very careful not to embarrass a student in class.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
Strongly Agree = 4; Agree = 3; Uncertain = 2; Disagree = 1; Strongly Disagree = 0.

38. This instructor should explain his grading system in detail to the students in this class.

39. This instructor should never give tests or examinations without announcing them in advance to this class.

40. I think it is important that the instructor grade and return examination papers promptly in this class.

41. I think it is important that this instructor provide the students in this class with supplementary study aids (such as course or lecture outlines, and study questions).

42. This instructor has the responsibility to spur the students in this class to their best academic achievement.

43. This instructor should not change a student's grade once it has been given; he should regard his original decision as final (except in cases where a mathematical mistake has been made in computing the grade).

44. If a student in this class makes relatively low grades but shows genuine interest and enthusiasm in the course, should this instructor be influenced by this to raise the student's grades.

45. This instructor should not allow a student's attitude to influence his grading of that student in this class.

46. A student's main reason for coming to college should be to study and learn subject matter.

47. It is more important for the student in this class to develop social skills than to develop academic competence.

48. It is more important for the student in this class to develop a "well-rounded personality" than to acquire knowledge.

49. I think that this instructor expects too much work from the students in this class.

50. A student in this class should try to get as much out of this course as possible even if he can see little or no practical value in the course.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
Strongly Agree = 4; Agree = 3; Uncertain = 2; Disagree = 1; Strongly Disagree = 0.

51. If a student in this class feels that the lectures in this course are not interesting or challenging he is justified in cutting classes as often as he wishes.

52. A student in this class is justified in cutting classes once or twice (or oftener) just on general principles, that is, without any specific reasons.

53. When this instructor presents a dull or disorganised lecture the students in this class are justified in showing their disapproval.

54. This course is a:

   0 = 100 level course
   1 = 200 level course
   2 = 300 level course
   3 = 400 level course
Appendix C

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: The following is a questionnaire that will be used in research I am conducting. The questionnaire has instructions associated with various sections. Each question on the questionnaire has a corresponding space on the IBM answer sheet. Please mark the appropriate answer on the answer sheet.

1. What was your age at your last birthday.
   
   0 = Up to and including 16
   1 = 17 through 18
   2 = 19 through 20
   3 = 21 through 22
   4 = 23 through 24
   5 = 25 through 26
   6 = 27 and over

2. What is your sex.
   
   0 = Male
   1 = Female

3. How would you rank the teacher of this class on the way in which authority is used.

   The authority in this class is distributed such that there are: (mark the appropriate designation on the answer sheet)

   0 = 50% of the decisions are made by the teacher and 50% by the students.
   1 = 60% of the decisions are made by the teacher and 40% by the students.
   2 = 75% of the decisions are made by the teacher and 25% by the students.
   3 = 85% of the decisions are made by the teacher and 15% by the students.
   4 = 100% of the decisions are made by the teacher.
   5 = 60% of the decisions are made by the students and 40% by the teacher.
   6 = 75% of the decisions are made by the students and 25% by the teacher.
   7 = 85% of the decisions are made by the students and 15% by the teacher.
   8 = 100% of the decisions are made by the students.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
4. What standing do you presently have.

   0 = Freshman
   1 = Sophomore
   2 = Junior
   3 = Senior
   4 = Graduate Student

5. At the time you were growing up, what was the occupation of the head of the household (based on your father's or guardian's situation, if possible).

   (Self-employed professional
   4 = Proprietor of large business (valued at $100,000 or more)
   (Top-level executive in a large organization

   (Salaried professional
   )Proprietor of a medium business (valued at $35,000 to $99,999)
   3 = (Official or executive (other than top) in large business or top in small business
   )Farmer having farm worth $100,000+
   (Salesman earning $35,000 or more

   (Proprietor of small business
   )Salesman earning under $35,000
   2 = (Clerical worker
   )Skilled technician
   (Small farmer

   1 = (Semi-skilled worker
   )Service worker

   (Unskilled worker
   0 = )Unemployed
   (Sharecropper

6. In which area is your major.

   0 = College of Applied Sciences
   1 = College of Business
   2 = College of Education
   3 = College of Arts and Sciences

PLEASE SKIP QUESTIONS 7 THROUGH 16. LEAVE THESE SPACES BLANK ON THE ANSWER SHEET.

QUESTIONS 7 THROUGH 16 - SKIP.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
Below are some statements regarding public issues with which some people agree and others disagree. Please give us your own opinion about these items, i.e., whether you agree or disagree with the items as they stand.

Please mark the appropriate number on your answer sheet as follows: Strongly Agree = 4; Agree = 3; Uncertain = 2; Disagree = 1; Strongly Disagree = 0.

START WITH QUESTION 17 ON THE ANSWER SHEET.

17. I worry about the future facing today's children.
18. Sometimes I have the feeling that other people are using me.
19. It is frightening to be responsible for the development of a little child.
20. There is little or nothing I can do towards preventing a major "shooting" war.
21. There are so many decisions that have to be made today that sometimes I could just "blow up."
22. There is little chance for promotion on the job unless a man gets a break.
23. We're so regimented that there's not much room for choice even in personal matters.
24. We are just so many cogs in the machinery of life.
25. The future looks very dismal.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
The following statements should be answered in relation to this specific class, the teacher of this class, and the students of this class. Each question has a corresponding space on the answer sheet. Please mark the appropriate number on your answer sheet as follows: Strongly Agree = 4; Agree = 3; Uncertain = 2; Disagree = 1; Strongly Disagree = 0.

START WITH QUESTION 26 ON THE ANSWER SHEET.

26. This course would be best organized on a student self-paced basis.

27. The teacher-student relations during this class should be more formal than informal.

28. The teacher-student relations after class should be more formal than informal (this still refers to the relations with the teacher and the student in this class).

29. The grades in this course would best be computed primarily from take-home problems.

30. This instructor should make a conscious effort to learn the names of the students in his class.

31. This instructor should take a personal interest in the students in this class.

32. I think it is a good idea for this instructor to occasionally come to class early and chat informally with the students before the class period begins.

33. This instructor should be very careful to develop a relationship with the students in this class such that they will not be afraid of him.

34. I think it is a good idea for this instructor to encourage the students in this class to come to his office for informal chats.

35. I think it is important that this instructor conscientiously keep his office hours.

36. When a student goes to talk with this instructor the instructor should be very careful not to give the student the impression that he (the student) is taking up too much of the instructor's time.

37. This instructor should be very careful not to embarrass a student in class.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
Strongly Agree = 4; Agree = 3; Uncertain = 2; Disagree = 1; Strongly
Disagree = 0.

38. This instructor should explain his grading system in detail to
the students in this class.

39. This instructor should never give tests or examinations without
announcing them in advance in this class.

40. I think it is important that the instructor grade and return
examination papers promptly in this class.

41. I think it is important that this instructor provide the
students in this class with supplementary study aids (such as
course or lecture outlines, and study questions).

42. This instructor has the responsibility to spur the students in
this class to their best academic achievement.

43. This instructor should not change a student's grade once it has
been given; he should regard his original decision as final
(except in cases where a mathematical mistake has been made in
computing the grade).

44. If a student in this class makes relatively low grades but shows
genuine interest and enthusiasm in the course, should this in­
structor be influenced by this to raise the student's grades.

45. This instructor should not allow a student's attitude to in­
fluence his grading of that student in this class.

46. A student's main reason for coming to college should be to
study and learn subject matter.

47. It is more important for the student in this class to develop
social skills than to develop academic competence.

48. It is more important for the student in this class to develop
a "well-rounded personality" than to acquire knowledge.

49. I think that this instructor expects too much work from the
students in this class.

50. A student in this class should try to get as much out of this
course as possible even if he can see little or no practical
value in the course.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
Strongly Agree = 4; Agree = 3; Uncertain = 2; Disagree = 1; Strongly Disagree = 0.

51. If a student in this class feels that the lectures in this course are not interesting or challenging he is justified in cutting classes as often as he wishes.

52. A student in this class is justified in cutting classes once or twice (or oftener) just on general principles, that is, without any specific reasons.

53. When this instructor presents a dull or disorganized lecture the students in this class are justified in showing their disapproval.

54. This course is a:

0 = 100 level course
1 = 200 level course
2 = 300 level course
3 = 400 level course
### CORRELATION MATRIX - FIRST RUN*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.0726</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0746</td>
<td>0.0475</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6351</td>
<td>-0.0037</td>
<td>-0.0823</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.1155</td>
<td>-0.0425</td>
<td>0.0182</td>
<td>-0.1313</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.0685</td>
<td>0.0379</td>
<td>-0.0040</td>
<td>-0.0501</td>
<td>0.0200</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.0798</td>
<td>0.0774</td>
<td>-0.1101</td>
<td>0.0326</td>
<td>-0.0042</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-0.0223</td>
<td>0.0225</td>
<td>0.0630</td>
<td>-0.0352</td>
<td>-0.0055</td>
<td>-0.1688</td>
<td>0.5193</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.1323</td>
<td>0.0132</td>
<td>0.0536</td>
<td>-0.1079</td>
<td>-0.1280</td>
<td>-0.0940</td>
<td>0.6179</td>
<td>0.5025</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0098</td>
<td>0.0088</td>
<td>-0.0280</td>
<td>0.0485</td>
<td>0.0416</td>
<td>-0.1684</td>
<td>0.4423</td>
<td>0.8287</td>
<td>0.3731</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-0.0365</td>
<td>-0.0039</td>
<td>0.0931</td>
<td>-0.0631</td>
<td>-0.0041</td>
<td>0.0078</td>
<td>0.4996</td>
<td>0.0420</td>
<td>0.3094</td>
<td>0.1105</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*KEY: 1 = student's age  
2 = student's social class  
3 = student's perception of authority  
4 = student's year in school  
5 = student's alienation score  
6 = conflict (dependent variable)  
7 = degree teacher holds  
8 = teaching experience of teacher  
9 = percentage of time teacher spends on classroom activities  
10 = teacher's age  
11 = amount of students in the class
### CORRELATION MATRIX - SECOND RUN*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.0355</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.1082</td>
<td>-0.1430</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.0299</td>
<td>-0.0662</td>
<td>0.0182</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0118</td>
<td>0.1455</td>
<td>-0.0040</td>
<td>0.0200</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.0558</td>
<td>0.1144</td>
<td>-0.1101</td>
<td>-0.0042</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1247</td>
<td>-0.0650</td>
<td>0.0630</td>
<td>-0.0055</td>
<td>-0.1688</td>
<td>0.5193</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0413</td>
<td>-0.1428</td>
<td>0.0536</td>
<td>-0.0280</td>
<td>-0.0940</td>
<td>0.6179</td>
<td>0.5025</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2288</td>
<td>-0.0466</td>
<td>-0.0402</td>
<td>0.0957</td>
<td>0.0584</td>
<td>0.2429</td>
<td>0.0323</td>
<td>0.4504</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*KEY: 1 = sex of student
2 = level of course
3 = student's perception of authority
4 = student's alienation score
5 = conflict (dependent variable)
6 = degree teacher holds
7 = experience of teacher
8 = percentage of time teacher spends on classroom activities
9 = teacher's sex
### CORRELATION MATRIX OF CONFLICT
**BY COLLEGE (DUMMY VARIABLE) - THIRD RUN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>* * * *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.0648</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.0831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:***
1 = Conflict
2 = College of Applied Sciences
3 = College of Business
4 = College of Education
5 = College of Arts and Sciences
SPEARMAN RANK-ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX - FIRST RUN*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0550</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1134</td>
<td>0.1161</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7457</td>
<td>0.0676</td>
<td>-0.0075</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.0579</td>
<td>-0.0104</td>
<td>0.0176</td>
<td>-0.0841</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.0027</td>
<td>0.1094</td>
<td>0.0286</td>
<td>-0.0039</td>
<td>0.0206</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0513</td>
<td>0.1721</td>
<td>-0.0169</td>
<td>0.1263</td>
<td>0.0543</td>
<td>0.0883</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0426</td>
<td>0.0745</td>
<td>0.1381</td>
<td>0.0239</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
<td>-0.1410</td>
<td>0.3820</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.0175</td>
<td>0.0753</td>
<td>0.1516</td>
<td>-0.1233</td>
<td>-0.0014</td>
<td>-0.0405</td>
<td>0.5907</td>
<td>0.4647</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0885</td>
<td>0.0512</td>
<td>0.0122</td>
<td>0.1089</td>
<td>0.0497</td>
<td>-0.1457</td>
<td>0.3883</td>
<td>0.7755</td>
<td>0.3416</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0307</td>
<td>0.0656</td>
<td>0.1484</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td>0.0476</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
<td>0.5745</td>
<td>0.0693</td>
<td>0.4381</td>
<td>0.1815</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*KEY: 1 = student's age  
  2 = student's social class  
  3 = student's perception of authority  
  4 = student's year in school  
  5 = student's alienation score  
  6 = conflict (dependent variable)  
  7 = degree teacher holds  
  8 = teaching experience of teacher  
  9 = percentage of time teacher spends on classroom activities  
 10 = teacher's age  
 11 = amount of students in the class  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1297</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0669</td>
<td>-0.0521</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1067</td>
<td>0.0108</td>
<td>0.0176</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1534</td>
<td>0.1952</td>
<td>0.0286</td>
<td>0.0206</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1129</td>
<td>0.2555</td>
<td>-0.0169</td>
<td>0.0543</td>
<td>0.0883</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2822</td>
<td>-0.0091</td>
<td>0.1381</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
<td>-0.1410</td>
<td>0.3820</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1994</td>
<td>-0.0591</td>
<td>0.1516</td>
<td>-0.0014</td>
<td>-0.0405</td>
<td>0.5907</td>
<td>0.4647</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.4551</td>
<td>0.1834</td>
<td>0.1591</td>
<td>0.2457</td>
<td>0.2172</td>
<td>0.3967</td>
<td>0.1939</td>
<td>0.6042</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*KEY: 1 = sex of student  
2 = level of course  
3 = student's perception of authority  
4 = student's alienation score  
5 = conflict (dependent variable)  
6 = degree teacher holds  
7 = experience of teacher  
8 = percentage of time teacher spends on classroom activities  
9 = teacher's sex
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 * * * *</th>
<th>2  0.2112</th>
<th>3  0.3315</th>
<th>4  0.1217</th>
<th>5  0.2440</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3315</td>
<td>0.2112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1217</td>
<td>0.3315</td>
<td>0.2112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2440</td>
<td>0.1217</td>
<td>0.3315</td>
<td>0.2112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*KEY: 1 = Conflict
2 = College of Applied Sciences
3 = College of Business
4 = College of Education
5 = College of Arts and Sciences