DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 502 SP 022 264

AUTHOR Mitman, Alexis L.; And Others
TITLE Students' Perceptions of Transition and School. Junior High School Transition Study, Volume III. Ecological Perspectives for Successful Schooling Practice.
INSTITUTION Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO EPSSP-81-3
PUB DATE 81
CONTRACT 400-80-01-03
NOTE 128p.; For related documents, see SP 022 256, SP 022 258, and SP 022 260-267. Some numbered volumes in this series were never released.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Class Organization; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; Grade 6; Grade 7; Junior High Schools; *Junior High School Students; Middle Schools; School Effectiveness; Sex Differences; *Student Adjustment; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; Student Development; Student Needs; Student Participation; Student Problems; Student School Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Concerns Questionnaire; *Student Opinion Survey

ABSTRACT

A critical ingredient for understanding the experiences that students undergo in the transition from elementary school to junior high school is the students' changing perceptions. The Ecological Perspectives for Successful Schooling Practice Junior High School Transition Study tapped the perceptions of students in transition using data from two instruments that were administered by cooperating school districts. Students completed the Student Opinion Survey (SOS), an instrument measuring general attitudes toward school, at the end of the sixth and seventh grades. Students also completed a Concerns Questionnaire during the fifth week of seventh grade. For this instrument, students responded to a list of potential transition concerns by indicating the degree of their concern both when they first entered junior high school and at the present time. Results from the two instruments are different in that students expressed fairly consistent dissatisfaction with junior high school on the SOS, but indicated few problems in the transition to junior high school. Explanations for this discrepancy are considered. The report contains 62 tables, and the SOS survey and Concerns Questionnaire are appended. (JM)

Ecological Perspectives for SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLING PRACTICE

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TRANSITION STUDY

Volume III

Students' Perceptions of Transition and School

Alexis L. Mitman
John R. Mergendoller
Thomas S. Rounds
Martin J. Packer
Gerald J. Dadey
Beatrice A. Ward
William J. Tikunoff

Report EPSSP-81-3

FAR WEST LABORATORY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
1855 FOLSOM STREET · SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103

The authors wish to acknowledge the support of the National Institute of Education, Department of Education, Under NIE Contract 400-80-01-03 to the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, California. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Institute and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A critical ingredient for understanding the experiences that students undergo in the transition from elementary school to junior high school is the changing perceptions of the students themselves. To this end, the Ecological Perspectives for Successful Schooling Practice (EPSSP) Junior High School Transition Study tapped the perceptions of students in transition using data from two instruments that were administered by the cooperating school districts.

Students completed the Student Opinion Survey (SOS) at the end of the sixth and seventh grades. The SOS is an instrument measuring general attitudes toward school. Results indicated that students generally were less satisified with school at the end of seventh grade than at the end of sixth grade, with the exception that they felt more positive about their academic work in junior high school. Group comparisons indicated that, in both the sixth and seventh grades, more positive attitudes were held by female students (as compared to male students) and by academically and socially oriented students (as compared to disruptive or withdrawn students).

Students also completed a Concerns Questionnaire during the fifth week of seventh grade. Here, students responded to a list of potential transition concerns by indicating the degree of their concern both when they first entered junior high school and at the present time. Results showed that most students did not have great concerns about the items listed. Given this low absolute level of concerns, students perceived themselves to have less total concern after five weeks of experience in junior high. Also, students reported relatively more concerns about academic work than the social aspects of junior high school. Group comparisons suggested that the independent variables of student sex, participation style, and previous classroom organization were important, but consistent patterns among groups were not found.

The results from the two instruments are different in that students expressed fairly consistent dissatisfaction with junior high school on the SOS, but indicated few problems in the transition to junior high school. Explanations for this discrepancy were considered, including the different times of administration, the different frames of reference called for by the instruments, and the different construction features of the two instruments. Further work and refinement of instruments, especially the Concerns Questionnaire, seems necessary before it can be concluded that students perceive the junior high school experience in a very different light at the beginning of their first year than they do at the end of that same year.

Ecological Perspectives for SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLING PRACTICE

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TRANSITION STUDY

Volume III

Students' Perceptions of Transition and School

Alexis L. Mitman
John R. Mergendoller
Thomas S. Rounds
Martin J. Packer
Gerald J. Dadey
Beatrice A. Ward
William J. Tikunoff

Report EPSSP-81-3

William J. Tikunoff
Director, Programs on Schooling

FAR WEST LABORATORY
FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
1855 FOLSOM STREET · SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (Cont.)

LIST OF TABLES (Cont.)

LIST OF TABLES (Cont.)

LIST OF TABLES (Cont.)

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF STUDENT PERCEPTION DATA

Introduction

The transition from elementary to secondary school -- middle or junior high school -- is a stage in the life of American youth that is currently receiving much attention from parents, educators, and researchers. According to Lipsitz (1980), one reason for the concern is the mounting evidence that early adolescence is a troubled time for at least 20 percent of the students enrolled in middle or junior high school. To illustrate the problems that may occur, Lipsitz notes that school violence "reaches its heights during the junior high school years" and "the most dangerous place for a seventh-grader to be is in school" (p. 8). Lipsitz also states that juvenile crime seems to reach a peak around age 14 and that 14 1/2 is the average age of runaways. Other statistics cited by Lipsitz include the fact that "the only age group for which the birth rate is not decreasing is that of fifteen-year olds and under" (p. 8). In addition, she notes that the rate of hard and soft drug abuse "soars" during junior high school, that "somewhere between 20 percent and 30 percent of eighth-graders drink excessively," and that "the suicide rate among young adolescents, while lower than for youth aged sixteen to twenty-two, is rapidly rising, and may have doubled in the past twenty years" (p. 8). Thus it appears that the middle and junior high school years present problems for some youngsters and may be times of crisis for approximately 1 or 2 out of every 10 students at this age level.

Among the problems that may face youngsters in the transition from elementary school to secondary school is the shift from the self-contained classroom -- or from participation in a limited number of classrooms -- to the multiple-classroom environment of the middle and junior high school. In the multiple-classroom setting, students must interpet and adapt to a school environment that is both instructionally and socially complex. They must deal with six or seven teachers, each of whom may place different demands on them. They must adapt to a new peer culture composed of students from a number of different elementary schools. They must shift from being the oldest students in their schooling world to being the youngest in a new educational environment.

These challenges of adaptation are accompanied by a variety of developmental changes that face early adolescents. As noted by Blyth, Simmons, and Bush (1978), transition from childhood into

early adolescence can be defined in terms of both physical maturity and social criteria (p. 149). While physical maturation may be expected to vary considerably among a group of students ages 12-13 (for example, see discussion by Tanner, 1961), Elder (1968, p. 4) notes, among others, that movement into a secondary school (e.g., junior high school) also may mark the social beginning of adolescence. Hence middle and junior high students must not only deal with the physiological changes brought on by the onset of puberty, but also the social pressures accompanying the establishment of new types of relationships with members of the opposite sex. For example, as noted earlier, students may be exposed to a peer culture that promotes opportunities to experiment with drugs and alcohol. Further, as they strive to attain independence, they may challenge and be rebuffed by the requirements of adult-formulated rules and procedures both in school and at home.

For all these reasons, early adolescence may be a stressful period for students, and entry into junior high or middle school may be a difficult transition. Alternatively, if the student role that is learned in the elementary school (for example, see Dreeben, 1968; and Jackson, 1968) also prevails in the middle or junior high school, the move to the new setting may not be as difficult as one might initially expect. Students may be able to employ many of the behaviors, expectations, etc., that worked successfully for them, academically and socially, during the previous years of schooling experience, in the new setting as well.

Since little is known about students' responses to entry into junior high school or middle school, determining whether the move from an elementary setting is traumatic, easy, etc., for students requires additional information. The major purpose of the Junior High School Transition Study is to provide information about this transition process and to make recommendations regarding teaching practices that help students move successfully from elementary to secondary school. The study was conducted in a single junior high school and the elementary schools from which the students came. It focuses on five areas of inquiry. They are:

1. Does the organization of instruction change from elementary to junior high school? if so, how? What are the implications for students?

2. What are students' concerns and feelings about their elementary school experience? junior high school experience? What are the implications for design of the transition process? for teaching practices?

3. How do students participate in and respond to junior high school instruction? Do students respond differently in different circumstances? Are these differences, if any, related to the success of students' transition to junior high school?

4. How do students describe and define various aspects of the junior high school experience? What are the implications, if any, for improvement of the schooling process in the junior high school?

5. What are parents' concerns about students' transitions to and experiences in junior high school?

This volume, Volume III, addresses the second question. Volumes II, IV, V, and VI address the first, third, fourth, and fifth questions respectively.

Overview of Student Perception Data

When students make the transition from the elementary school environment to the junior high school environment, they experience many changes. They move to a new school site, one that has new and larger groups of teachers and students. Even if students have come from an elementary school where they had more than one teacher during one grade level, they meet even greater differentiation and diversity in junior high school. While these observations characterize the objective aspects of transition to junior high school, little is known about how students themselves perceive the transition experience. A better understanding of these perceptions is needed to understand what, if anything, makes the transition experience difficult or enjoyable. These student perceptions also are important because they serve to at least partially mediate the impact of the new school environment on student behavior. In other words, students' own definitions of the situation help determine the students' overt behavior in that situation.

Student perceptions were measured in two ways in this study using data from instruments administered by the cooperating school districts. First, students completed a Student Opinion Survey (SOS) at the end of sixth grade and at the end of seventh grade. The SOS is an instrument that measures attitudes toward school by having students respond to different statements about school and by having them rate different school concepts. Second, students completed a Concerns Questionnaire during the fifth week of seventh grade. The Concerns Questionnaire presented students with a list of potential transition concerns to which students indicated the degree to which they were concerned about each item. Students responded to the list twice, once in terms of the degree of concern at the time they first entered junior high school ("in the past") and again in terms of the degree of concern at the present time ("today").

The sample in this study consisted of seventh-graders at Waverley Junior High School who had attended six designated feeder schools within the same district. Waverley was located in a suburban area near San Francisco and served a population that was largely white and middle-class. Waverley was a grade 7-8 school.

The analyses for each of the student perception instruments were conducted separately. The results for the Student Opinion Survey are presented in Chapter Two, and the results for the Concerns Questionnaire are presented in Chapter Three. These chapters are self-contained in that they also present a full description of the sample, instruments and procedures used.

A similar approach was taken to analyzing each of the different sets of results. Descriptive statistics for both instruments were obtained. These are discussed first in the respective chapters. The item responses to each instrument also were factor analyzed. Finally, variation in student responses to each instrument was tested for its relationship with the three independent variables of student sex, participation style (as rated by sixth-grade teacher), and previous classroom organization in sixth grade.

Before moving on to a brief summary of results, it should be noted that the sample sizes for the analyses of the SOS and Concerns Questionnaire were different. Analyses for each instrument were based on those students who had complete data (e.g., answered all items and had data on all independent variables). Because the SOS and Concerns Questionnaire were administered at different times, the set of students with complete data on the two instruments did not overlap completely. A total of 143 students had complete data for the Student Opinion Survey. A total of 208 students had complete data on the Concerns Questionnaire (of whom 123 had been in the SOS sample). Both samples were similar in terms of the percentage distribution of students among the sex, participation style, and classroom organization groups.

Results for the Student Opinion Survey

When students' responses to the SOS at the end of sixth grade were compared with their responses at the end of seventh grade, a general trend was found. This trend indicated that students were generally less satisfied with school at the end of seventh grade than they had been at the end of sixth grade. The only area where students indicated a more positive response to junior high school was academic performance. This more positive attitude may have been in part a reaction to the unchallenging curricula offered at Waverley.

Factor analyses of the SOS yielded an interpretable factor structure. When scores for the various factors were analyzed to determine their relationship with the student characteristics of sex, participation style, and previous classroom organization, several trends were noted. For one, female students were more positive about more aspects of school than male students. The only areas in which males were more positive than females were in their confidence about academic performance and mathematics. Most effects for the participation style variables also followed a general pattern, so that students in groups defined as being more academically and socially oriented tended to express more positive

attitudes than students in groups defined as being more withdrawn or disruptive. Thus, while the overall attitude of all students fell between sixth and seventh grades, the students who experienced the least negative decline were those who were involved in school in acceptable ways and probably were rewarded according to the academic and social systems in place at the school.

As indicated, the independent variables of sex and participation style accounted for significant amounts of variance on a number of the SOS factors. This is consistent with the findings of other investigators who have used the same instrument at the middle school level (Evans & Richards, 1980; Power & Cotterell, 1979). In contrast, the independent variable of previous classroom organization was relatively unimportant, showing up as significant only a few times. This suggests that classroom organization (i.e., cluster vs. no-cluster arrangement) in sixth grade by itself had little direct impact on student satisfaction with school, both at the sixth-grade and seventh-grade levels. Previous literature is equivocal about the role of this organizational variable (cf., Evans & Richards, 1980; McPartland, Epstein, & McDill, 1972; Power & Cotterell, 1979).

Results for the Concerns Questionnaire

Descriptive statistics for both the "in the past" and "today" portions of the Concerns Questionnaire indicated that most junior high students did not have great concerns about the items listed. Nonetheless, it was possible to distinguish between items in terms of the relative degree of expressed concern. In general, students expressed relatively more concern about those items having to do with academic work and relatively less concern about those items having to do with the social aspects of junior high school.

When students were each given a total concerns score, results showed a significant decrease in total expressed concerns from the "in the past" to "today" portions of the questionnaire. This suggents that students viewed themselves as having adjusted to whatever few transition problems existed within the first few weeks of junior high school. The independent variables of sex, participation style, and previous classroom organization did not serve to explain significant amounts of variance in the total concerns score.

When the Concerns Questionnaire was factor analyzed, an interpretable and overlapping factor structure was identified for both the "in the past" and "today" portions of the questionnaire. As with the SOS analyses, the next step was to determine whether the independent variables of student sex, participation style, and previous classroom organization accounted for significant portions of variance in the different sets of factor scores. The results showed that all three variables played a role in accounting for variance on some factors. While there were considerably more significant effects than would be expected by chance, the number of effects for each variable was small (ranging from two to four), making trends among variable groups difficult to identify. In fact, there were no notable

consistencies in the patterns of means for the significant group comparisons.

Comparison of the Results for the Student Opinion Survey and Concerns Questionnaire

The results of the two student perception instruments used in this study are worth comparing because there is some similarity between the two instruments. Specifically, many of the transition concerns listed in the Concerns Questionnaire touch on features of school that also are the focus of items on the Student Opinion Survey.

In reviewing the results for both instruments, it appears that the results are quite different. As a whole, the SOS results indicate that, relative to elementary school, students were dissatisfied with junior high school in many ways. In contrast, the Concerns Questionnaire results suggest that there was little that students perceived to be a problem in junior high school. Furthermore, whereas the SOS results show that academic performance was the one area where students felt more positive in junior high school, academic work was the area that received the highest relative concerns ratings on the Concerns Questionnaire. The results for the two instruments probably are in the most agreement over the respective findings that the independent variables of student sex, participation style, and classroom organization play some role in accounting for variance in students' perceptions, although the nature of this relationship was difficult to determine for the Concerns Questionnaire.

Perhaps the most plausible explanation for the above discrepancies in the SOS and Concerns Questionnaire results has to do with the different times at which the two instruments were administered. While SOS results concerning students' attitudes toward junior high school came from an administration that took place within the last month of seventh grade, the Concerns Questionnaire was administered at the very beginning of the year, during the fifth week of seventh grade. In other words, students may have been more favorably inclined to the junior high school experience at the beginning of the year than they were at the end of the year. Two studies that administered the SOS both at the beginning and end of the first year of secondary school lend support to this claim. Both Evans and Richards (1980) and Power and Cotterell (1979) report that students' attitudes were more favorable at the beginning of the first year of secondary school experience than at the end. The latter authors specifically suggest that the early period of the first year in secondary school may be "the most satisfying period" in the transition timeframe (in this case, sixth and seventh grades). The reason for this positive peak in attitudes may be that students are generally enthusiastic about any change in environment -- e.g., a "novelty" effect. In short, the lack of expressed concern may have been due to the fact that the Concerns Questionnaire was administered at a time when students were feeling exceptionally positive about their new school.

Differences between the two instruments in responses to items about academic work also may be tied to temporal factors. For instance, at the beginning of the year, the nature of the academic work demands may have remained an unknown for some time, especially because students entered with the expectation that work in junior high school would be more difficult. By the end of the year, however, students certainly had enough experience to make the judgment that the work was less difficult than they expected.

Other factors may have contributed to differences between the results for the SOS and Concerns Questionnaire as well. For one, the SOS was an instrument with a broader focus than the Concerns Questionnaire. While the SOS asked students to indicate their attitudes toward their experience during the entire school year, the Concerns Questionnaire focused on the much briefer time period of transition. It is possible, for example, that students were dissatisified with Waverley at the time they completed the Concerns Questionnaire, but that this did not show up because they viewed the transition process itself as problem-free. Students, then, may have worked from very different frames of reference when completing the two instruments. Other important factors that distinguish between the two instruments are characteristics of their construction. Several weaknesses with the Concerns Questionnaire are discussed at the end of Chapter Three, including the juxtaposition of the "in the past" and "today" portions of the questionnaire, the limited item alternatives, and the limited content of the items themselves. A study using a similar instrument (Applegate, 1981) suggests that making some refinements to the Concerns Questionnaire might result in a more useful instrument. In contrast, the SOS is an instrument that has already gone through a refinement process and yields more item variability.

In sum, there are several explanations that account for the difference between the SOS and Concerns Questionnaire results. Part of the difference may be attributable to actual differences in students' perceptual states, while another part may be more a function of differences in instrument construction. Making the instruments more comparable in terms of the quality and refinement should be a first step. Then it will be possible to determine with greater assurance whether students' perceptions of transition are different from their perceptions of the broader experience in a new school setting. If it is true -- as the results here suggest -- that the immediate transition period is a time mostly of student enthusiasm, with little reflection on problems, then researchers' efforts may be better directed toward capturing in greater detail what makes the new school experience sour by the end of the year. The consequences of this attitude change should be examined as well. It is possible that at schools like Waverley, students' motivational behavior and academic knowledge attainment also decline, and that this decline is mediated by poorer attitudes toward the new school environment.

CHAPTER TWO

STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL

At the end of the school year, sixth-grade students in six schools designated as feeder schools to Waverley Junior High School completed an attitude questionnaire, the Student Opinion Survey (SOS) which was administered by the school districts. The questionnaire tapped students' level of confidence (as opposed to anxiety) about school and their satisfaction with school, their work, and their social relationships. Students also were asked to rate their school, teachers, and subjects on specific quality dimensions. Approximately one year later, these same students, now finishing their seventh-grade year at Waverley Junior High School, completed the same attitude questionnaire again under the auspices of the school district in which the junior high school was located. The two resulting sets of data, one coming before and the other after the transition to junior high school, were made available to the study staff. The data make possible an examination of how student attitudes toward school changed as a function of changing school structure and environment.

The results from the Student Opinion Survey (SOS) are presented in two sections. Descriptive statistics for the items in Part A and Part B appear in the first section. The second section presents the results of a factor analysis of the SOS.

This chapter begins by describing the data-collection methods. The results of the data analyses are presented next. A summary of results ends the chapter.

Method

The sample of students available for the analyses of the SOS is described first. This is followed by a description of the origin of the SOS instrument and its final form. Last, the procedures for administering the SOS are described.

Sample

The sample with complete data on the Student Opinion Survey consisted of 143 students. The designation of "complete data" means that each sample student had a completed form of the SOS for both the sixth- and seventh-grade administration and that there also was information on the student's sex, participation style as rated by sixth-grade

teacher, and sixth-grade class organization (cluster vs. no-cluster). While the SOS was actually completed by 299 sixth-graders, the size of this original sample was eventually truncated for two reasons: (1) some sixth-graders who completed the SOS went on to attend schools other than Waverley Junior High School; and (2) some sixth-graders who completed the SOS and did attend Waverley Junior High School were absent on the day of the seventh-grade administration.

The demographic characteristics of seventh-graders attending Waverley Junior High School are described in detail in Volume I of this series. Here it is adequate to note that the Waverley population consisted of students from largely white, middle-class families.

Of the 143 students with complete SOS data, 66 (46%) were girls and 77 (54%) were boys. When this sample is viewed in terms of participation style as rated by sixth-grade teacher, 47 (33%) students were rated as success, 21 (15%) as social, 35 (24%) as dependent, 27 (19%) as phantom, 10 (7%) as alienate, and 3 (2%) as isolate. (For more detail on the definitions and origins of the participation style ratings, see Volume I of this series). Finally, 35 (24%) of the 143 students had been in sixth-grade classes with a no-cluster arrangement (i.e., single-teacher, self-contained classes), while the remaining 108 students had been in sixth-grade classes with a cluster arrangement (i.e., different teachers taught different subjects or some instruction was done by teams of teachers).

Instrument

The Student Opinion Survey (SOS) was a slightly modified version of an instrument developed and used by Power and Cotterell (1979). The original instrument will be described below and the relevant modifications noted. The items in the Power and Cotterell (1979) instrument are divided under two sections entitled Part A and Part B. In Part A, students are asked to respond to statements about school (e.g., "I like my teachers" and "I am making good progress with my work") by marking one of three alternatives: True, Uncertain, or False. Power and Cotterell's pilot version of Part A consisted of 60 items written to reflect the three subscales of school satisfaction, alienation from school, and school-related anxiety. For the final version of Part A, this pool of items was reduced to 36 by eliminating items with low item-subscale correlations. While Power and Cotterell's items were selected to reflect different subscales, the authors nonetheless factor analyzed the responses of 310 students to the instrument in an effort to cross-validate the subscale structure. The factor analysis indicated four broad factors: (1) General School Satisfaction, (2) Confidence, (3) Work Satisfaction, and (4) Social Satisfaction. It also was possible to associate each item with one of the four factor scales. In other words, based on the factor analysis results, Power and Cotterell were able to categorize each of the 36 items as belonging to one of four subscales. Twelve, ten, nine, and five items were categorized as belonging to the General School Satisfaction, Confidence, Work Satisfaction, and Social Satisfaction subscales, respectively.

Part A of Power and Cotterell's instrument was employed by the cooperating districts with only slight modifications. Twenty-nine of the original items were used, and of these seven appeared twice. Thus, the modified instrument still consisted of a total of thirty-six items. These items appear in Table 2.1, numbered according to their order of presentation. The table also indicates the subscale membership of each item according to Power and Cotterell's classification scheme.

Part B of Power and Cotterell's instrument asked students to respond to five curriculum concepts (School, English, Math, Social Studies, and Science) and two teacher concepts (Teachers at High School, Teachers at Primary School) in a semantic differential format. For each concept, students were asked to make a mark on a 7-point scale for each of five bipolar adjective pairs (interesting/dull, bad/good, easy/difficult, useless/useful, and confusing/clear). This resulted in a 35-item instrument (seven concepts x five adjective pairs). When Power and Cotterell factor analyzed Part B, eight major factors resulted. These factors represented most of the single-subject or teacher concepts (e.g., all five adjective pairs for Social Studies had high loadings on one factor). There also were two across-concept factors, one with high loadings on the "easy" and "confusing" adjective pairs and one with high loadings on the "useless" adjective pair.

Part B of the Power and Cotterell instrument also was used by the school districts. Some modifications were made in terms of the concepts included. Also, the sixth- and seventh-grade forms for this portion of the instrument differed slightly. The five curriculum concepts (School, English, Math, Social Studies, and Science) from the original instrument were used for the sixth-grade SOS form. Sixth-grade responses indicated that some students did not receive a clearly defined "Science" curriculum (i.e., students could not complete the items associated with this concept). Also, it was known that "Science" was not a component of the seventh-grade junior high curricula. Thus, the science concept was eliminated from the analysis of the SOS. The two teacher concepts (Teachers at High School, Teachers at Primary School) that were included on the original form of Part B were replaced by one teacher concept -- Teachers at School -- on the sixth- and seventh-grade forms of the SOS, thus asking students to reflect on their current teachers. In the sixth-grade form of the SOS, students were asked to respond to the two additional concepts of "Junior High School" and "Junior High School Teachers." These two concepts were placed under a new heading called Part C. Also in Part C, sixth-grade students were asked to answer two open-ended questions about three problems and three things they looked forward to upon entering junior high school. Seventh-graders were asked two open-ended questions under Part C about problems and things they enjoyed in junior high school. Responses to the open-ended questions in Part C are not analyzed and discussed in this report.

In sum, the Student Opinion Survey (SOS) instrument used in this study consisted of two major parts. In Part A, students indicated the extent to which 36 statements about school were true for them.

Table 2.1

Items in Part A of the Student Opinion Survey

1. I look forward to coming to school each day. (1)[a]
2. I like my teachers. (1)
3. A lot of what we are supposed to do at this school doesn't make sense. (1)
4. My teachers are helping me to learn and understand. (1)
5. In school I am often able to work with people I like. (1)
6. I do not really enjoy anything about school. (1)
7. Normally I feel quite relaxed at school. (1)
8. Some teachers are really against me. (1)
9. I wish we were free to do things our own way instead of being told exactly what to do. (1)
10. I like school better than most other kids do. (1)
11. My teachers are friendly toward me. (1)
12. My teachers take into account what I need and what I am interested in. (1)
13. During exams I worry that I might fail or do badly. (2)
14. I do not really enjoy anything about school. (1)
15. At this school I don't have as many friends as I would like. (4)
16. Normally I feel quite relaxed at school. (1)
17. Some teachers are really against me. (1)
18. The way this school is run leaves me so confused, I don't know where to turn. (3)
19. I tense up when the teachers ask me questions in class discussion. (2)
20. In this school people like me don't have any luck. (2)
21. What happens in this school goes on no matter what the pupils do. (3)
22. I wish we were free to do things our own way instead of being told exactly what to do. (1)
23. I am making good progress with my work. (3)
24. I am accepted and liked by most of the kids in my class. (4)
25. I think that people like me will never do well at this school no matter how hard we try. (2)
26. During exams I worry a lot about how I am doing. (2)
27. I like school better than most other kids. (1)
28. Nobody in this school seems to notice me or care what happens to me. (4)
29. It is hard for me to do as well at school as my parents and teachers expect. (3)
30. My teachers are friendly toward me. (1)
31. A good deal of schoolwork is just to keep us busy. (3)
32. I am often afraid I will make a fool of myself in class. (2)
33. When exams are due, I feel quite confident I will do well. (2)
34. My teachers take into account what I need and what I am interested in. (1)
35. I get upset when my teachers don't come to my help when I need it. (2)
36. I am quite satisfied with how my schoolwork is going. (3)

[a]The number in parentheses following each item indicates the classification of the item according to Power and Cotterell's (1979) subscales of General School Satisfaction (1), Confidence (2), Work Satisfaction (3), and Social Satisfaction (4).

NOTE: Students responded to these items by marking one of three alternatives: True, Uncertain, or False.

In Part B, students rated school, curriculum areas, and teachers in terms of five bipolar adjective pairs. Students were given the same forms of the SOS in sixth and seventh grades with two exceptions. In the seventh-grade form, students were not able to rate the curriculum area of Science, and the Science concept was thus eliminated from all analyses. Second, the sixth-grade form contained four additional items under a Part C that were different from the Part C in the seventh-grade form. Two of the sixth-grade items required ratings of junior high school, and the other two items asked for students' open-ended responses about anticipated pluses and minuses in junior high school. In the seventh-grade form, students responded to two open-ended questions about their experiences in junior high school under Part C. A copy of the entire SOS instrument appears in Appendix A.

Procedures

The SOS instrument was administered by the two cooperating school districts to sixth-grade students in six of the feeder schools for Waverley Junior High School on one occasion during the first two weeks of May 1980. The following year, the SOS was administered to seventh-graders at Waverley Junior High School on one of three days during the second week of May 1981. Teachers administered the instrument, following the standard written directions, for both the sixth- and seventh-grade administrations.

Results

The first portion of the results section presents the descriptive statistics for the Student Opinion Survey data obtained from the school districts. These statistics are presented for items on Part A and Part B of the survey, for both the pretest and posttest. The second portion of the results deals with the factor analysis of the SOS.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics on the SOS are presented separately for Parts A and B of the survey. The bipolar adjective items that appeared in Part C of the sixth-grade SOS are discussed along with the Part B items.

Part A. Table 2.2 presents the pretest and posttest means and standard deviations for the items in Part A of the Student Opinion Survey (SOS). Items that were repeated are not included in the presentation or in further analyses. The table also indicates the direction of the mean difference between pretest and posttest in terms of whether students in general responded to the item in a more or less favorable way (that some items were worded positively and others negatively is taken into account).

Table 2.2

Means and Standard Deviations on Student Opinion Survey Items (Part A), Pretest and Posttest (N=143)

	Pretest		Posttest		Direction of Pre-Post Mean Difference
Item #[a]	M	SD	M	SD	
1	1.71	.74	1.99	.76	Less favorable
2	1.24	.56	1.57	.61	Less favorable
3	2.55	.66	2.36	.76	Less favorable
4	1.09	.37	1.26	.49	Less favorable
5	1.44	.71	1.65	.85	Less favorable
6	2.89	.40	2.70	.56	Less favorable
7	1.63	.71	1.83	.75	Less favorable
8	2.29	.80	2.27	.75	Less favorable
9	2.01	.83	1.85	.77	Less favorable
10	1.77	.75	2.04	.77	Less favorable
11	1.41	.62	1.54	.64	Less favorable
12	1.69	.68	2.03	.66	Less favorable
13	1.57	.78	1.59	.80	More favorable
15	2.64	.70	2.64	.72	Same
18	2.73	.57	2.59	.63	Less favorable
19	1.99	.87	1.99	.88	Same
20	2.69	.57	2.60	.60	Less favorable
21	2.20	.76	2.00	.77	Less favorable
23	1.54	.67	1.50	.63	More favorable
24	1.41	.61	1.43	.63	Less favorable
25	2.81	.47	2.73	.55	Less favorable
26	1.50	.77	1.59	.83	More favorable
28	2.69	.57	2.47	.67	Less favorable
29	1.97	.88	1.90	.88	Less favorable
31	2.34	.86	2.17	.86	Less favorable
32	2.03	.88	2.15	.84	More favorable
33	1.82	.73	1.97	.68	Less favorable
35	2.06	.87	1.83	.84	Less favorable
36	1.58	.77	1.75	.82	Less favorable

[a]The seven items that were repeated twice appear only once.

NOTE: Item alternatives were scored so that True = 1, Uncertain = 2, and False = 3.

It is striking that the pre-to-post mean differences for all but six of the twenty-nine Part A items were in a direction indicating a less favorable response. In other words, Waverley students' attitudes toward school were largely less favorable after one year of junior high school than they had been at the end of elementary school.

It is of interest to consider the items that were the exception to the predominant trend of less favorable attitude change from elementary to junior high school. Four of the six items that did not meet the overall pattern were concerned with students' attitudes about their own work performance, or what Power and Cotterell (1979) labeled as "Confidence" items. These items were: "During exams I worry that I might fail or do badly" (Item 13); "During exams I worry a lot about how I am doing" (Item 26); "I am often afraid I will make a fool of myself in class" (Item 32); and, "I tense up when teachers ask me questions in class discussion" (Item 19). The overall means for these items indicate that students felt no differently about these aspects of their academic performance in junior high school than in elementary school or even felt less worried about their academic performance in junior high school than in elementary school. The two other items that did not have pre-to-post mean differences in a less favorable direction were Item 23, "I am making good progress with my work," and Item 15, "At this school I don't have as many friends as I would like."

Another characteristic of the data in Table 2.2 is that the standard deviations for most items were larger at posttest than pretest. This suggests that students expressed a greater range of attitudes about school in junior high school than in elementary school. This is not surprising given that junior high school environments are less uniform than those of elementary schools and thereby more likely to engender diverse reactions among students.

Table 2.3 presents the means and standard deviations for the SOS items in Part B. The items under the heading of "Science" are not included because most students were unable to respond to this. Also, the items that only sixth-graders answered (responding to "Junior High School" and "Junior High School Teachers") are not included because a pretest-posttest comparison was not possible. Items were scored from 1 to 7, parallel to the 7-point scale. Because items were set up so that the positive adjective was sometimes on the left pole (interesting and easy) and other times on the right pole (good, useful, and clear), means for the items must be interpreted with these reversals in mind. Thus, for example, a low mean for the interesting/dull pair indicates that students tended to view the given concept as more interesting, whereas a low mean for the confusing/clear pair indicates that students tended to view the given concept as more confusing.

In Table 2.3, pretest means for the School concept indicate that students had a generally favorable attitude about school, with responses averaging closer to the interesting, good, useful, and clear ends of the polar dimensions. The only dimension where students were more

Table 2.3

Means and Standard Deviations on Student Opinion Survey Items (Part B), Pretest and Posttest (N=143)

Item #	Item	Pretest		Posttest	
		M	SD	M	SD
	SCHOOL				
37	interesting/dull	3.03	1.59	3.85	1.54
38	bad/good	5.86	1.39	4.82	1.51
39	easy/difficult	4.07	1.54	3.80	1.45
40	useless/useful	6.51	1.14	5.77	1.42
41	confusing/clear	4.65	1.81	4.59	1.47
	ENGLISH				
42	interesting/dull	4.27	2.02	3.78	1.77
43	bad/good	4.97	1.77	4.80	1.64
44	easy/difficult	4.28	1.86	3.76	1.74
45	useless/useful	6.04	1.52	5.70	1.47
46	confusing/clear	4.44	1.77	4.70	1.81
	MATH				
47	interesting/dull	2.43	1.83	4.39	2.16
48	bad/good	6.19	1.33	4.60	1.98
49	easy/difficult	3.48	1.91	3.39	1.95
50	useless/useful	6.57	1.13	5.66	1.70
51	confusing/clear	5.23	1.78	4.50	1.84
	SOCIAL STUDIES				
52	interesting/dull	3.78	2.20	3.27	2.13
53	bad/good	5.10	1.80	5.14	1.71
54	easy/difficult	3.68	1.73	3.49	2.02
55	useless/useful	5.82	1.59	5.38	1.77
56	confusing/clear	4.80	1.78	5.17	1.84
	TEACHERS AT SCHOOL				
62	interesting/dull	2.52	1.78	3.44	1.81
63	bad/good	5.90	1.62	4.96	1.69
64	easy/difficult	3.66	1.79	3.85	1.51
65	useless/useful	6.17	1.58	5.28	1.82
66	confusing/clear	5.24	1.81	4.59	1.79

neutral was easy/difficult, with students' scores averaging at the midpoint of this dimension. The posttest data for the same School concept show that four of the five means moved in a direction indicating less favorable attitudes toward school at the end of seventh grade relative to sixth. The exception to this is, again, the easy/difficult dimension, where students as seventh-graders rated school as being closer to the easy end of the dimension than they had as sixth-graders.

Looking at the three specific subject-matter concepts that are represented in Table 2.3 -- English, Math, and Social Studies -- several features of the data are notable. First, the pretest means show that students' average ratings for these subjects on all dimensions are in the mid-to-positive ranges of the dimensions. Furthermore, Math has a higher set of pretest means than either English or Social Studies. This higher set of ratings may reflect the way the subject is taught or also the nature of the subject itself -- e.g., Math is a subject with very clear-cut guidelines and criteria for "rightness."

In looking at the direction of change in the three sets of curriculum means from pretest to posttest, there are several patterns. It is interesting, for example, that students on average rated each subject as closer to the easier end of the dimension in the seventh grade than in the sixth grade. This is consistent with the results for the School concept and also with the case study data which showed that Waverley generally was not a challenging academic environment for students.

For English alone, changes in the direction of means from pretest to posttest are mixed, and the differences are small in magnitude. Besides being rated as closer to easy, English is rated as being closer to interesting, bad, useless, and clear. These fluctuations probably are attributable to chance. Also, students' answers in sixth grade may have been invalid because they did not have one discrete subject called "English." Instead, sixth-graders had Reading, Spelling, Language Arts, and Phonics. There is no way of knowing which of these subjects sixth-graders had in mind when they responded to the concept of English.

Among the three subject areas, changes in the pretest to posttest means are greatest for Math. Except for the easy/difficult dimension, students on average rated Math more negatively in seventh grade than in sixth. This change was most substantial for the dimensions of interesting/dull and bad/good, where students' average ratings moved closer to the dull and bad ends of the dimensions.

For Social Studies, changes in the direction of the means are mostly positive, although the magnitude of the differences is small. Relative to sixth grade, students rated Social Studies in seventh grade as closer to the interesting, good, easy, and clear ends of the respective dimensions. Only on the useless/useful dimension is the change in means in a negative direction, with students rating Social Studies as less useful in the seventh grade than in the sixth grade. As was the case for English, changes in the Social Studies means from

pretest to posttest are small and attributable to chance. Also, while there was a definite curriculum called "Social Studies" in the sixth grade, the closest counterpart in seventh grade was called "World History." Because of this discrepancy, it is unknown whether students were comparing the appropriate curricula across years.

The last concept in Table 2.3 is Teachers at School. The changes from pretest to posttest in the direction of these means are consistent and negative. In seventh grade, students rated their teachers closer to the dull, bad, difficult, useless, and confusing ends of the dimensions than they had in sixth grade. The consistency of this pattern suggests that, on average, students were less satisfied with their teachers at Waverley compared to the teachers they had known in elementary school. Finally, while one might expect the Waverley teachers to be rated as "easier" based on other results in Table 2.3, it is noteworthy that the teachers were rated as closer to difficult. Perhaps these students were not thinking of easy/difficult in reference to the instructional content presented by teachers, but more in terms of teachers' personalities -- e.g., teachers are more difficult to get along with.

Together, the descriptive statistics for Part A and Part B of the SOS present a fairly coherent picture of changes in students' attitudes as they moved from their elementary schools to Waverley Junior High School. In responding to items about their academic confidence and school satisfaction, students tended to express slightly more confidence about their academic performance in seventh grade than they had in sixth grade. In other words, students said they were less worried about their performance at Waverley. As far as satisfaction with school in general, and in the work and social realms specifically, trends indicated that students were consistently less satisfied at Waverley Junior High School than they had been in their respective elementary schools. When students were asked to rate their school and teachers in terms of bipolar adjective dimensions, trends showed that the ratings were in a more negative direction in seventh grade than in sixth grade, the exception being that school was rated more in the easy direction. Ratings for the specific subject matters of English, Math, and Social Studies had trends that were more mixed, and most differences probably are attributable to chance. Still of interest are the findings that each curriculum concept was rated as closer to the easy end of the dimension in seventh grade, and that Math received more negative average ratings on all dimensions except easy/difficult in seventh grade. The perception of Waverley as academically easier than elementary school goes along with the greater academic confidence of students in seventh grade, but it also suggests that Waverley was not an environment providing sufficient academic stimulation. In sum, with the exception that students perceived themselves as more able to meet the academic expectations of Waverley, the SOS data show that students consistently viewed junior high school as a less satisfying environment than elementary school.

Before moving on to another set of analyses, it is worth considering the adjective ratings that only sixth-graders made in response

to the concepts of "Junior High School" and "Junior High School Teachers." These ratings, presented in Table 2.4, can be viewed as sixth-graders' expectations for junior high school. Furthermore, by comparing these ratings to students' responses to "School" and "Teachers at School" in seventh grade, it is possible to determine the extent to which students had to accommodate their expectations to reality. The means in Table 2.4 indicate that students as sixth-graders generally had high hopes for junior high school and its teachers. Students rated junior high school and its teachers as being close to the interesting, good, and useful ends of the respective dimensions.

Table 2.4

Means and Standard Deviations on Student Opinion Survey Items (Part C), Pretest (N=143)

Item #	Item	Pretest	
		M	SD
	JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL		
67	interesting/dull	2.18	1.45
68	bad/good	5.66	1.56
69	easy/difficult	4.80	1.80
70	useless/useful	6.39	1.18
71	confusing/clear	4.09	1.91
	JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS		
72	interesting/dull	3.01	1.74
73	bad/good	5.43	1.56
74	easy/difficult	4.52	1.59
75	useless/useful	6.19	1.40
76	confusing/clear	4.62	1.71

In seventh grade, students' ratings of school and teachers were not as positive, indicating that their expectations had not been fulfilled. The biggest change occurred for students' ratings of school on the interesting/dull dimension, where students as seventh-graders rated school on average as 1.77 points closer to the dull end of the dimension than they had rated junior high school as sixth-graders. In sixth grade, students rated junior high school and its teachers close to the midpoint on the easy/difficult and confusing/clear dimensions. By seventh grade, the ratings of school moved in a direction indicating that students found junior high to be easier and more clear than they expected. This is one more indication that students' anticipation of a more challenging academic environment at the high grade levels was not fulfilled. As seventh-graders, students rated teachers as being easier than they expected and as about the same in terms of being confusing/clear.

Factor Analysis of the Student Opinion Survey

Identification of the Factor Structure. As described in the method section, the original version of the SOS was factor analyzed by Power and Cotterell (1979), and a clear factor structure was identified. In this study, it was of interest to factor analyze the SOS to determine to what extent the factor structure resulting from a different sample of students was similar to that of Power and Cotterell's. The pretest and posttest scores on the SOS were factor analyzed separately. Furthermore, Part A and Part B of the SOS were factor analyzed separately. In short, four different factor analyses were conducted: one for the pretest Part A data, one for the posttest Part A data, one for the pretest Part B data, and one for the posttest Part B data. Results will be presented in this order. The principal components method of factor analysis was used, with varimax rotation.

The factor analyses for Part A of the SOS indicated a more complex set of dimensions than that found by Power and Cotterell (1979) or by other investigators (Evans & Richards, 1980). The pretest analysis of Part A yielded seven interpretable factors accounting for 53 percent of the total variance. The posttest analysis of Part A yielded eight factors accounting for 59 percent of the total variance. For Part B of the SOS, the factor analysis of the pretest data showed a simpler factor structure than that shown by analysis of the posttest data. The pretest Part B data yielded five factors accounting for 64 percent of the total variance. The posttest Part B data yielded nine factors accounting for 79 percent of the total variance. All factors that were considered had eigenvalues exceeding 1.0, with the exception of the last two factors from the posttest Part B analysis. These two factors were included anyway, because they could be easily interpreted. For consistency, factors were named according to the meaning of the items with positive loadings. The factor results for each analysis are discussed below.

Table 2.5 presents the highest-loading items on the factors produced in the analysis of Part A of the pretest. All items with loading of .40 or greater are listed. The first factor has five high-loading items, all of which belong to, but do not fully represent, Power and Cotterell's subscale of General School Satisfaction. The five items seem to reflect the need for self-direction. Because students responding to the positively worded items received the highest score when they answered "False," this factor was labeled the "Need for Self-Direction Factor." The second factor in Table 2.5 has five high-loading items, all of which concern academic performance. These items represent some of the items from Power and Cotterell's Confidence subscale. Because students scoring highest on the positive-loading items would be indicating a lack of fear about academic failure, this factor was labeled specifically as the "Confidence about Academic Performance Factor." Factor 3 has three high-loading items, all of which reflect the concept of having friends, in particular, among peers. These items come from Power and Cotterell's subscale of Social Satisfaction. Here, this factor was labeled the "Friendship Factor," since students scoring highest on the positive-loading items would be indicating that they were

Table 2.5

Highest-Loading Items on the Seven Factors from the Analysis of the Pretest Student Opinion Survey, Part A

Item #	Item	Factor Loading
	FACTOR 1 - NEED FOR SELF-DIRECTION	
3.	A lot of what we are supposed to do at this school doesn't make sense.	-.650
4.	My teachers are helping me learn and understand.	.456
7.	Normally I feel quite relaxed at school.	.556
9.	I wish we were free to do things our own way instead of being told exactly what to do.	-.466
12.	My teachers take into account what I need and what I am interested in.	.552
	FACTOR 2 - CONFIDENCE ABOUT ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE	
13.	During exams I worry that I might fail or do badly.	.816
19.	I tense up when the teachers ask me questions in class discussion.	.652
26.	During exams I worry a lot about how I am doing.	.836
32.	I am often afraid I will make a fool of myself in class.	.426
33.	When exams are due, I feel quite confident I will do well.	-.470
	FACTOR 3 - FRIENDSHIP	
15.	At this school I don't have as many friends as I would like.	.683
24.	I am accepted and liked by most of the kids in my class.	-.760
28.	Nobody in this school seems to notice me or care what happens to me.	.765
	FACTOR 4 - BELONGINGNESS IN SCHOOL	
5.	In school I am often able to work with people I like.	-.615
8.	Some teachers are against me.	.548
10.	I like school better than most other kids do.	-.491
11.	My teachers are friendly toward me.	-.419
18.	The way this school is run leaves me so confused I don't know where to turn.	.712
	FACTOR 5 - POOR PROGRESS WITH SCHOOLWORK	
4.	My teachers are helping me to learn and understand.	.423
23.	I am making good progress with my work.	.742
29.	It is hard for me to do as well at school as my parents and teachers expect.	-.597
33.	When exams are due, I feel quite confident I will do well.	.497
36.	I am quite satisfied with how my schoolwork is going.	.751
	FACTOR 6 - GENERAL DISLIKE OF SCHOOL	
1.	I look forward to coming to school each day.	.521
2.	I like my teachers.	.817
6.	I do not really enjoy anything about school.	-.689
10.	I like school better than most other kids do.	.524
11.	My teachers are friendly toward me.	.610
	FACTOR 7 - POSITIVE ATTRIBUTION	
20.	In this school people like me don't have any luck.	.521
25.	I think that people like me will never do well at this school no matter how hard we try.	.651
31.	A good deal of schoolwork is just to keep us busy.	.630

successful in having friends. There are five high-loading items for the fourth factor in Table 2.5. Four of these items come from Power and Cotterell's subscale of General School Satisfaction. Thus, Factor 4 appears to be very close to Factor 1 in this analysis. The items for Factor 4 seem different from the items for Factor 1, however, in that they refer to whether students are close to or isolated from peers and teachers. Thus, Factor 4 was labeled as the "Belongingness in School Factor." Five items load highly on Factor 5. Among these, two of the lower-loading items, Items 4 and 33, appear on previous factors. The three highest-loading items for Factor 5, Items 23, 29, and 36, come from Power and Cotterell's subscale of Work Satisfaction. Thus, while all of the items for Factor 5 refer to the academic realm of school, the three highest-loading items suggested the label of the "Poor Progress with Schoolwork Factor." Table 2.5 shows five high-loading items for Factor 6, all of which appeared on Power and Cotterell's General School Satisfaction subscale. Factor 6 overlaps with Factor 4, sharing two of the same high-loading items. As a whole, the Factor 6 items seem to reflect general affect about school. Because students scoring highest on the positive-loading items were disagreeing with favorable statements about school, this factor was labeled as the "General Dislike of School Factor." Last, Factor 7 has three high-loading items. The first two items are negative self-attributions about getting along in school. The third item may reflect an attribution that schoolwork is not interesting because it is just "busywork." Since high scores indicated disagreement with these attributions, Factor 7 was labeled as the "Positive Attribution Factor."

In sum, the seven factors from the analysis of Part A of the pretest SOS were given the following labels, respectively: Need for Self-Direction Factor, Confidence about Academic Performance Factor, Friendship Factor, Belongingness in School Factor, Poor Progress with Schoolwork Factor, General Dislike of School Factor, and Positive Attribution Factor. The items that clustered together on any one factor usually represented some of the items from one of the four factors identified by Power and Cotterell (1979). Factors from the present analysis were more differentiated than those identified by Power and Cotterell, however. In particular, the items for one factor, identified by Power and Cotterell as the General School Satisfaction Factor, clustered on three different factors in the present analysis (Need for Self-Direction Factor, Belongingness in School Factor, and General Dislike of School Factor).

Table 2.6 summarizes the results for the factor analysis of posttest Part A. As indicated earlier, the posttest analysis of Part A yielded eight interpretable factors, one factor more than in the pretest analysis. Factor 1 in Table 2.6 shows six high-loading items. Four of these items load on the General Dislike of School Factor in the pretest analysis. Thus, posttest Factor 1 and pretest Factor 6 appear comparable. Factor 2 in Table 2.6 has four high-loading items, all of which load on the Confidence about Academic Performance Factor in the pretest. Factor 3 has five high-loading items, three of which were the high-loading items on the Friendship Factor in the pretest analysis. Factor 4 from the posttest analysis

Table 2.6

Highest-Loading Items on the Eight Factors from the Analysis of the Posttest Student Opinion Survey, Part A

Item #	Item	Factor Loading
	FACTOR 1 - GENERAL DISLIKE OF SCHOOL	
1.	I look forward to coming to school each day.	.728
2.	I like my teachers.	.453
6.	I do not really enjoy anything about school.	-.584
7.	Normally I feel quite relaxed at school.	.406
10.	I like school better than most other kids do.	.728
12.	My teachers take into account what I need and what I am interested in.	.595
	FACTOR 2 - CONFIDENCE ABOUT ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE	
13.	During exams I worry that I might fail or do badly.	.790
26.	During exams I worry a lot about how I am doing.	.888
32.	I am often afraid I will make a fool of myself in class.	.489
33.	When exams are due, I feel quite confident I will do well.	-.527
	FACTOR 3 - FRIENDSHIP	
15.	At this school I don't have as many friends as I would like.	.671
18.	The way this school is run leaves so confused, I don't know where to turn.	.446
24.	I am accepted and liked by most of the kids in my class.	-.702
28.	Nobody in this school seems to notice me or care what happens to me.	.649
32.	I am often afraid I will make a fool of myself in class.	.415
	FACTOR 4 - SENSE OF PURPOSE	
2.	I like my teachers.	-.425
3.	A lot of what we are supposed to do at this school doesn't make sense.	.686
4.	My teachers are helping me to learn and understand.	-.665
31.	A good deal of schoolwork is just to keep us busy.	.424
	FACTOR 5 - POSITIVE TEACHER	
8.	Some teachers are really against me.	.798
11.	My teachers are friendly toward me.	-.574
35.	I get upset when my teachers don't come to my help when I need it.	.572
	FACTOR 6 - POOR PROGRESS WITH SCHOOLWORK	
23.	I am making good progress with my work.	.708
29.	It is hard for me to do as well at school as my parents and teachers expect.	-.616
33.	When exams are due, I feel quite confident I will do well.	.426
36.	I am quite satisfied with how my schoolwork is going.	.772
	FACTOR 7 - LACK OF CONTROL OVER WORK	
5.	In school I am often able to work with people I like.	.428
9.	I wish we were free to do things our own way instead of being told exactly what to do.	.749
	FACTOR 8 - POSITIVE SCHOOL	
6.	I do not really enjoy anything about school.	.482
19.	I tense up when teachers ask me questions in class discussion.	.566
20.	In this school people like me don't have any luck.	.570
25.	I think people like me will never do well no matter how hard we try.	.686

has four high-loading items. This combination of items has no close counterpart in the pretest analysis. The items concern whether or not there is a sense of purpose emanating from teachers, school, and schoolwork. Thus, this factor was labeled the "Sense of Purpose Factor." As shown in Table 2.6, Factor 5 has three high-loading items, all of which refer specifically to teachers' friendliness and helpfulness. These items also have no direct counterpart in the pretest analysis. Because students scoring highest on the positive-loading items would be disagreeing with negative statements about teachers, this factor was labeled the "Positive Teacher Factor." Factor 6 from the posttest analysis shows four high-loading items, all of which load highly on the Poor Progress with Schoolwork Factor in the pretest analysis. Thus, these two factors seem comparable. Factor 7 from the posttest analysis has only two high-loading items. These items did not load together on one factor in the pretest analysis. While the items reflect the need for self-direction, as did the items for Factor 1 in the pretest analysis, it is inappropriate to give the same label to two factors with little overlap in items. Instead, Factor 7 from the posttest analysis was labeled as the "Lack of Control over Work Factor." The last factor in Table 2.6, Factor 8, has four high-loading items. This combination of items has no counterpart in the pretest factor analysis. Because these items reflect a variety of attitudes and feelings toward school, with high scores indicating disagreement with negative statements about school, Factor 8 was labeled as the "Positive School Factor."

The pretest and posttest factor analyses of Part A of the SOS, then, yielded interpretable factor structures with moderate overlap. Four of the factors from the pretest analysis had counterparts in the posttest analysis. In addition, the factor analyses yielded three factors unique to the pretest and four factors unique to the posttest. Table 2.7 summarizes the list of factors from the pretest and posttest analyses.

Table 2.8 presents the results of the factor analysis of Part B of the pretest SOS. Recall that in Part B, students responded to five concepts -- School, English, Math, Social Studies, and Teachers at School -- in terms of five bipolar adjective pairs. The five factors in Table 2.8 call for relatively straightforward interpretations. Four of the factors -- Factors 1, 2, 3, and 5 -- each represent one of the individual rating concepts: Teachers at School, English, Math, and Social Studies. Only the School concept is without representation as a single factor. For each of the English, Math, and Social Studies Factors, it is noteworthy that all adjective pairs except easy/difficult loaded highly. This suggests that students viewed the question of a curriculum subject's usefulness as apart from evaluations of the subject's level of interest, goodness, easiness, and clarity. The remaining factor in Table 2.8, Factor 4, represents the adjective dimension of useless/useful rather than a particular curriculum concept. The useless/useful dimensions for all concepts except Social Studies load highly on Factor 4.

In general, the results of the factor analysis of the pretest Part B are similar to the results obtained by Power and Cotterell

Table 2.7

Factors Derived in the Analyses of the Student Opinion Survey, Part A

	PRETEST	POSTTEST
COMPARABLE FACTORS	Confidence about Academic Performance Factor (2)[a]	Confidence about Academic Performance Factor (2)
	Friendship Factor (3)	Friendship Factor (3)
	Poor Progress with School-work Factor (5)	Poor Progress with School-work Factor (6)
	General Dislike of School Factor (6)	General Dislike of School Factor (1)
UNIQUE FACTORS	Need for Self-Direction Factor (1)	Sense of Purpose Factor (4)
	Belongingness in School Factor (4)	Positive Teacher Factor (5)
	Positive Attribution Factor (7)	Lack of Control over Work Factor (7)
		Positive School Factor (8)

a Numbers in parentheses indicate the ordinal position of the factor in the analysis.

Table 2.8

Highest-Loading Items on the Five Factors from the Analysis of the Pretest Student Opinion Survey, Part B

Item #	Item	Factor Loading
	FACTOR 1 - TEACHERS AT SCHOOL	
62.	Teachers at School: interesting/dull	-.879
63.	Teachers at School: bad/good	.838
65.	Teachers at School: useless/useful	.619
66.	Teachers at School: confusing/clear	.492
	FACTOR 2 - ENGLISH	
42.	English: interesting/dull	-.685
43.	English: bad/good	.590
44.	English: easy/difficult	-.726
46.	English: confusing/clear	.712
	FACTOR 3 - MATH	
47.	Math: interesting/dull	-.816
48.	Math: bad/good	.766
49.	Math: easy/difficult	-.645
51.	Math: confusing/clear	.692
	FACTOR 4 - USELESS/USEFUL	
40.	School: useless/useful	.831
45.	English: useless/useful	.485
50.	Math: useless/useful	.741
65.	Teachers at School: useless/useful	.460
	FACTOR 5 - SOCIAL STUDIES	
52.	Social Studies: interesting/dull	-.596
53.	Social Studies: bad/good	.429
54.	Social Studies: easy/difficult	-.801
56.	Social Studies: confusing/clear	.815

(1979) when they factor analyzed Part B. Power and Cotterell's analysis yielded a single factor for each rating concept, with the exception of English. English was divided among two factors, with the interesting, good, and useful dimensions loading separately from the easy and clear dimensions.

Table 2.9 presents the factor analysis results for the posttest version of Part B. It is immediately apparent that the factor structure is much more complex for the posttest than the pretest. There are only two concepts, Teachers at School and English, where four or five of the adjective pairs load altogether on one factor (Factors 1 and 9, respectively.) There are two other concepts, Social Studies and Math, where the adjective dimensions split and load on separate factors. As indicated by the highest-loading items for Factors 2, 3, 4, and 5, the easy/difficult and confusing/clear dimensions load separately for both Social Studies and Math, whereas the interesting/dull, bad/good, and useless/useful dimensions load separately on two other factors. The separation of the easy and clear dimensions from the remaining dimensions parallels Power and Cotterell's results for the English concept.

There was no School factor for the pretest results, but Table 2.9 shows a posttest factor with three high-loading School dimensions -- Factor 7 with the interesting, good, and clear dimensions. Note that this is not the same combination of three dimensions found for the Math and Social Studies concept.

The remaining factors in Table 2.9 represent particular adjective dimensions. Factor 6 has high loadings for the useless/useful dimensions from the School, English, and Math concepts. Thus, this factor is comparable to Factor 4 in the pretest analysis. The remaining factor, Factor 8, has high loadings for the easy/difficult dimensions from the School, English, and Teachers at School concepts.

In sum, the pretest and posttest factor analyses of Part B of the SOS indicated factor structures that represented both single-rating concepts (e.g., English, Math) and single-rating dimensions (e.g., useless/useful). The main difference between the pretest and posttest results was in the degree of differentiation represented by the factors. In the pretest, for example, the concepts of Social Studies and Math were each represented by a single factor. In the posttest, each of the two concepts was represented by two factors consisting of different combinations of adjective dimensions. The greater number of factors at posttest than at pretest may indicate that students were better able to discriminate between different characteristics of a situation. This increased discrimination may be attributable largely to developmental factors. Or, it is possible that the differences in pretest and posttest factor structures reflects actual differences in the sixth-grade and seventh-grade experiences. For instance, it may be that the positive (or negative) qualities of the rating dimensions correlated highly with one another in sixth grade (e.g., subjects that were interesting also were perceived to be useful, clear, etc.). In seventh

Table 2.9

Highest-Loading Items on the Nine Factors from the Analysis of the Posttest Student Opinion Survey, Part B

Item #	Item	Factor Loading
	FACTOR 1 - TEACHERS AT SCHOOL	
62.	Teachers at School: interesting/dull	-.725
63.	Teachers at School: bad/good	.742
64.	Teachers at School: easy/difficult	-.460
65.	Teachers at School: useless/useful	.732
66.	Teachers at School: confusing/clear	.741
	FACTOR 2 - SOCIAL STUDIES EASY-CLEAR	
54.	Social Studies: easy/difficult	-.824
56.	Social Studies: confusing/clear	.856
	FACTOR 3 - SOCIAL STUDIES INTERESTING-GOOD-USEFUL	
52.	Social Studies: interesting/dull	-.883
53.	Social Studies: bad/good	.849
55.	Social Studies: useless/useful	.729
	FACTOR 4 - MATH INTERESTING-GOOD-USEFUL	
47.	Math: interesting/dull	-.857
48.	Math: bad/good	.866
50.	Math: useless/useful	.696
	FACTOR 5 - MATH EASY-CLEAR	
49.	Math: easy/difficult	-.866
51.	Math: confusing/clear	.865
	FACTOR 6 - USELESS/USEFUL	
40.	School: useless/useful	.778
45.	English: useless/useful	.722
50.	Math: useless/useful	.430
	FACTOR 7 - SCHOOL	
37.	School: interesting/dull	-.630
38.	School: bad/good	.802
41.	School: confusing/clear	.496
	FACTOR 8 - EASY/DIFFICULT	
39.	School: easy/difficult	.620
44.	English: easy/difficult	.578
64.	Teachers at School: easy/difficult	.682
	FACTOR 9 - ENGLISH	
42.	English: interesting/dull	.764
43.	English: bad/good	.716
44.	English: easy/difficult	.609
46.	English: confusing/clear	.744

grade, on the other hand, exposure to more teachers and subject matters may have led many students to feel that, for instance, a subject could be interesting and useful but, at the same time, be taught in a difficult and confusing way. Table 2.10 summarizes the list of factors from the pretest and posttest analyses of Part B.

Table 2.10

Factors Derived in the Analyses of the Student Opinion Survey, Part B

	PRETEST	POSTTEST
COMPARABLE FACTORS	Teachers at School Factor (1)[a] English Factor (2) Useless/Useful Factor (4)	Teachers at School Factor (1) English Factor (9) Useless/Useful Factor (6)
UNIQUE FACTORS	Math Factor (3) Social Studies Factor (5)	Math Interesting-Good-Useful Factor (4) Math Easy-Clear Factor (5) Social Studies Interesting-Good-Useful Factor (3) Social Studies Easy-Clear Factor (2) School Factor (7) Easy/Difficult Factor (8)

a Numbers in parentheses indicate the ordinal position of the factor in the analysis.

Factor Score Comparisons. The preceding results indicate that there was an interpretable factor structure for both Part A and Part B of the Student Opinion Survey (SOS). These factor structures changed slightly from pretest to posttest, with some overlap among

factors. The next step in the analysis was to consider the different factors on an individual basis, examining whether differences among students in sex, participation style, and sixth-grade classroom organization accounted for factor variance. To carry out this analysis, a factor score for each student on each factor was created based on the factor-score coefficient matrices outputted with each factor analysis. For each factor, each student's score on that factor was computed by multiplying the student's score on each item by the factor weight associated with each item. Thus, each student had one score for each of the 15 Part A factors (7 pretest and 8 posttest) and 14 Part B factors (5 pretest and 9 posttest). The scores for each factor were then analyzed using three independent one-way analyses of variance: one each for the variables of sex, participation style, and previous classroom organization.

Tables 2.11 through 2.43 present the results of the one-way analyses of variance on the different factor scores. The results for the Part A factors are presented first, followed by the results for the Part B factors. Furthermore, factors that were derived both in the pretest and posttest analyses are discussed before factors that were derived only once, in the pretest or posttest analyses.

The results for the Confidence about Academic Performance Factor, from Part A of the SOS, are presented in Table 2.11. The table indicates significant differences for both the sex and participation style variables at pretest and posttest. Means for the sex variable show that males scored higher at pretest and posttest ($\underline{M}$ = .201, $\underline{SD}$ = 1.053 and $\underline{M}$ = .150, $\underline{SD}$ = 1.037, respectively) than females ($\underline{M}$ = -.235, $\underline{SD}$ = .886 and $\underline{M}$ = -.175, $\underline{SD}$ = .932 at pretest and posttest, respectively). This suggests that males expressed more confidence about their academic performance than females.

In order to interpret the meaning of a significant difference among the six participation groups on the Confidence about Academic Performance Factor, a Duncan's multiple range test with Kramer's adjustment for unequal group sizes was performed on the group means. Table 2.12 lists the means for the participation style groups in descending order. Brackets to the side of each list enclose subsets of means that are not significantly different from one another (an alpha level of .10 was used). For example, the brackets to the left of the pretest means indicate that the means for the social, alienate, and success groups are not significantly different from one another but are significantly different from the phantom, dependent, and isolate groups. At the same time, the means for the alienate, success, and phantom groups are not significantly different from one another but are significantly different from the social, dependent, and isolate groups. Finally, the means for the phantom, dependent, and isolate groups are not significantly different from one another but are different from the means for the remaining three groups.

The ordering of the means in Table 2.12 is fairly stable from sixth grade to seventh grade and makes sense. As expected, the success and social students expressed more confidence about their

Table 2.11

Results of Group Comparisons on Confidence about Academic Performance Factor

	Pretest		Posttest	
	F	p	F	p
Sex	7.04**	.01	3.82*	.05
Participation Style	3.53**	.01	3.19*	.01
Classroom Organization	1.86	.17	.85	.36

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

Table 2.12

Differences Among Participation Style Groups on the Confidence about Academic Performance Factor Scores

Pretest		Posttest	
Social	(.512; 1.056)[a]	Social	(.380; 1.055)
Alienate	(.301; 1.263)	Success	(.301; 1.045)
Success	(.190; .980)	Alienate	(-.135; 1.029)
Phantom	(-.310; .927)	Dependent	(-.224; 1.020)
Dependent	(-.361; .805)	Isolate	(-.424; .344)
Isolate	(-.557; .521)	Phantom	(-.432; .608)

[a] The mean and standard deviation for each group appear in parentheses.

academic performance than most other students. In contrast, it is surprising that the alienate students are among the groups expressing more confidence, because they generally are poor achievers. Perhaps this is a defensive response on their part. The students expressing the lowest relative levels of confidence about academic performance were in the phantom, dependent, and isolate groups. Dependent students may have relatively low levels of confidence because they know they have to rely on seeking assistance from others. Isolate students may have relatively low levels of confidence because they have withdrawn from school, thus making academic success very unlikely. Finally, despite moderate academic success, phantom students may be less confident than many other students simply because they choose not to work with others (or are unable to do so).

Table 2.13 presents the results of the group comparisons on the Friendship Factor. The results are not noteworthy except for a weak sex effect at posttest. The means for this result indicate that females had higher (i.e., more positive) responses on this factor than males ($\underline{M}$ = .148, $\underline{SD}$ = 1.008 and $\underline{M}$ = -.127, $\underline{SD}$ = .982, for females and males, respectively). Because this difference did not occur at pretest, it appears that some aspects of the junior high environment led females to feel relatively more certain of their friendship status or, conversely, led males to feel relatively less certain of their friendship status.

Table 2.13

Results of Group Comparisons on Friendship Factor (Part A)

	Pretest		Posttest	
	$\underline{F}$	$\underline{p}$	$\underline{F}$	$\underline{p}$
Sex	.05	.82	2.72†	.10
Participation Style	1.42	.22	1.50	.19
Classroom Organization	.04	.84	.05	.83

† $\underline{p} \leq .10$

The results for the Poor Progress with Schoolwork Factor are presented in Table 2.14. There is a highly significant sex effect on this factor at posttest and a highly significant participation style effect on both the pretest and posttest versions of this factor. Regarding the sex effect, means show that females had a perception of greater progress with their schoolwork than males. While this difference was not quite significant at pretest, the means are in the same direction. The tendency of females to view their academic progress more optimistically than males may be due to any number of internal psychological or environmental factors. In any case, this sex difference apparently becomes more pronounced after a year in junior high school.

Table 2.14

Results of Group Comparisons on Poor Progress with Schoolwork Factor (Part A)

	Pretest		Posttest	
	F	p	F	p
Sex	2.62	.11	9.48**	.00
Participation Style	7.16**	.00	3.65**	.00
Classroom Organization	.48	.49	.02	.90

** $p \leq .01$

In order to interpret the participation style effects for the Poor Progress with Schoolwork Factor, it is necessary to examine the ordering and grouping of means, shown in Table 2.15. The ordering of the means is the same at pretest and posttest except for a reversal between the phantom and dependent groups. In terms of the actual academic success that is likely to be experienced by the participation style groups (given how the groups were defined), the ordering of the means is what one would expect were students' self-perceptions objective. The success and social students, those defined as having the greatest level of achievement, responded to items defining this factor by indicating more progress with schoolwork relative to other students. Conversely, students in the alienate and isolate groups, those defined as having the lowest level of achievement, indicated a lower level of progress with schoolwork relative to other students.

Table 2.15

Differences Among Participation Style Groups on the Poor Progress with Schoolwork Factor Scores

Pretest		Posttest	
Alienate	(1.220; .896)[a]	Alienate	(.823; .993)
Isolate	(.401; 2.317)	Isolate	(.561; 1.380)
Phantom	(.379; 1.045)	Dependent	(.197; 1.099)
Dependent	(-.014; .970)	Phantom	(.118; 1.901)
Social	(-.067; .960)	Social	(-.085; .932)
Success	(-.463; .587)	Success	(-.388; .711)

[a] The mean and standard deviation for each group appear in parentheses.

Table 2.16 presents the group comparison results for the General Dislike of School Factor. There are significant effects for sex at pretest and posttest and a significant effect for participation style at pretest only. The direction of the sex effect is the same at pretest and posttest: males had significantly lower scores on this factor than females, thus indicating that males reported less liking for school than females.

The means associated with the significant participation style effect for the General Dislike of School Factor are shown in Table 2.17. The table indicates that by the end of sixth grade, alienate and isolate students expressed a greater dislike for school than other students. This is not surprising since it is likely that these students received the fewest social and academic rewards in school. The remaining means suggest that dependent, success, social, and phantom students had a greater liking of school. While it is unexpected that the phantom group has the mean indicating the highest average liking of school, it may be that this group also had less demanding expectations upon which they based their attitudes. By the end of seventh grade, participation style was not related to students' reported liking of school, suggesting that the environment of Waverley fostered a fairly uniform affective response across these groups.

Table 2.16

Results of Group Comparisons on
General Dislike of School Factor (Part A)

	Pretest		Posttest	
	F	p	F	p
Sex	3.35†	.07	10.34**	.00
Participation Style	4.42**	.00	.29	.92
Classroom Organization	.03	.85	.00	.98

† $p \leq .10$

** $p \leq .01$

Table 2.17

Differences Among Participation Style Groups
on the General Dislike of School Factor Scores

Pretest

Alienate	(1.156; 1.895)[a]
Isolate	(.470; .884)
Dependent	(.115; .996)
Success	(-.032; .810)
Social	(-.256; .879)
Phantom	(-.375; .588)

[a] The mean and standard deviation for each group appear in parentheses.

Tables 2.18 through 2.22 present results for the scores of three factors that were found in the pretest analysis only: The Lack of Self-Direction Factor, Belongingness in School Factor, and Positive Attribution Factor. Table 2.18 indicates that none of the group comparisons were significant for the Lack of Self-Direction Factor. In contrast, Tables 2.19 and 2.21 show significant sex and participation style effects for both the Belongingness in School Factor and the Positive Attribution Factor. For the Belongingness in School Factor, means for sex indicate that females scored higher than males on this factor, i.e., females reported feeling less isolated. The means for the participation style groups on this factor, shown in Table 2.20, indicate that the greatest degree of belongingness was reported by the phantom, success, and dependent groups as compared with the social, alienate, and isolate groups. For the Positive Attribution Factor, means for the sex effect show that females had higher scores on this factor than males. In other words, females on average made more positive attributions about school than males. The ordering of the means for the participation style groups, shown in Table 2.22, indicates that social, phantom, and success students made more positive attributions than alienate, dependent, and isolate students. This ordering is not unexpected given that the former groups of students are defined as those who are capable of doing their academic work on their own more successfully.

Table 2.18

Results of Group Comparisons on
Lack of Self-Direction Factor (Part A)

	Pretest	
	F	p
Sex	1.55	.22
Participation Style	1.58	.17
Classroom Organization	.03	.86

Table 2.19

Results of Group Comparisons on
Belongingness in School Factor (Part A)

	Pretest	
	F	p
Sex	3.45†	.07
Participation Style	2.37*	.04
Classroom Organization	.06	.81

† $p \leq .10$

* $p \leq .05$

Table 2.20

Differences Among Participation Style Groups
on the Belongingness in School Factor Scores

	Pretest
Phantom	(.253; .896)[a]
Success	(.179; .891)
Dependent	(-.038; 1.072)
Social	(-.299; 1.054)
Alienate	(-.390; 1.006)
Isolate	(-1.243; 1.189)

[a] The mean and standard deviation for each group appear in parentheses.

Table 2.21

Results of Group Comparisons on
Positive Attribution Factor (Part A)

	Pretest	
	F	p
Sex	4.70*	.03
Participation Style	3.74**	.00
Classroom Organization	.12	.73

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

Table 2.22

Differences Among Participation Style Groups
on Positive Attribution Factor Scores

	Pretest
Social	(.268; .883)[a]
Phantom	(.171; .698)
Success	(.113; .686)
Alienate	(.051; .972)
Dependent	(-.294; 1.262)
Isolate	(-1.922; 2.485)

[a] The mean and standard deviation for each group appear in parentheses.

Tables 2.23 through 2.27 present results for scores of four factors that were found in the posttest analysis only: The Sense of Purpose Factor, Positive Teacher Factor, Lack of Control over Work Factor, and Positive School Factor. The tables show that the Lack of Control over Work Factor is alone in having a significant result, with the other three factors having no group comparisons that reach significance. Table 2.25 indicates that the significant group comparison for the Lack of Control over Work Factor involves the participation style factor. Table 2.26 shows the means for the different participation style groups. The ordering of the means from highest average score to lowest average score is: social, dependent, success, phantom, alienate, and isolate. The results of the Duncan's multiple range test, illustrated by the bracket, shows that the significance of the effect is attributable to the average mean of the social group, which is higher relative to the means for the other groups. This suggests that students in the social group felt rather strongly that they did not have the opportunity to do work of their choice or to work cooperatively with preferred peers. In short, there may have been aspects of the instructional organization at Waverley that were especially frustrating to social students.

Table 2.28 begins the presentation of the group comparison results for Part B of the Student Opinion Survey. Again, factors that were derived both in the pretest and posttest analyses are considered before factors that were derived only once, in the pretest or posttest analyses.

Table 2.28 shows the pretest and posttest results for the Teachers at School Factor. There are significant effects for the sex factor at pretest and posttest and a significant effect for the classroom organization factor at pretest. For the sex effect, pretest and posttest, group means show that females had higher average scores than males. In other words, females expressed a more favorable attitude toward their teachers than males both at the end of elementary school and after one year of junior high school. Means for the classroom organization groups indicate that students who were in cluster classroom arrangements in sixth grade had more favorable attitudes toward teachers than students who were in no-cluster classroom arrangements in the sixth grade. This difference occurred at pretest only.

Table 2.29 presents the results for the English Factor. The table shows that none of the group comparisons reached significance. In other words, variation in students' attitudes toward English could not be explained by the factors of sex, participation style, or classroom organization.

Table 2.23

Results of Group Comparisons on
Sense of Purpose Factor (Part A)

	Posttest	
	F	p
Sex	2.25	.14
Participation Style	.32	.90
Classroom Organization	.92	.34

Table 2.24

Results of Group Comparisons on
Positive Teacher Factor (Part A)

	Posttest	
	F	p
Sex	.08	.77
Participation Style	1.52	.19
Classroom Organization	.02	.88

Table 2.25

Results of Group Comparisons on
Lack of Control over Work Factor (Part A)

	Posttest	
	F	p
Sex	.12	.73
Participation Style	2.20†	.06
Classroom Organization	.11	.74

† $p \leq .10$

Table 2.26

Differences Among Participation Style Groups
on Lack of Control over Work Factor Scores

	Posttest
Social	(.592; 1.037)[a]
Dependent	(-.029; 1.089)
Success	(-.081; .826)
Phantom	(-.113; .996)
Alienate	(-.204; .942)
Isolate	(-.840; 1.499)

[a] The mean and standard deviation for each group appear in parentheses.

Table 2.27

Results of Group Comparisons on
Positive School Factor (Part A)

	Posttest	
	F	p
Sex	.13	.72
Participation Style	.93	.46
Classroom Organization	1.37	.24

Table 2.28

Results of Group Comparisons on
Teachers at School Factor (Part B)

	Pretest		Posttest	
	F	p	F	p
Sex	4.91*	.03	8.34**	.00
Participation Style	1.77	.12	1.22	.30
Classroom Organization	3.03†	.08	1.30	.26

† $p \leq .10$

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

Table 2.29

Results of Group Comparisons
on English Factor (Part B)

	Pretest		Posttest	
	F	p	F	p
Sex	1.08	.30	1.68	.20
Participation Style	1.22	.30	.89	.49
Classroom Organization	.01	.93	.48	.49

The results for the Useless/Useful Factor are presented next in Table 2.30. Significant effects for the participation style factor are shown both at pretest and posttest. The means for the participation style groups appear in Table 2.31. The pretest means indicate that the dependent, social, and success students viewed various aspects of school as more useful than the phantom, isolate, and alienate students. The ordering of the means, thus, appears associated with the defined levels of student academic success for the different groups. The ordering of the means at posttest approximates the pretest ordering with the exception of the mean for the isolate group. While isolates were among the groups viewing school as least useful on the pretest, they were the group viewing school as most useful at posttest. This change should not be given great weight because the number of cases for the isolates is very small, and also because the mean for the isolate group alone is not the source of the significant effect.

Tables 2.32 through 2.35 present results of the group comparisons for factors that were derived in the pretest analysis only. Table 2.32 shows significant sex and participation style effects for the Math Factor. Means for the sex groups show that males had a more favorable attitude toward math than females. This direction of difference is what one would predict. Table 2.33 shows the different means associated with the participation style effect. The ordering of the means is the same as that for the posttest Useless/Useful factor. Again, the position of the isolate group, as the group with the highest mean, is difficult to explain and should be viewed with caution. It is the alienate group that is exceptionally low, relative to all other groups, and is the source of the participation style effect. In other words, alienate students expressed the least favorable attitude toward math.

Significant effects for all three independent variables are shown in Table 2.34 for the Social Studies Factor. For the sex effect, means show that females had a more favorable attitude toward social studies than males. The means associated with the participation style effect are in Table 2.35. The ordering of the means does not lend itself to an obvious interpretation, with a mixing of the more and less academically and socially oriented students. Furthermore, although the overall F-test showed up as significant, the Duncan's multiple range test did not identify a group (or groups) that was significantly different from other groups. Turning to the effect for classroom organization, means indicate that students in no-cluster classrooms had more favorable feelings about social studies than students in cluster classrooms.

Tables 2.36 through 2.43 present results of group comparisons for the six factors that were derived in the posttest analysis only. Tables 2.36 and 2.37 show results for the two math factors. Table 2.36 indicates that for the Math Interesting-Good-Useful Factor, there is a significant sex effect. Means show that males found math to be more interesting, good, and useful than females. Table 2.37 indicates that for the Math Easy-Clear Factor, the participation style effect reaches significance. The participation style means, presented in Table 2.38, show that the social, dependent, and success

Table 2.30

Results of Group Comparisons
on Useless/Useful Factor (Part B)

	Pretest		Posttest	
	F	p	F	p
Sex	.81	.37	.84	.36
Participation Style	3.92**	.00	3.14**	.01
Classroom Organization	.03	.87	.13	.72

** $p \leq .01$

Table 2.31

Differences Among Participation Style Groups
on the Useless/Useful Factor Scores

Pretest		Posttest	
Dependent	(.306; .618)[a]	Isolate	(.874; .462)
Social	(.156; .803)	Success	(.250; .779)
Success	(.071; .746)	Dependent	(.016; 1.151)
Phantom	(-.161; 1.003)	Social	(-.035; .930)
Isolate	(-.772; 2.272)	Phantom	(-.186; 1.077)
Alienate	(-1.062; 2.006)	Alienate	(-.916; .854)

[a] The mean and standard deviation for each group appear in parentheses.

Table 2.32

Results of Group Comparisons on Math Factor (Part B)

	Pretest	
	F	p
Sex	5.62*	.02
Participation Style	3.99**	.00
Classroom Organization	.12	.72

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

Table 2.33

Differences Among Participation Style Groups on Math Factor Scores

	Pretest
Isolate	(.640; .381)[a]
Social	(.262; .625)
Success	(.151; .812)
Dependent	(.118; 1.178)
Phantom	(-.294; .977)
Alienate	(-1.071; 1.228)

[a] The mean and standard deviation for each group appear in parentheses.

Table 2.34.

Results of Group Comparisons
on Social Studies Factor (Part B)

	Pretest	
	F	p
Sex	4.86*	.03
Participation Style	2.27*	.05
Classroom Organization	3.95*	.05

* $p \leq .05$

Table 2.35

Differences Among Participation Style
Groups on Social Studies Factor Scores

	Pretest
Isolate	(.351; 1.605)[a]
Success	(.314; 1.019)
Alienate	(.067; .764)
Social	(.036; 1.057)
Phantom	(-.132; .822)
Dependent	(-.390; .986)

a The mean and standard deviation for each group appear in parentheses.

Table 2.36

Results of Group Comparisons on
Math Interesting-Good-Useful Factor (Part B)

	Posttest	
	F	p
Sex	3.90*	.05
Participation Style	.34	.89
Classroom Organization	.58	.45

* $p \leq .05$

Table 2.37

Results of Group Comparisons
on Math Easy-Clear Factor (Part B)

	Posttest	
	F	p
Sex	.51	.48
Participation Style	2.09†	.07
Classroom Organization	.21	.65

† $p \leq .10$

Table 2.38

Differences Among Participation Style
Groups on Math Easy-Clear Factor Scores

	Posttest
Social	(.421; .836)[a]
Dependent	(.191; 1.044)
Success	(-.072; .937)
Phantom	(-.208; .900)
Alienate	(-.405; 1.246)
Isolate	(-.818; 1.658)

[a] The mean and standard deviation for each group appear in parentheses.

students have higher average means on this factor than the phantom, alienate, and isolate students. In particular, it is the social and dependent students who found math to be more easy and clear than the other students. While a reason for this difference is not immediately apparent, it may be that in order to understand most of the math instruction at Waverley (e.g., the instruction of Teacher AD), communication among students was required. Social and dependent students were defined as students who interacted frequently with peers.

Table 2.39 presents the results for the group comparisons in the Social Studies Interesting-Good-Useful Factor. The table shows that none of the F-tests reached a level of significance.

Table 2.40 presents the results for the other social studies factor, the Social Studies Easy-Clear Factor. Both the participation style and classroom organization effects are significant. The means for the participation style groups, given in Table 2.41, show that the success, social, and alienate students felt that social studies was easier and clearer than the phantom, dependent, and isolate students. The position of the alienate students among the higher groups is puzzling as is the position of the dependent students below the alienate and phantom groups. The means for the classroom organization effect indicate that students who came from no-cluster classrooms in the sixth grade felt social studies was easier than students who came from cluster classrooms in the sixth grade. While it is difficult to imagine how this feature of sixth-grade classroom organization had an impact on students' ability to understand social studies in the seventh grade, it is possible that no-cluster students were exposed to more social studies content in the sixth grade and, thus, were more prepared. Some of the uncertainty in interpreting the results for the one pretest and two posttest factors for social studies may rest with the fact that all students did not think of the same subject matter when responding to the "social studies" heading.

Table 2.42 presents the results for the School Factor that was derived in the posttest analysis. The table shows a significant effect for the sex factor. Means for this effect indicate that females on average had a more favorable attitude toward school than males at the end of seventh grade.

Table 2.43 presents the results for the final factor, the Easy/Difficult Factor. None of the group comparisons for this factor reached significance, suggesting that variation in students' attitudes about the difficulty of school and teachers was not systematically linked to student sex, participation style, or previous classroom organization.

Before summarizing the results for the Student Opinion Survey, it is worth noting that the number of significant effects from the group comparisons far exceeded that which could be expected by chance. Of the 87 independent F-tests that were conducted, 31 (or 36%) reached at least the .10 level of significance. The distribution of significant effects also is of interest. Twenty-eight of the 31 significant

Table 2.39

Results of Group Comparisons on
Social Studies Interesting-Good-Useful Factor (Part B)

	Posttest	
	F	p
Sex	.79	.37
Participation Style	1.25	.29
Classroom Organization	.40	.53

Table 2.40

Results of Group Comparisons on
Social Studies Easy-Clear Factor (Part B)

	Posttest	
	F	p
Sex	.70	.40
Participation Style	3.76**	.00
Classroom Organization	3.93*	.05

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

Table 2.41

Differences Among Participation Style Groups
on Social Studies Easy-Clear Factor Scores

	Posttest
Success	(.332; .893)[a]
Social	(.235; .746)
Alienate	(.135; .857)
Phantom	(-.128; .772)
Dependent	(-.434; 1.162)
Isolate	(-1.089; 2.128)

[a] The mean and standard deviation for each group appear in parentheses.

Table 2.42

Results of Group Comparisons
on School Factor (Part B)

	Posttest	
	F	p
Sex	7.06**	.01
Participation Style	1.83	.11
Classroom Organization	.00	.97

** $p \leq .01$

Table 2.43

Results of Group Comparisons
on Easy/Difficult Factor (Part B)

	Posttest	
	F	p
Sex	1.74	.19
Participation Style	1.10	.36
Classroom Organization	.63	.43

effects were evenly split between the sex and participation style variables. Thus, only three effects were for the classroom organization variable. In short, in terms of explaining variation in students' attitudes toward their sixth-grade and seventh-grade school experiences, students' sex and participation style seemed to be important variables. On the other hand, whether students had been in cluster or no-cluster sixth-grade classrooms seemed to have relatively little impact in shaping students' attitudes toward school.

Summary and Suggestions for Future Research

The descriptive statistics for the Student Opinion Survey suggest that, on average, students had less positive attitudes about school at the end of seventh grade than they had at the end of sixth grade. This trend characterized Part A of the questionnaire, where students indicated their level of agreement with statements about school. This decline in general attitude toward school by the end of the first year in junior high also was found in two other studies that used the SOS instrument (Evans & Richards, 1980; Power & Cotterell, 1979). In this study, the declining trend also occurred for students' ratings of school and teachers, which took place in Part B of the questionnaire. In contrast, Power and Cotterell (1979) did not find notable changes on the ratings of school and teachers.

One exception to the trend of declining attitudes among the present sample took place for items about students' own academic performance, where students tended to indicate a more positive attitude about their academic performance at the end of seventh grade than at the end of sixth grade. Most of these items came from what Power and Cotterell (1979) called the Confidence subscale. These investigators also report that responses to these items were more positive in secondary school than in elementary school. Power and Cotterell (1979) also report that attitudes became more positive for those items in a subscale they labeled Work Satisfaction (see Table 2.1). This finding was not replicated here.

Students also rated school and specific subject matters closer to the easy end of the easy/difficult dimension in seventh grade than at the end of sixth grade. Furthermore, students' ratings of the anticipated difficulty level of junior high school, completed in sixth grade, were greater than their ratings of the actual difficulty of junior high school, completed at the end of seventh grade. When these results are viewed in connection with the knowledge of the relatively lower-order curricula that were available at Waverley (see Volume II), it seems reasonable to assume that students' ostensibly more positive attitudes about their own work performance actually stemmed from a less stimulating academic environment, both relative to their past educational experience and relative to the academic environment they expected.

Factor analysis of the SOS proved to be a fruitful approach to identifying commonalities among SOS items and relationships with the independent variables of student sex, participation style, and previous classroom organization. Interpretable factor structures were found for Parts A and B of the SOS, both for the pretest and posttest versions. These factor structures were more complex than those identified by Power and Cotterell (1979) and Evans and Richards (1980). It is possible that cultural differences in students and schools are partly responsible for the different results. Both of the comparison studies were conducted in Austrailia.

Where group comparisons were done of the individual sets of factor scores, using student sex, participation style, and previous classroom organization as independent variables, a large number of significant differences were found. While it is not possible to summarize all these findings adequately, several general features of the data were noted. For one, both the sex and participation style variables appeared to have more explanatory power than the variable of previous classroom organization. The relative importance of these variables in explaining student attitudes toward school is partially supported by other literature. Both Power and Cotterell (1979) and Evans and Richards (1980) found that the student characteristic of sex explained significant amounts of variance for parts of the SOS. And while neither of these studies included a variable similar to participation style, they did examine the impact of student ability or student achievement as rated by the teachers. Power and Cotterell found that student ability accounted for a large portion of the variance in the elementary and secondary responses for Part A and the secondary responses for Part B. Evans and Richards (1980) found no strong relationship between achievement scores and attitude scores in their sample, but they did find that a trichotomous variable that was a composite of teachers' ratings for student achievement and behavior was associated with students' attitudes as expressed in Part A (Evans and Richards did not administer Part B of the SOS). In short, it seems reasonable that variables which reflect students' performance and class behavior (as the participation style variable did) usually help predict students' attitudes toward school. There is less consensus in the literature about the third variable, previous classroom organization. McPartland, Epstein, and McDill (1972) found that characteristics of the elementary school (an open vs. a traditional arrangement) did not impact student attitudes toward school either in elementary school or junior high school. Evans and Richards (1980) found that the primary school attended was related to student attitudes early in the first year of secondary school, but not later in that school year. In contrast, Power and Cotterell (1979) report that the structure of the elementary and secondary schools (open vs. self-contained) had an impact on attitudes and that particular characteristics of the classroom environment (e.g., level of involvement) also played a small role in accounting for attitude variance.

The direction of difference for the many significant sex group comparisons is another feature of the data that is worth considering. In general, it appears that when sex differences occurred, females responded in a more positive manner than males, For example, females

indicated that they felt more certain of their friends, a greater sense of belongingness in school, and a greater liking for school. There were only two exceptions to this trend. First, while females indicated greater progress with their schoolwork than males, males expressed more confidence about their academic performance than females. Second, on factors representing ratings of math, males gave math more favorable ratings than females. The sex differences noted by Power and Cotterell (1979) in their analysis of the SOS are fairly similar:

> Male students were more satisfied with science [not measured here] and more confident (less anxious) than female students throughout the transition period, while female students displayed higher levels of general satisfaction, work satisfaction, and more positive attitudes toward school, English, Social Studies, and their teachers (both primary and secondary) (p. 136).

Put briefly, it appears that females had more positive attitudes about more aspects of school than males. Because this trend was found both at the end of sixth grade and the end of seventh grade, it is not possible to claim that females made a better adjustment to junior high school than males. Instead, it appears that females are generally more satisfied in the context of schooling institutions than males.

It is worth considering how these general and sex-related trends in attitude change accord with the transition study conducted by Blyth, Simmons, and Bush (1978). Blyth, et al, examined changes in student self-esteem and reported a decline in self-esteem from elementary to junior high school that was slight for males and substantial for females. The notion of a general decline in self-esteem following transition is similar to the general decline in attitudes reported here, but it seems unlikely that the measure of self-esteem and attitudes toward school are completely comparable. It seems more plausible that the SOS items that loaded on the Confidence factor are similar to the content of the self-esteem instrument, in which case Blyth et al's report of the substantial decline in self-esteem for females provides support for the finding in this study of the lower level of female attitudes in this one realm of academic confidence.

The participation style effects found in this study also suggest a common trend. Not surprisingly, those groups of students who were defined as being more academically and socially oriented tended to express more positive attitudes about school on the different factors than the groups of students who were defined as being more withdrawn or disruptive. Thus, sixth-grade teachers' identification of students according to the participation style categorizations was associated not only with students' attitudes in sixth grade, but also their attitudes after one year of junior high school.

CHAPTER THREE

STUDENTS' CONCERNS ABOUT THE TRANSITION TO JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

At the beginning of the school year, the school district had seventh-graders at Waverley Junior High School fill out a questionnaire that asked them to indicate the importance of 32 possible concerns associated with the transition from sixth to seventh grades. Students were asked to indicate both how important these concerns were at the time they first entered junior high school and how important these concerns were presently, now that they had been initiated into the junior high school environment.

Students' responses to the Concerns Questionnaire were made available to the transition study staff. Analyses of the responses were done in four parts. The first part of the analyses examined which particular concerns were of most importance to students and whether these concerns changed as a function of having actual experience in junior high school. The second part analyzed students' total scores on the two different portions of the Concerns Questionnaire. Of interest were the questions of whether the concerns scores differed as a function of student sex, participation style, and previous classroom organization, and whether the total amount of expressed concerns changed significantly from the "in the past" to "today" portions of the questionnaire. The third part of the analyses was conducted to determine the factor structure of the questionnaire. Because the concerns items were generated from an empirical rather than conceptual source, it was of interest to examine how the concerns items clustered together and what general concerns these clusters represented. Given that the concerns items could be represented in terms of several general factors, it also was of interest to ask whether there were differences among students on the factors as a function of the students' sex, participation style, and previous classroom organization. The fourth part of the analysis summarized students' answers to three open-ended questions on the Concerns Questionnaire about the transition from elementary school to junior high school.

This chapter first describes the method of collecting the student concerns data. The results of the data analyses follow. The chapter concludes with a summary of the results.

Method

This section presents a description of the sample of Waverley Junior High School students whose responses to the Concerns Questionnaire were analyzed. The Concerns Questionnaire instrument and the procedures for its administration are described next.

Sample

The sample consisted of 208 seventh-grade students who attended Waverley Junior High School. While 331 Waverley seventh-graders completed the Concerns Questionnaire, only 208 of these students (or 63%) had complete data. The criteria for complete data were that each student have a response for every item on the questionnaire and have information on additional variables of interest including student sex, student participation style as rated by sixth-grade teacher, and sixth-grade classroom organization (cluster vs. no-cluster arrangement). Most of the missing data (86 out of the 123 cases, or 70%) resulted from the fact that there were students at Waverley who completed the Concerns Questionnaire but who were not from the identified elementary schools that fed into Waverley. In short, most of the missing data consisted of students who transferred into Waverley from other school districts or from schools within the district that were not among the six designated feeder schools.

Waverley Junior High School was located in a suburban area approximately 50 miles north of San Francisco. Students attending Waverley were largely white and from families with middle-class incomes.

Of the 208 students in the sample, 107 were girls and 101 were boys. With regard to the student participation style ratings given by the sixth-grade teachers, the majority of students were rated as either success (N = 60, or 29%) or dependent (N = 57, or 27%) students. For the remaining participation style categories of social, phantom, alienate, and isolate, the respective percentages of students rated in each category were 18, 16, 7, and 3. (For more detail on the definitions and origins of the participation style ratings, see Volume I of this series.) Finally, the majority of sample students (72%) had attended sixth-grade classes where there were cluster arrangements -- i.e., where students had different teachers for different subjects or were instructed by teams of teachers. This gave students some experience with the multi-teacher organization they would encounter in junior high school. The remaining students had attended sixth-grade classes where there were single-teacher, self-contained classes.

Instrument

The Concerns Questionnaire, which was administered by the cooperating school district, presented students with 32 different concerns. These 32 concerns were derived from five different sources. The first source was the open-ended written responses of seventh- and eighth-graders to questions about what the transition from sixth to seventh grade was like. For instance, students were asked to answer the question, "Before you started seventh grade, what were three things that worried you most?" Gathering students' responses to these questions was part of a separate but related data collection effort (Good, 1980).

The second source of concerns items was written comments from sixth-graders about the problems they anticipated when they entered junior high school. These comments were obtained from an open-ended question that appeared at the end of the Student Opinion Survey. This question was answered by sixth-graders in six of the elementary schools that fed into Waverley Junior High School. (The Student Opinion Survey is further described in Chapter Two of this volume.)

A third source of information about the potential concerns affecting students in transition from elementary school to junior high school was comments from elementary school principals about the transition problems they thought sixth-graders worried about. The comments were collected in interviews with several elementary school principals in the Summer of 1980.

The fourth source of concerns items was the parents of students who were about to enter junior high school. These parents were interviewed in August 1980 about their children's and their own transition concerns (see Volume VI of this series for a more detailed report).

The final source for deriving the concerns items was sixth-grade teachers' impressions of transition worries their students had. Questions about these worries were included at the end of the Curriculum Interviews given to sixth-grade teachers in May 1980 at the six feeder schools.

Thirty-two potential concerns were identified from the above sources. These concerns are listed in Table 3.1; their numbers correspond to the numbering used in the questionnaire. The first 18 items reflect concerns suggested by the student and principal sources. The remaining 14 items reflect concerns suggested by the parent and teacher sources.

As indicated earlier, the Concerns Questionnaire asked students to respond to each concern item in two different contexts. In Part A of the questionnaire, students were asked to indicate how great each concern was when they had started junior high school. Part A is subsequently referred to as the "in the past" portion of the questionnaire. In Part B of the questionnaire, students were asked to indicate how great each concern was to them presently. Part B is subsequently referred to as the "today" portion of the questionnaire. In both Parts A and B, students responded to each concern item by marking one of three alternatives: "A Great Concern," "A Small Concern," or "No Concern at All."

The Concerns Questionnaire also contained three open-ended questions about the similarities and differences between sixth and seventh grades and what was good and bad about the first weeks of junior high school. These questions appeared on the last page of the questionnaire, referred to as Part C. A copy of the complete Concerns Questionnaire appears in Appendix B.

Table 3.1

Categories of Concerns

1. Concern that schoolwork would be difficult
2. Concern that it would be hard to meet new friends
3. Concern that you would not see old friends as much
4. Concern that junior high teachers would be harder than elementary school teachers
5. Concern that it would be hard to be the youngest student in the new school after being the oldest in elementary school
6. Concern about dating (not having a girl- or boyfriend)
7. Concern that it would be hard to talk to other students
8. Concern that it would be hard to talk to teachers
9. Concern that older students might make fun of you
10. Concern that older students might bully or beat you up
11. Concern about knowing how to act and what to do in school
12. Concern about how to use your locker and lock
13. Concern about finding the rooms of different teachers
14. Concern about going into the restroom
15. Concern about the difficulty of homework
16. Concern about undressing for gym
17. Concern about being able to understand what teachers say in class
18. Concern about being able to get work done on time
19. Concern about having too much homework to do
20. Concern that classes are too easy
21. Concern that you don't have the teachers who are best for you
22. Concern that older students expect you to do things that you don't feel are right
23. Concern about being tired from spending too much time in class
24. Concern about not having recess
25. Concern about having more opportunities to get into trouble
26. Concern about getting to class on time
27. Concern about being expected to behave like a high school student (e.g., stay out late, go on dates, etc.)
28. Concern about being bored in class
29. Concern about gym and successfully participating in athletics
30. Concern that teachers will not take a personal interest in you
31. Concern that parents and teachers are not communicating with each other
32. Concern that personal possessions will be stolen

Procedures

The Concerns Questionnaire was administered by the school district to students in all seventh-grade English classes at Waverley Junior High School during the fifth week of school, on October 2, 1980. English teachers at Waverley administered the questionnaire following the standard set of directions written in the questionnaire booklet. The teachers read the instructions, answered any questions students had, and read each item out loud to facilitate complete comprehension.

Results

The analyses of the Concerns Questionnaire focused on four different sets of questions: (1) What did students perceive to be their greatest concerns upon entering junior high school, and did these concerns change after students experienced junior high school? (2) Did students' total expressed concerns change after transition, and did these concerns differ as a function of student sex, participation style, and previous classroom organization? and (3) What was the underlying factor structure of the Concerns Questionnaire, and did students' scores on the main factors differ according to student sex, participation style, and previous classroom organization? (4) What were students' responses to open-ended questions about the transition to junior high school, and how did these responses mesh with the other Concerns Questionnaire results?

The Relative Strength of Concerns Items

Table 3.2 presents the descriptive statistics for the 32 concerns items for both the "in the past" and "today" response portions of the questionnaire. These statistics are based on the entire sample of 208 students. Means and standard deviations are presented for each item. In addition, the rankings of the means are given for each set. Because student responses were coded so that "great concern" received the lowest score, a "1," the lower the mean for the item, the greater the expressed average concern among students.

Several characteristics of the data are notable. First, the means for the "in the past" concerns indicate that relatively few items solicited a predominate self-report of "great concern." Frequencies for the response alternatives corroborate this interpretation because there is not one item on either the "in the past" or "today" response portions of the questionnaire where a majority of students indicated that the item was a great concern. On the "in the past" items, there were only six items where "great concern" received the second largest percentage of responses. On all other "in the past" items, "great concern" received the lowest percentage of responses. On the "toda " items, "great concern" received the lowest percentage of responses on all items.

Table 3.2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranks of Concerns Items "In the Past" and "Today" (N=208)

Item #	IN THE PAST M	SD	Rank	TODAY M	SD	Rank
1	1.90	.59	3*[a]	2.18	.68	3
2	2.39	.69	21	2.69	.55	25
3	2.24	.68	14*	2.59	.62	20*
4	1.96	.72	7	2.45	.63	13
5	2.61	.62	29*	2.77	.48	28
6	2.35	.75	20	2.42	.70	10
7	2.58	.61	28	2.67	.55	23
8	2.27	.71	17	2.49	.61	15*
9	2.21	.74	12	2.46	.67	14
10	2.03	.74	8	2.35	.70	8
11	2.24	.72	14*	2.55	.63	17
12	2.24	.80	14*	2.79	.50	29
13	1.94	.72	6	2.87	.41	32
14	2.71	.57	32	2.84	.43	31
15	1.93	.64	5	2.20	.65	4
16	2.45	.69	24	2.81	.44	30
17	2.17	.68	11	2.30	.67	6
18	1.90	.74	3*	2.04	.71	1
19	1.80	.74	1	2.11	.73	2
20	2.61	.63	29*	2.75	.51	27
21	2.34	.72	19	2.49	.66	15*
22	2.22	.78	13	2.43	.71	11
23	2.44	.68	23	2.57	.63	19
24	2.56	.65	26*	2.74	.53	26
25	2.40	.74	22	2.56	.66	18
26	1.88	.76	2	2.32	.72	7
27	2.49	.68	25	2.59	.66	20*
28	2.14	.72	10	2.38	.71	9
29	2.33	.77	18	2.44	.72	12
30	2.56	.66	26*	2.66	.58	22
31	2.69	.55	31	2.68	.58	24
32	2.06	.80	9	2.27	.78	5
Mean over all items	2.27			2.51		

[a]Asterisks after ranks indicate that there was a tie among rankings.

NOTE: Items were scored so that Great Concern = 1, Small Concern = 2, and No Concern = 3.

Explanations for the general absence of concerns associated with the 32 questionnaire statements are worth considering. One explanation is that there are very few things about a new school environment that most students felt great concern about. In other words, most students may carry with them the sense that they will be able to adapt to junior high fairly easily and that they will have the support base of their peers in doing so. A second explanation has to do with the response alternatives used in the questionnnaire. It may be that using a three-alternative response format (a "Great Concern," a "Small Concern," and "No Concern at All") did not provide students with an adequate range of alternatives. Students who felt moderately concerned about some items may have shied away from the "Great Concern" alternative and marked "Small Concern" instead. A third possible explanation is that some of the concerns items did not represent typical transition concerns of students. Specifically, because the concerns items were derived from a variety of sources, it may be that the items suggested by non-student sources elicited fewer concern responses from students. However, examination of Table 3.2 does not support this last explanation. Comparing the means for the first 18 items, which were based largely on student sources, with the means of the remaining items, which were all based on non-student sources, indicates that there are no appreciable differences that can be associated with differences in item sources.

A second notable feature of the data in Table 3.2 is evident from comparing the overall mean for the "in the past" and "today" items. This comparison shows that students expressed less overall concerns when reporting on how they currently felt in junior high school and greater overall concerns when reporting on how they felt at the time they entered junior high school. Consistent with this, 31 of the individual concern items had higher means on the "today" portion of the questionnaire than the "in the past" portion. Only one item, "Concern that parents and teachers are not communicating with each other," had an "in the past" mean that was virtually unchanged on the "today" portion of the questionnaire.

Table 3.3 indicates the ten highest-ranked concerns items on both the "in the past" and "today" portions of the questionnaire. This table shows what, if any, changes occurred in the relative positioning of items. It can be seen that across the two portions of the questionnaire, there was little change in the makeup of the highest-ranked concerns items, although it should be kept in mind that on the "today" portion of the questionnaire, students were generally less concerned about all items. Eight of the ten highest-ranked items on the "in the past" portion of the questionnaire were still among the ten highest-ranked items on the "today" portion. Half of these eight items reflected concerns about being able to do schoolwork, while other items reflected a mix of peer and logistical concerns. Of the two items that were ranked among the ten highest on the "in the past" portion of the questionnaire, but not on the "today" portion of the questionnaire, one did not change positions greatly on the "today" portion while the other item did. The former item, "Concern that junior high teachers would be harder than elementary school teachers," was ranked seventh on the "in the

Table 3.3

Ten Highest-Ranked Concerns Items, "In the Past" and "Today

IN THE PAST			TODAY		
Item Rank	Item #	Concern	Item Rank	Item #	Concern
1	19.	Concern about having too much homework to do	1	18.	Concern about being able to get work done on time
2	26.	Concern about getting to class on time	2	19.	Concern about having too much homework to do
3	1.	Concern that schoolwork would be difficult	3	1.	Concern that schoolwork would be difficult
3	18.	Concern about being able to get work done on time	4	15.	Concern about the difficulty of homework
5	15.	Concern about the difficulty of homework	5	32.	Concern that personal possessions will be stolen
6	13.	Concern about finding the rooms of different teachers	6	17.	Concern about being able to understand what teachers say in class
7	4.	Concern that junior high teachers would be harder than elementary school teachers	7	26.	Concern about getting to class on time
8	10.	Concern that older students might bully or beat you up	8	10.	Concern that older students might bully or beat you up
9	32.	Concern that personal possessions will be stolen	9	28.	Concern about being bored in class
10	28.	Concern about being bored in class	10	6.	Concern about dating (not having a girl- or boyfriend)

past" portion of the questionnaire and thirteenth on the "today" portion of the questionnaire. The latter item, "Concern about finding the rooms of different teachers," was ranked sixth on the "in the past" portion of the questionnaire and thirty-second, in last place, on the "today" portion of the questionnaire. This suggests that while students viewed the logistics of finding different rooms as a concern when they first entered junior high school, this concern quickly dissipated once they had some experience in the junior high environment.

Two of the ten highest-ranked items on the "today" portion of the questionnaire were not among the top ten on the "in the past" portion of the questionnaire. Again, one of these two items represents only a small change in relative rank position while the other represents a larger change. The item, "Concern about being able to understand what teachers say in class," moved up to the seventh highest-ranked position on the "today" portion of the questionnaire from the eleventh highest-ranked position on the "in the past" portion of the questionnaire. The item, "Concern about dating (not having a girl- or boyfriend)," ranked as the sixth highest concern item on the "today" portion of the questionnaire, a substantial move upward from twentieth position on the "in the past" portion of the questionnaire. This suggests that once students were initiated into the social milieu of the junior high school, displaying interest in the opposite sex took on increased importance.

Table 3.4 presents the ten lowest-ranked concerns items on both the "in the past" and "today" portions of the questionnaire. It is notable that, unlike the highest-ranked items, none of the items reflect concerns about the difficulty of work. Instead, the items of lowest overall concern have to do with peer and other social concerns. Like the highest-ranked concerns item results, the table indicates that there was little change across the two portions of the questionnaire in the makeup of the ten lowest-ranked concerns items. Seven of the ten lowest concerns items on the "in the past" portion of the questionnaire also were among the ten lowest concerns items on the "today" portion of the questionnaire. Three of the ten lowest concerns items that appeared on the "in the past" portion of the questionnaire, but not on the "today" portion of the questionnaire, did not have a substantially higher rank on the "today" portion of the questionnaire. Of the three lowest concerns items for the "today" portion of the questionnaire, that were not among the ten lowest-ranked items on the "in the past" portion of the questionnaire, two items represented a substantial change in ranking. Item 12, "Concern about how to use your locker and lock," while ranked twenty-ninth on the "today" portion of the questionnaire, had ranked in fourteenth place on the "in the past" portion of the questionnaire. And as already indicated, Item 13, "Concern about finding the rooms of different teachers," ranked thirty-second on the "today" portion of the questionnaire, a substantial drop from sixth place on the "in the past" portion of the questionnaire. Both Items 12 and 13 represent concerns about the logistics of getting around the physical plant of the junior high school, concerns that students apparently overcame in a short period of time.

Table 3.4

Ten Lowest-Ranked Concerns Items, "In the Past" and "Today"

IN THE PAST			TODAY		
Item Rank	Item #	Concern	Item Rank	Item #	Concern
23	23.	Concern about being tired from spending too much time in class	23	7.	Concern that it would be hard to talk to other students
24	16.	Concern about undressing for gym	24	31.	Concern that parents and teachers are not communicating with each other
25	27.	Concern about being expected to behave like a high school student (e.g., stay out late, go out on dates, etc.)	25	2.	Concern that it would be hard to meet new friends
26	24.	Concern about not having recess	26	24.	Concern about not having recess
26	30.	Concern that teachers will not take a personal interest in you	27	20.	Concern that classes are too easy
28	7.	Concern that it would be hard to talk to other students	28	5.	Concern that it would be hard to be the youngest student in the new school after being the oldest in the elementary school
29	5.	Concern that it would be hard to be the youngest student in the new school after being the oldest in elementary school	29	12.	Concern about how to use your locker and lock
29	20.	Concern that classes are too easy	30	16.	Concern about undressing for gym
31	31.	Concern that parents and teachers are not communicating with each other	31	14.	Concern about going into the restroom
32	14.	Concern about going into the restroom	32	13.	Concern about finding the rooms of different teachers

Table 3.5 summarizes the changes in the rank position of all concerns items from the "in the past" to "today" portions of the questionnaire. The table indicates that there were few marked changes in the relative perceived importance of concerns as a result of students' greater familiarization in junior high school. Only one fourth of the items changed rank positions by six or more places (Items 3, 4, 6, 12, 13, 16, 29, and 31). The item showing the greatest increase in rank position from "in the past" to "today" was Item 6, "Concern about dating (not having a girl- or boyfriend)." The item showing the greatest decrease in rank position from "in the past" to "today" was Item 13, "Concern about finding the rooms of different teachers."

To summarize so far, the data for the concerns items suggest that most Waverley students did not have a high level of self-reported concern about various aspects of junior high school either before or after they were familiar with Waverley. Furthermore, the overall level of concern associated with all the items decreased from the "in the past" to "today" portion of the questionnaire, suggesting that students' actual experience in junior high school helped mitigate whatever concerns they had upon entry. There also were consistencies in terms of the relative importance of the concerns across the two response portions of the questionnaire. In general, students perceived the possibility of increases in the quantity and difficulty of work to be one of the more important concern areas. This was true for both the "in the past" and "today" portions of the questionnaire. Conversely, the items of least concern represented not the academic aspects of school, but some of the social aspects of school. There were some social aspects of school that were rated to be of relatively high importance, however. For example, on both the "in the past" and "today" portions of the questionnaire, students expressed relatively high concern about being beaten up by older students and having their possessions stolen. This social concern is consistent with other reports of increased student victimization in junior high school (Blyth, et al, 1978). One social concern, that about dating, took on greatly increased importance, presumably as a result of students' initiation into a new social milieu. Finally, while students had relatively high concerns about getting around junior high school when they first entered Waverley (i.e., finding different rooms and using lockers), these students reported having relatively little concern about these same items after five weeks of experience at Waverley.

Students' Total Expressed Concerns

In order to have an overall index of students' concerns at the student level, a total concerns score was created for each student for both the "in the past" and "today" concerns items. These total concerns scores consisted of the sum of the 32 item scores on each of the respective questionnaire portions. Because item responses had been scored so that "great concern" received a score of 1 and "no concern" a score of 3, the lower a student's total concerns score, the greater was the student's overall level of expressed concern. Conversely, the higher a student's total concerns score, the lower was the student's overall level of expressed concern.

Table 3.5

Changes in Rank Position of the 32 Concerns Items from the "In the Past" to "Today" Portions of the Concerns Questionnaire

Item #	Item	Rank Change[a]
1	Concern that schoolwork would be difficult	--[b]
2	Concern that it would be hard to meet new friends	-4
3	Concern that you would not see old friends as much	-6
4	Concern that junior high teachers would be harder than elementary school teachers	-6
5	Concern that it would be hard to be the youngest student in the new school after being the oldest in elementary school	+1
6	Concern about dating (not having a girl- or boyfriend)	+10
7	Concern that it would be hard to talk to other students	+5
8	Concern that it would be hard to talk to teachers	+2
9	Concern that older students might make fun of you	-2
10	Concern that older students might bully or beat you up	--
11	Concern about knowing how to act and what to do in school	-3
12	Concern about how to use your locker and lock	-15
13	Concern about finding the rooms of different teachers	-26
14	Concern about going into the restroom	+1
15	Concern about the difficulty of homework	+1
16	Concern about undressing for gym	-6
17	Concern about being able to understand what teachers say in class	+5
18	Concern about being able to get work done on time	+2
19	Concern about having too much homework to do	-1
20	Concern that classes are too easy	+2
21	Concern that you don't have the teachers who are best for you	+4
22	Concern that older students expect you to do things that you don't feel are right	+2
23	Concern about being tired from spending too much time in class	+4
24	Concern about not having recess	--
25	Concern about having more opportunities to get into trouble	+4
26	Concern about getting to class on time	-5
27	Concern about being expected to behave like a high school student (e.g., stay out late, go on dates, etc.)	+5
28	Concern about being bored in class	+1
29	Concern about gym and successfully participating in athletics	+6
30	Concern that teachers will not take a personal interest in you	+4
31	Concern that parents and teachers are not communicating with each other	+7
32	Concern that personal possessions will be stolen	+4

[a]Before Rank minus After Rank

b"--" indicates no change in rank positions

The lowest possible total concerns score was 32 (which would mean answering "great concern" on every item), and the highest possible total concerns score was 96 (which would mean answering "no concern" on every item).

Table 3.6 presents the means, standard deviations, and score ranges for the two total concerns scores. The table shows that the mean of the total concerns "today" score was substantially higher than that of the total concerns "in the past" score, corroborating the finding in the previous section that Waverley students expressed less overall concern after having attended junior high school. The range of scores for the "in the past" and "today" total concerns scores are similar. However, frequency distributions for the two sets of total scores indicate that whereas the distribution of "in the past" total scores was skewed slightly in the direction indicating less overall concern (skewness = -.207), the "today" total scores were skewed much more heavily in this same direction (skewness = -.845). In other words, there was a much greater tendency on the "today" portion of the questionnaire for students to have scores in the highest range, thus indicating that they had few or no concerns.

Table 3.6

Means, Standard Deviations, and Score Ranges for Total Concerns Scores

Measure	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range of Scores
Total Concerns "In The Past"	208	72.63	10.27	48 - 95
Total Concerns "Today"	208	80.43	9.90	44 - 96

In order to assess whether students' total expressed concerns were influenced by the student characteristics of sex, participation style as rated by sixth-grade teacher, or previous classroom organization, a series of one-way analyses of variance were conducted. One series of analyses was conducted with the total concerns "in the past" score as the dependent measure, and another series was conducted with the total concerns "today" score as the dependent measure. There were three statistical tests in each series, one for each independent variable: student sex, student participation style as rated by sixth-grade teacher, and previous classroom organization. In addition to the two-level variable of student sex, previous classroom organization also was a two-level variable that contrasted previous experience in cluster sixth-grade classrooms with no-cluster sixth-grade classrooms. Student participation style was a six-level variable where, based upon the the ratings of sixth-grade

teachers, students were classified as having a predominant success, social, dependent, phantom, alienate, or isolate participation style.

Table 3.7 presents the means that were tested in each of the one-way analyses of variance. A comparison of the sex group means indicates that, on average, males and females had almost identical total concerns scores.

A comparison of the means across participation style groups shows that there were few differences in the degree of total expressed concerns among the success, social, dependent, phantom, and alienate groups. For the remaining group, the isolates, means indicate that these students were considerably less concerned than other students on both the "in the past" and "today" portions of the questionnaire. This is not surprising in that the isolates are defined as students who have totally withdrawn from the academic and social press of the school. (Even the alienates, defined as those students who reject school, have a level of concern comparable to their more success-oriented peers, indicating that alienates in some ways are part of the system that they ostensibly rebel against.) Unfortunately, the small number of identified isolates (N = 6) probably precluded the possibility of obtaining a significant F value in the one-way analyses of variance for participation style comparisons.

The final comparisons involve the cluster variable. The means for the cluster and no-cluster groups are very similar, and, understandably, the tests for differences are not significant. While it was anticipated that students in the cluster group might have fewer transition concerns than students in the no-cluster group, owing to their previous experience in a more organizationally varied, multi-teacher setting, this evidently was not the case. In fact, the direction of the means is not even consistent with this hypothesis.

The final analysis that was done on the total concerns scores involved determining whether or not there was a significant decrease in concerns from the "in the past" to the "today" portions of the questionnaire. A t-test for paired samples was conducted (the relevant means are presented in Table 3.6). A highly significant t-value of 19.97 ($p < .001$) resulted, indicating that students felt considerably less concerned after five weeks of experience at Waverley Junior High School than they had felt previous to that point.

In sum, the analyses presented in this section suggest that the variability in students' total concerns scores could not be explained by the variables of student sex, student participation style, or previous classroom organization in sixth grade. The one caveat to this generalization is that one of the participation style groups may have been quite different from the other participation style groups. Specifically, students classified as isolates, i.e., as withdrawn from school and peers, apparently had fewer concerns than all other participation style students. A small incidence of isolate students did not permit a full test of this hypothesis, however.

Table 3.7

Means and Standard Deviations on Total Concerns Scores for Different Comparison Groups

	SEX		PARTICIPATION STYLE						SIXTH-GRADE CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION	
	FEMALE N = 106	MALE N = 102	SUCCESS N = 60	SOCIAL N = 38	DEPENDENT N = 57	PHANTOM N = 33	ALIENATE N = 14	ISOLATE N = 6	CLUSTER N = 150	NO-CLUSTER N = 58
TOTAL CONCERNS "IN THE PAST"	M=72.39 SD=10.10 -- no difference--	M=72.87 SD=10.49	M=72.40 SD=10.31	M=71.71 SD=10.11	M=72.25 SD=10.33	M=73.36 SD=10.29	M=72.79 SD=11.83	M=79.83 SD= 6.53 no difference	M=72.12 SD=10.21 --- no difference --	M=73.93 SD=10.40
TOTAL CONCERNS "TODAY"	M=80.42 SD=10.30 -- no difference--	M=80.44 SD= 9.53	M=81.15 SD= 9.86	M=79.71 SD= 7.92	M=79.84 SD=11.11	M=80.27 SD=10.11	M=79.64 SD=11.07	M=86.17 SD= 6.11 no difference	M=80.13 SD= 9.68 --- no difference --	M=81.22 SD=10.50

Finally, a statistical test showed that students reported significantly less overall concern as a function of having accumulated experience in junior high school. This is consistent with all other descriptive data presented so far.

Factor Analysis of the Concerns Questionnaire

Identifying the Factor Structure of the Questionnaire. Because the concerns items were originally derived from empirical sources, with no explicit subscale structure in mind, it was of interest to determine if an interpretable factor structure for the Concerns Questionnaire existed. The "in the past" and "today" portions of the questionnaire were factor analyzed separately with the responses from the 208 students as input. A principal components factor analysis was conducted, followed by varimax rotation. Five interpretable factors were extracted in the "in the past" analyses, accounting for a total 42 percent of the extracted variance. Six interpretable factors were extracted in the "today" analyses, most of which overlapped with the "in the past" factors. The six factors for the "today" portion of the questionnaire accounted for a total 51 percent of the extracted variance. All of the factors selected had eigenvalues exceeding 1.00.

Table 3.8 presents a listing of the items that loaded most highly on the five factors in the "in the past" analysis. All items that had loadings of .40 or greater are included in the listing. The first factor has the largest number of high-loading items, and these items all reflect concerns about the difficulty of understanding or carrying out schoolwork. The second factor has four high-loading items, all of which suggest potentially negative interactions with peers. The third factor has only two high-loading items, both of which suggest concerns about having privacy. The fourth factor has three high-loading items, all of which can be interpreted as reflecting concern about classes at a general level as opposed to the specific schoolwork assigned in class. The fifth factor, with three high-loading items, is not as easy to interpret as the previous four factors. The two highest-loading items ("classes are too easy" and "parents and teachers are not communicating") may be connected in the sense that they reflect students' feelings of less control in the more complex setting of the junior high school. For example, if students find that some classes are too easy, they may feel that the school is not living up to its role. Furthermore, given whatever complaints they do have about school, students may perceive that their parents have less personal impact on the junior high school.

Given the above interpretations of the factors from the "in the past" analysis, the factors 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were labeled as the "Difficulty of Schoolwork Factor," "Negative Peer Factor," "Privacy Factor," "Classes Factor," and "Less Control Factor," respectively.

Table 3.8

Highest-Loading Items on the Five Factors from the "In the Past" Analysis

Item #	Item	Loading
	FACTOR 1 - DIFFICULTY OF SCHOOLWORK	
1.	Schoolwork would be difficult	.678
4.	Junior high teachers would be harder than elementary school teachers	.582
15.	The difficulty of homework	.803
17.	Being able to understand what teachers say in class	.564
18.	Being able to get work done on time	.708
19.	Having too much homework to do	.676
	FACTOR 2 - NEGATIVE PEER	
9.	Older students might make fun of you	.646
10.	Older students might bully or beat you up	.808
25.	Having more opportunities to get in trouble	.460
32.	Personal possessions will be stolen	.592
	FACTOR 3 - PRIVACY	
14.	Going into the restroom	.778
16.	Undressing for gym	.445
	FACTOR 4 - CLASSES	
21.	You don't have the teachers who are best for you	.656
23.	Being tired from spending too much time in class	.528
28.	Being bored in class	.728
	FACTOR 5 - LESS CONTROL	
20.	Classes are too easy	.704
27.	Being expected to behave like a high school student	.428
31.	Parents and teachers are not communicating	.548

Table 3.9 presents a listing of the highest-loading items on the six factors from the "today" analysis. Again, the criterion of .40 was used to differentiate highest-loading items from the other items. The first factor in the table, with nine high-loading items, is comparable to the Difficulty of Schoolwork Factor derived in the "in the past" analysis. All six items that loaded on this factor in the "in the past" analysis appear again in the "today" analysis. The factor is broadened by three additional items, of which items 8 and 11 seem to fit as concerns about getting along in the academic framework of school. The second factor in Table 3.9 has two high-loading items that are the same two items that loaded highly on the Less Control Factor in the "in the past" analysis. The third factor in Table 3.9 is comparable to the Negative Peer Factor in the preceding factor analysis, with a switch in one of the four items. The fourth factor derived in the "today" analysis has no counterpart in the preceding factor analysis. The items loading on this factor seem to share the common theme of encountering new features of junior high school. Thus, it was appropriate to label this factor as the "Newness of Junior High Factor." The fifth factor shown in Table 3.9 has three high-loading items, the two highest of which are the same items that defined the Privacy Factor in the "in the past" analysis. Last, the sixth factor from the "today" analysis has five high-loading items, all of which seem to reflect concerns about having friends or doing the things that would increase the chances of having friends. This factor has no counterpart in the preceding factor analysis and was given the label of the "Friends Factor."

To summarize so far, the factor analyses of the "in the past" and "today" portions of the questionnaire yielded factor structures that were partly overlapping. Each analysis independently showed four factors that can be referred to as the Difficulty of Schoolwork Factor, Negative Peer Factor, Privacy Factor, and Less Control Factor. The "in the past" analysis showed one other major factor, not shown in the "today" analysis, that can be viewed as a Classes Factor. Conversely, the "today" analysis produced two factors that did not have counterparts in the "in the past" analysis. These two factors were labeled as the Newness of Junior High Factor and Friends Factor. Table 3.10 summarizes the names of the derived factors in each analysis.

Before continuing with additional results, it is worth making the observation that the "today" portion of the questionnaire generally had a clearer and more defined factor structure than the "in the past" portion of the questionnaire. One possible explanation for this is that it was fairly difficult for students to answer the "in the past" items in a completely accurate, retrospective framework. Another explanation is that students did not have the same mental associations among items for the "in the past" portion of the questionnaire as they had for the "today" portion of the questionnaire.

Table 3.9

Highest-Loading Items on the Six Factors from the "Today" Analysis

Item #	Item	Loading
	FACTOR 1 - DIFFICULTY OF SCHOOLWORK	
1.	Schoolwork would be difficult	.689
4.	Junior high teachers would be harder than elementary school teachers	.538
8.	It would be hard to talk to teachers	.447
11.	Knowing how to act and what to do in school	.464
15.	The difficulty of homework	.746
17.	Being able to understand what teachers say in class	.662
18.	Being able to get work done on time	.722
19.	Having too much homework to do	.651
26.	Getting to class on time	.422
	FACTOR 2 - LESS CONTROL	
20.	Classes are too easy	.768
31.	Parents and teachers are not communicating with each other	.533
	FACTOR 3 - NEGATIVE PEER	
9.	Older students might make fun of you	.723
10.	Older students might bully or beat you up	.820
22.	Older students expect you to do things that you don't feel are right	.621
32.	Personal possessions will be stolen	.652
	FACTOR 4 - NEWNESS OF JUNIOR HIGH	
5.	It would be hard to be the youngest student in the new school after being the oldest in elementary school	.485
12.	How to use your locker and lock	.678
13.	Finding the rooms of different teachers	.723
24.	Not having recess	.595
	FACTOR 5 - PRIVACY	
14.	Going into the restroom	.640
16.	Undressing for gym	.768
26.	Getting to class on time	.415
	FACTOR 6 - FRIENDS	
2.	It would be hard to meet new friends	.717
3.	You would not see old friends as much	.464
7.	It would be hard to talk to other students	.479
27.	Being expected to behave like a high school student (stay out late, go out on dates)	.570
29.	Gym and successfully participating in athletics	.492

Table 3.10

Factors Derived in the Analyses of the Concerns Questionnaire

	IN THE PAST	TODAY
COMPARABLE FACTORS	Difficulty of Schoolwork Factor (1)[a]	Difficulty of Schoolwork Factor (1)[a]
	Negative Peer Factor (2)	Negative Peer Factor (3)
	Privacy Factor (3)	Privacy Factor (5)
	Less Control Factor (5)	Less Control Factor (2)
UNIQUE FACTORS	Classes Factor (4)	Newness of Junior High Factor (4)
		Friends Factor (6)

a Numbers in parantheses indicate the ordinal position of the factor in the analysis

Factor Score Comparisons. Given that it was possible to identify an underlying factor structure for the Concerns Questionnaire that accounted for a large percentage of the items (56% of the "in the past" items and 84% of the "today" items), it was of interest to examine the different factors separately. Specifically, each factor was explored to determine whether the individual student characteristics of sex, participation style, and previous classroom organization helped explain variation in the scores for that factor. The analyses were parallel to the analyses carried out on the total concerns scores (see previous section), only instead of using a total additive measure of concerns as a dependent measure, factor scores for the main factors served as dependent measures. It was conceivable that analyses of more discrete aspects of the Concerns Questionnaire migh prove more fruitful than the analyses of the total concerns scores.

The factor scores for each of the factors (shown in Table 3.10) were created from the factor-score coefficient matrices outputted with each factor analysis ("in the past" and "today"). For each factor, each student's score on that factor was computed by multiplying the student's score on each item by the factor coefficient associated with each item. Thus, each student had one score for each of the five "in the past" and six "today" factors. The set of students' scores for each factor were standardized ($\underline{M}$ = 0.0

and SD = 1.0). In addition, because the concerns items were originally scored so that a higher score indicated a smaller degree of concern, the factor scores had to be interpreted in a parallel fashion -- i.e., the higher a student's (or group's) score on a factor, the less concern that student (or group) expressed about that factor relative to a student (or group) with a lower score on that factor. The scores for each factor were analyzed using three independent one-way analyses of variance: one each for the variables of sex, participation style, and previous classroom organization.

Tables 3.11 through 3.19 present the results of the one-way analyses of variance on the different factor scores. The results represented in each table will be discussed in turn.

The results for the Difficulty of Schoolwork Factor are presented in Table 3.11. The table indicates that the sex and classroom organization variables were not significant sources of variance. The participation style variable does show up as significant, however, on both the "in the past" and "today" sets of factor scores ($F = 2.31$, $p = .05$ and $F = 2.57$, $p = .03$, respectively). In order to interpret the meaning of these significant differences among groups, a Duncan's multiple range test with Kramer's adjustment for unequal group sizes was performed on the group means. Table 3.12 presents the participation style groups in descending order according to their means. Brackets to the side of each list enclose subsets of means that are not significantly different from one another (an alpha level of .10 was used). For example, the table shows that for the "in the past" analysis, the subsets of success, social, and isolate means are not significantly different from one another yet are significantly different from the means of the dependent, phantom, and alienate groups. At the same time, the means of the social, isolate, dependent, and phantom groups are not significantly different from each other yet are different from the means of the success and alienate groups.

From the viewpoint of substantive interpretations, the data in Table 3.12 make fairly good sense. It was expected that, relative to other groups, the success students would express less concern about the difficulty of schoolwork. Likewise, it makes sense that alienates would be a group that expressed more concern about the difficulty of schoolwork. Alienates are defined as students who openly rebel in school and have poor achievement. Nonetheless, these students may care about performing at an acceptable level. It also was expected that the dependent and social groups would be among the mid-to-low groups in terms of expressed concern over the difficulty of schoolwork, although it is somewhat surprising that dependent students would rank below the social students in the "today" analysis. Finally, the relative positioning of the phantom and isolate groups is plausible. Phantom students are characterized as valuing success, and the factor scores indicate that they expressed more concern about the difficulty of schoolwork relative to most other students. Perhaps this is because they have difficulty in obtaining assistance with their schoolwork when they need it. Students in the

Table 3.11

Results of Group Comparisons on
Difficulty of Schoolwork Factor

	In the Past		Today	
	F	p	F	p
Sex	.41	.52	.78	.38
Participation Style	2.31*	.05	2.57*	.03
Classroom Organization	.37	.55	.00	.96

* $p \leq .05$

Table 3.12

Differences Among Participation Style Groups
on the Difficulty of Schoolwork Factor Scores

In the Past		Today	
Success	(.278; 1.007)[a]	Isolate	(.812; .484)
Social	(.144; 1.025)	Success	(.205; .964)
Isolate	(.091; .755)	Dependent	(.053; .962)
Dependent	(-.175; .901)	Social	(-.119; .974)
Phantom	(-.198; 1.032)	Alienate	(-.319; .942)
Alienate	(-.438; 1.064)	Phantom	(-.339; 1.119)

[a] The mean and standard deviation for each group appear in parentheses.

isolate group are characterized as being very withdrawn from the academic and social setting of the school. Table 3.12 indicates that this group expressed little concern about schoolwork relative to other groups. This is consistent with the information, presented earlier, that isolates had less total concerns relative to other participation groups.

Turning to the Negative Peer Factor scores, Table 3.13 indicates that none of the one-way analyses of variance were significant. Only the analysis for the sex factor approached significance. The female and male group means for this factor (not presented) indicate that males expressed more concern about the negative consequences of peer interaction than females on both the "in the past" and "today" portions of the questionnaire. This makes sense from the standpoint that males probably encounter more opportunities for troublemaking than females.

Table 3.14 presents the results of the group comparisons on the Privacy Factor scores. Both the sex and classroom organization factors account for some variance in this outcome. The sex factor is highly significant for both the "in the past" and "today" portions of the questionnaire. Taking the "in the past" portion first, the mean for the male group ($\underline{M}$ = .258, $\underline{SD}$ = .927) is higher than the mean for the female group ($\underline{M}$ = -.249, $\underline{SD}$ = 1.009), indicating that males were less concerned about their privacy than females. The same relationship holds true for the "today" analysis ($\underline{M}$ = .217, $\underline{SD}$ = .858 and $\underline{M}$ = -.208, $\underline{SD}$ = 1.084 for males and females, respectively). The greater concern on the part of females seems plausible because females are going through more physiological changes at this age than males. Thus, females may be more subject to -- and sensitive to -- comparisons that take place among their peers. An effect for the classroom organization variable appears for the "today" scores for the Privacy Factor. Group means show that students who had been in cluster classrooms in sixth grade expressed more concern on this factor (M = -.082, $\underline{SD}$ = 1.069) than students who had been in no-cluster classrooms in sixth grade ($\underline{M}$ = .213, $\underline{SD}$ = .760). While it might be expected that students with experience in cluster classrooms probably would be used to less privacy in a more complex organizational setup, it may be that this experience actually caused more anxiety about encountering an even less private climate in junior high school. However, this does not explain why the classroom organization factor shows up only on the "today" and not the "in the past" portion of the questionnaire.

Results for the Less Control Factor scores appear in Table 3.15. Considering that this factor was difficult to interpret, it is surprising that four of the six $\underline{F}$ tests yielded significant results. First, there is an effect for sex on the "in the past" scores. Means show that females expressed less concern on this factor ($\underline{M}$ = .172, $\underline{SD}$ = .985) than males ($\underline{M}$ = -.179, $\underline{SD}$ = .989). Sex does not continue to be a significant explanatory variable for the "today" scores.

Table 3.13

Results of Group Comparisons on
Difficulty of Schoolwork Factor Scores

	In the Past		Today	
	F	p	F	p
Sex	2.52	.11	1.94	.17
Participation Style	.96	.44	.58	.71
Classroom Organization	.79	.38	.95	.33

Table 3.14

Results of Group Comparisons
on Privacy Factor Scores

	In the Past		Today	
	F	p	F	p
Sex	14.22**	.00	9.80**	.00
Participation Style	1.22	.30	1.23	.30
Classroom Organization	.39	.54	3.70†	.06

† $p \leq .10$

** $p \leq .01$

Table 3.15

Results of Group Comparisons
on Less Control Factor Scores

	In the Past		Today	
	F	p	F	p
Sex	6.60*	.02	.03	.86
Participation Style	1.86†	.10	2.15†	.06
Classroom Organization	19.08**	.00	.95	.33

† $p \leq .10$

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

Table 3.16

Differences Among Participation Style
Groups on the Less Control Factor Scores

In the Past		Today	
Isolate	(.711; .812)[a]	Dependent	(.812; .484)
Success	(.169; 1.058)	Phantom	(.205; .964)
Phantom	(.157; .833)	Social	(.053; .962)
Alienate	(-.136; 1.020)	Alienate	(-.119; .974)
Social	(-.165; .968)	Success	(-.319; .942)
Dependent	(-.200; 1.018)	Isolate	(-.339; 1.119)

[a] The mean and standard deviation for each group appear in parentheses.

The second set of results for the Less Control Factor scores involves the participation style variable. This variable has explanatory power for both the "in the past" and "today" scores. Again, it is necessary to examine the relative positions of the six participation style groups in order to see the nature of the effects. This information is presented in Table 3.16. What is striking about the information in this table is that while three of the participation groups in the medium range of concerns (phantom, alienate, and social) moved little across the "in the past" and "today" portions of the questionnaire, the remaining three groups (isolate, success, and dependent) reversed positions completely across the two portions of the questionnaire. The initial position of the isolate group makes sense in that students who detach themselves from school probably have relatively little interest in exercising control over the school environment. The reversal of this group in the "today" analysis, to the position of expressing the most concern about a lack of control, is difficult to explain. It may be that junior high was turning out to be a worse place for these students relative to other students. It also may be that the small sample size for this group (N = 6) makes the means unreliable. The movement of the success students is more plausible. In the "in the past" analysis, success students had relatively less concern about a lack of control compared to most other students, perhaps because this had not been a problem in their past schooling experience. In the "today" analysis, success students were relatively more concerned about a lack of control. The new organizational complexity of junior high school may be frustrating to this group of students who are used to greater responsiveness. Finally, dependent students apparently felt relatively more concern over the issue of control in anticipating a new environment. After some experience in junior high, however, they indicated feeling relatively less concern about a lack of control. This suggests that many dependent students found their position satisfactory.

The third result for the Less Control Factor scores is an effect for the classroom organization variable on the "in the past" portion of the questionnaire. Means indicate that students who were in no-cluster classes in sixth grade expressed more concern on this factor ($\overline{M}$ = -.467, $\overline{SD}$ = .952) than students who were in cluster classes in the sixth grade ($\overline{M}$ = .181, $\overline{SD}$ = .962). Because cluster classrooms more closely approximated the junior high school environment, the direction of these means is expected. No-cluster students probably felt more anxious about a new school environment because they had experienced more control in elementary school than cluster students.

Results for the Classes Factor scores, Newness of Junior High School Factor scores, and Friends Factor scores follow in Tables 3.17 to 3.19. These tables show that none of the independent variables were significant sources for the three sets of factor scores.

To summarize the group comparison results, a number of significant results suggest that sex, participation style, and previous classroom organization were important variables in accounting for variance in some of the factor scores. The number of significant results exceeds that which can be expected by chance, since 9 of

Table 3.17

Results of Group Comparisons
on Classes Factor Scores

	In the Past	
	F	p
Sex	.56	.46
Participation Style	.77	.58
Classroom Organization	.90	.35

Table 3.18

Results of Group Comparisons on
Newness of Junior High Factor Scores

	Today	
	F	p
Sex	.00	.98
Participation Style	1.68	.14
Classroom Organization	.18	.68

Table 3.19

Results of Group Comparisons
on Friends Factor Scores

	Today	
	F	p
Sex	.20	.66
Participation Style	.57	.72
Classroom Organization	.06	.81

the 33 independent F tests (27%) surpassed the .10 level of significance. The sex variable played a role in explaining the Privacy Factor scores and the Less Control Factor scores. The participation style variable played a role in explaining the Difficulty of Schoolwork Factor scores and the Less Control Factor scores. Finally, the classroom organization variable played a role in explaining the Privacy Factor scores and Less Control Factor scores.

The results of the factor analyses and the one-way analyses of variance on the different sets of factor scores are interesting, but they should be viewed with caution. Limitations include the following: (1) some of the factors were defined by very few items, (2) the sensitivity of factor analytic techniques in general, and (3) substantial differences in the sizes of some of the comparison groups. The analyses in this section perhaps are most valuable not in terms of the particular details of the findings, but rather for the guidelines they provide for future research. Specifically, the results suggest that it is useful to conceptualize the concerns items in terms of various concerns concepts, and that it is more profitable to examine the concerns items in terms of discrete sets rather than as a whole. Using the factor analyses results and item correlations, it may be desirable to modify the concerns instrument for future use so that it has a defined subscale structure. The results in this section also support the notion that the three independent variables selected for analysis -- student sex, participation style, and previous classroom organization -- are worth further study as explanatory concepts.

Students' Responses to the Open-ended Questions

As described in the method section of this chapter, students were asked to respond to three open-ended questions at the end of the Concerns Questionnaire:

Question One: How is the seventh grade <u>different from</u> the sixth?

Question Two: How is the seventh grade the <u>same</u> as the sixth?

Question Three: Looking back at the start of the seventh grade, would you say you had a good start or a bad start? Why? What were the first three weeks in junior high like for you? What was good? What was bad?

The responses of a subset of students were examined in order to get a general sense of the range of the most frequent responses. The questionnaires of students with the first 82 consecutive identification numbers were selected to form this subsample. Because 9 of these students did not have questionnaire data, the final subsample was pared down to 73 students. These students each had answers written to all

three questions, with the exception of one student who responded to the first two questions but not the third.

The most frequent student responses to each of the three questions are summarized in turn below. A more detailed analysis of responses to the questions can be found in a separate document (Packer, 1981).

Question One. How is the seventh grade different from the sixth? Four kinds of responses (or a combination of them) were typical answers to this question. The first kind of response reflected the perception that there were "more" of a lot of things at junior high school relative to elementary school, e.g., more students, more teachers, more classes, and more homework. A second kind of response to this question was that junior high was different than elementary school because students had to change classes. In conjunction with this, students sometimes mentioned having to move from one classroom to another and the increased likelihood of being tardy. A third kind of frequent response, related to the first two, was that students had different teachers in junior high school. This perception often was hard to separate from the notion of having more teachers. The fourth kind of frequent response to Question One focused on recess and lunch. Many students mentioned that they no longer had recess in seventh grade. With regard to lunch, students indicated that in junior high school they had more lunch food options with both a cafeteria and snack bar. Some students also mentioned that in seventh grade they ate lunch at a different time and could eat on the lawn if they wanted.

There were other reponses to Question One that occurred in number, but to a lesser extent than those mentioned above. These responses included that seventh grade entailed harder work, more responsibility, having a locker, and more freedom and fun.

In sum, the most salient difference between seventh grade and sixth grade, according to students, was that seventh grade presented them with greater quantities of things to negotiate in the environment -- in particular, people and classes. Students' comments on this difference were usually made without any implied evaluations. Students also viewed changes in their "free time" schedule to be important -- i.e., the different lunch options and the lack of recess. It is noteworthy that only a small minority of students mentioned the content of their classes by saying that work was harder in junior high school than in elementary school.

Question Two. How is seventh grade the same as the sixth? The most typical response of students to this question was that "you still have to do the work." Students used the term "work" to mean in-class work, homework, learning, tests, and the same subject matter. This self-report meshes nicely with the student perception data of Everhart (1979). Everhart found that junior high students had an undifferentiated view of instructional activities (relative to teachers) and that they generally discussed those activities under the one rubric of "work."

The second most frequent response to Question Two was that there were different teachers and classes in both sixth grade and seventh grade. The occurrence of this response can be traced to the fact that the majority of the students in the sample had attended elementary schools with "cluster" arrangements in the sixth grade, i.e., where students had different teachers for different subjects or were instructed by teams of teachers. This response at first appears to contradict some of the responses to Question One about what made sixth grade and seventh grade different. However, it seems that in Question One students were referring to having more teachers and students to deal with than ever before. Also, when students responded to Question One by saying that they had to change classes, they seemed to be referring to the logistics of moving from room to room throughout the day and having different students in each class. Sixth-graders in cluster schools never had to change rooms more than four times a day and usually remained with the same group of students.

The third most frequent response to Question Two was that there were no similarities between sixth grade and seventh grade. Fourteen of the 73 students (or 19%) responsed in this manner.

Two other fairly common responses to Question Two were that it was still possible to get together with friends from sixth grade, and that there still was a lunchtime.

Question Three. Looking back at the start of seventh grade, would you say that you had a good start or a bad start? Why? What were the first three weeks in junior high like for you? What was good? What was bad? The great majority of students (53 or 74%) answered Question Three by saying that they had a good start in seventh grade. While eight of these students gave no reason for why their start was good, the other students furnished a variety of reasons. The most common reason for a good start was that they (the respondents) had their friends as company and also were making new friends. The second most common reason given for having a good start was not getting into trouble (e.g., into fights) or having nothing bad happen. Other frequent reasons were being able to get to class on time and doing well on schoolwork (e.g., getting good grades on assignments).

Ten of the 72 respondents to Question Three indicated that they had neither a good or bad start or, in other words, they had an "okay" start. These students typically went on to mention both good and bad aspects of junior high school, e.g., handing in homework on time and losing two textbooks, or meeting new friends and getting crushed in the halls.

Nine of the 72 respondents to Question Three said that they had a bad start at Waverley. The most common reasons for the bad start were that it was difficult to find classes or get to classes on time, and that there was too much work or work that was too hard.

Summary and Suggestions for Future Research

Descriptive data from the Concerns Questionnaire indicated that most students did not have great concerns about the items listed either on the "in the past" or "today" portions of the questionnaire. Given this low absolute level of concern, the relative rank position of concerns items remained fairly stable over the two portions of the questionnaire. Students expressed relatively more concern about academic work and relatively less concern about most social aspects of junior high. Two items about the logistics of getting around junior high school dropped substantially in ranked concern level from the "in the past" to "today" portions of the questionnaire. One item about dating increased substantially in ranked concern level from the "in the past" to "today" portions of the questionnaire.

When students were each given a total concerns score, group comparisons showed that total expressed concern was not a function of student sex, participation style, or previous classroom experience. There was a significant drop in total expressed concern from the "in the past" to "today" portions of the questionnaire.

Exploring the Concerns Questionnaire in terms of empirically and conceptually related subsets of items, identified by factor analysis, proved to be a more promising approach than analyzing a total concerns score. Interpretable, largely overlapping factor structures were identified for the "in the past" and "today" portions of the questionnaire. Group comparisons on the factor scores, using student sex, participation style, and previous classroom organization as independent variables, supported the notion of the potential explanatory power of these variables for some of the questionnaire factors. Factors identified as the Difficulty of Schoolwork Factor, Privacy Factor, and Less Control Factor had variance that was accounted for by one or more of these independent variables.

Students' open-ended responses to questions at the end of the Concerns Questionnaire suggest that when students compared junior high with elementary school, they perceived more differences than similarities. The differences identified by most students focused on aspects of the junior high environment not directly related to instruction or content of academic work -- e.g., that in junior high there were more people and classes, different teachers, and no recess. At first, this seems to contradict the Concerns Questionnaire results showing that academic work was of relatively greater concern than other aspects of school. However, the open-ended questions did not ask students to list concerns, but rather differences and similarities. In doing so, students apparently found the non-academic aspects of school to be more salient than the strictly academic aspects of school. This is corroborated by the fact that the most commonly listed similarity between sixth and seventh grades was that "you still have to do the work." The study by Everhart (1979) also supports this interpretation. It is possible that by junior high, students view academic work as a given, unchanging function of school -- one that is not especially

interesting, but one that they have concerns about in the sense that it is a means to the rewards that school and society offer. When asked whether or not they had a good or bad start at Waverley, the great majority of students said they had a good start. Again, the most frequent reasons that students gave for their good start did not have to do with academics.

In concluding, it is worth considering how the Concerns Questionnaire might be improved for use in future research. The initial results for the Concerns Questionnaire reported in this paper are promising, and they suggest several possible areas where modifications can be tried. This process of modification is desirable if the Concerns Questionnaire is to be established as a valid and reliable tool for studying students' perceptions of junior high school.

One area where modifications are worth exploring has to do with the low absolute level of concern that most items elicited. This fairly consistent low level of expressed concern is undesirable from the standpoint of suppressing variance in the instrument. Several possible explanations and solutions for this problem are considered below.

One explanation is that the Concerns Questionnaire suffered because of the time at which it was administered. It is possible that having students respond to the "in the past" items when they already had experience in junior high school made it impossible for them to reflect on what their transition concerns really were like at an earlier point in time. It seems likely that concerns may have been greater in the past. Furthermore, because students went on to complete the "today" portion of the questionnaire immediately after the "in the past" portion, students may have been subject to a response bias in which they felt, "I must show myself to be better off now than I was in the past." Again, this would lead to an artificial suppression of concerns. Thus, in studying transition, it may be desirable to split the administration of the instrument so that students respond to the concerns items once at the end of elementary school or during the transition summer and once after several weeks of junior high school. If it is only possible to administer the Concerns Questionnaire in seventh grade, then it may be preferable to have students respond to the concerns items only once, reflecting on how they currently feel about the concerns.

A second explanation for the low level of expressed concern elicited by the items is that the response alternatives were inadequate. As mentioned earlier, it may be that providing students with only three alternatives did not adequately capture the range of their concerns. Or, it is possible that simply rewording the alternatives so as to avoid the gap between "A Great Concern" and "A Small Concern" would increase the variance. Another approach to item alternatives is demonstrated by Applegate (1981), who used a similar instrument called the Student Problem Checklist. Applegate asked students to respond to each problem by indicating both the frequency of the problem (i.e., All of the time, Most of the

time, Sometimes, Hardly ever, and Never) and the degree to which the problem bothered them (i.e., A whole lot, A lot, Some, Very little, and Not at all). This approach appears to have been fruitful, because Applegate reports several sets of items that students identified as being significantly frequent or bothersome.

A third explanation is that the content of the concerns items themselves did not adequately reflect students' concerns. This explanation seems the least plausible, because the items were generated by actually asking the same population of students and others in their environment what the typical transition concerns were. Of course, it is possible that the list of concerns might be profitably broadened through further study of various populations. Applegate (1981), for instance, found that students expressed the most concern about access to teacher support in class and having independence. These concerns areas are not addressed directly in the Concerns Questionnaire. Of course, it is possible that transition concerns may be different from one population to the next. It seems likely, for instance, that students in transition to urban junior high schools would have considerably different concerns than those in suburban or rural areas because of the greater frequency of delinquency or violence in most urban settings. Here, the researcher faces the question of whether it is better to have one broad instrument that speaks in part to all possible populations, or whether it is better to have different instruments tailored to different populations.

A fourth explanation for the low level of concerns in this study is that the transition experience is not difficult for most students. Students may quickly find that despite the structural changes of junior high school, "school is school and work is work." If this is generally the case, then the above modifications to the Concerns Questionnaire would not produce markedly different results. It also is possible that Waverley was relatively unique among junior high schools in terms of the transition experience it offered students. Especially salient might be the size of Waverley -- approximately 700 students -- which is substantially smaller than many junior high schools. In order to determine whether this or other characteristics made Waverley a school where students experienced a relatively easy transition, an examination of students' transition concerns in other junior high schools is necessary.

A second possible area of modification for the Concerns Questionnaire is that of refining the instrument so that it has a subscale structure. The factor analysis results reported here suggest that there are different conceptual dimensions in the instrument and that looking at these dimensions separately may be preferable to viewing the questionnaire as a whole. The refinement process should take place following any modifications based on the preceding suggestions. Further factor analyses and item corrrelations can be examined to reduce unnecessary redundancy and to create scales that are different from one another while still correlating highly with the instrument as a whole.

REFERENCES

Applegate, J. H. Perceived problems of secondary school students. Journal of Educational Research, 1981, 75, 49-55.

Blyth, D. A., Simmons, R. G., & Bush, D. The transition into early adolescence: A longitudinal comparison of youth in two educational contexts. Sociology of Education, 1978, 51(July), 149-162.

Dreeben, R. On what is learned in school. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Elder, G. H., Jr. Adolescent socialization and personality development. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1968.

Evans, M. J., & Richards, N. J. From primary to secondary school: A study of the satisfaction and confidence of students in transition. Melbourne, Australia: Burwood State College, 1980.

Everhart, R. B. The fabric of meaning in a junior high school. Theory into Practice, 1979, 18, 152-157.

Good, T. L. Students' open-ended responses about the transition to junior high school. Unpublished manuscript, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1980.

Jackson, P. W. Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc., 1968.

Lipsitz, J. S. The age group. In M. Johnson (Ed.), The National Society for the Study of Education 1980 Yearbook. Chicago: NSSE, 1980.

McPartland, J., Epstein, J. L., & McDill, E. L. Student reactions to the transition from open elementary school to junior high school: A case study. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools, 1972. (Rep. No. 139)

Packer, M. J. Students' open-ended responses about transition. Unpublished manuscript, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1981.

Power, C., & Cotterell, J. Students in transition. Adelaide, South Australia: The Flinders University of South Australia, School of Education, 1979.

Tanner, J. M. Growth at adolescence (2nd ed.). Oxford, England: Blackwell Science, 1961.

APPENDIX A

STUDENT OPINION SURVEY

SIXTH-GRADE

STUDENT OPINION SURVEY

STUDENT OPINION SURVEY

NAME:_____ TODAY'S DATE:_____

SCHOOL:_____ GRADE:_____

The questions in this booklet are aimed at finding out how you feel about your school. Your answers will help us to study what happens when people go from elementary to junior high school. As the study could lead to important changes in education, we need your honest answers. We promise that what you say will remain a secret between the researchers and you: no one else will see what you say.

The question booklet is in three parts. Each question will be read out loud. After hearing the question, please answer it as quickly as possible.

Thank you very much for your part in this research study.

PART A

Please respond to each question below by marking with an X. If you feel the statement is true mark the space after T, if you are uncertain mark the space after U, and if it is false then mark the space after F. For example, if you feel happy at school then you might mark your booklet as follows:

I feel happy at school. T[X] U[ ] F[ ]

1. I look forward to coming to school each day. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
2. I like my teachers. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
3. A lot of what we are supposed to do at this school doesn't make sense. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
4. My teachers are helping me to learn and understand. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
5. In school I am often able to work with people I like. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
6. I do not really enjoy anything about school. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
7. Normally I feel quite relaxed at school. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
8. Some teachers are really against me. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]

9.	I wish we were free to do things our own way instead of being told exactly what to do.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
10.	I like school better than most other kids do.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
11.	My teachers are friendly towards me.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
12.	My teachers take into account what I need and what I am interested in.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
13.	During exams I worry that I might fail or do badly.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
14.	I do not really enjoy anything about school.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
15.	At this school I don't have as many friends as I would like.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
16.	Normally I feel quite relaxed at school.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
17.	Some teachers are really against me.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
18.	The way this school is run leaves me so confused, I don't know where to turn.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
19.	I tense up when the teachers ask me questions in class discussion.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
20.	In this school people like me don't have any luck.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
21.	What happens in this school goes on no matter what the pupils do.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
22.	I wish we were free to do things our own way instead of being told exactly what to do.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
23.	I am making good progress with my work.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
24.	I am accepted and liked by most of the kids in my class.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
25.	I think that people like me will never do well at this school no matter how hard we try.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
26.	During exams I worry a lot about how I am doing.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
27.	I like school better than most other kids.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
28.	Nobody in this school seems to notice me or care what happens to me.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
29.	It is hard for me to do as well at school as my parents and teachers expect.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
30.	My teachers are friendly towards me.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]

31. A good deal of school work is just to keep us busy. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]

32. I am often afraid I will make a fool of myself in class. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]

33. When exams are due, I feel quite confident I will do well. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]

34. My teachers take into account what I need and what I am interested in. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]

35. I get upset when my teachers don't come to my help when I need it. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]

36. I am quite satisfied with how my schoolwork is going. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]

STUDENT OPINIONS

PART B

On this page please show us how you feel about school in general and about some of the subjects you study. Please mark an X in each row between the words on the right and left-hand sides of the page. If, for example, you feel school is very good, you would put your X at the right hand side of the row next to good. Your paper would look like this. Example:

bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	good

If you feel school is average, you would put your X in the middle of the row. Example:

bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	good

SCHOOL

interesting	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	dull
bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	good
easy	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	difficult
useless	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	useful
confusing	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	clear

ENGLISH

interesting	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	dull
bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	good
easy	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	difficult
useless	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	useful
confusing	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	clear

MATH

interesting	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	dull
bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	good
easy	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	difficult
useless	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	useful
confusing	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	clear

SOCIAL STUDIES

interesting	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	dull
bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	good
easy	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	difficult
useless	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	useful
confusing	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	clear

SCIENCE

interesting	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	dull
bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	good
easy	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	difficult
useless	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	useful
confusing	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	clear

TEACHERS AT SCHOOL

interesting	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	dull
bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	good
easy	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	difficult
useless	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	useful
confusing	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	clear

PART C

Part C is similar to the last part except you are asked to indicate what junior high school will be like next year. Please mark an X in each row between the words on the right and left-hand sides of the page. If, for example, you feel school will be very good next year, you should put your X at the right hand side of the row next to good. Your paper would look like this.

Example:

bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	good

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

interesting	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	dull
bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	good
easy	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	difficult
useless	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	useful
confusing	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	clear

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

interesting	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	dull
bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	good
easy	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	difficult
useless	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	useful
confusing	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	clear

Please answer the following two questions as completely as possible.

1. Name three things that you are looking foward to next year in junior high school.

2. Name three problems which you think you will encounter when you enter junior high school.

SEVENTH-GRADE

STUDENT OPINION SURVEY

STUDENT OPINION SURVEY

NAME:_____ TODAY'S DATE:_____

SCHOOL:_____ GRADE:_____

The questions in this booklet are aimed at finding out how you feel about your school. Your answers will help us to study what happens when people go from elementary to junior high school. As the study could lead to important changes in education, we need your honest answers. We promise that what you say will remain a secret between the researchers and you: no one else will see what you say.

The question booklet is in three parts. Each question will be read out loud. After hearing the question, please answer it as quickly as possible.

Thank you very much for your part in this research study.

PART A

Please respond to each question below by marking with an X. If you feel the statement is <u>true</u> mark the space after T, if you are <u>uncertain</u> mark the space after U, and if it is <u>false</u> then mark the space after F. For example, if you feel happy at school then you might mark your booklet as follows:

I feel happy at school. T[X] U[ ] F[ ]

1.	I look forward to coming to school each day.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
2.	I like my teachers.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
3.	A lot of what we are supposed to do at this school doesn't make sense.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
4.	My teachers are helping me to learn and understand.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
5.	In school I am often able to work with people I like.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
6.	I do not really enjoy anything about school.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
7.	Normally I feel quite relaxed at school.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
8.	Some teachers are really against me.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]

9.	I wish we were free to do things our own way instead of being told exactly what to do.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
10.	I like school better than most other kids do.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
11.	My teachers are friendly towards me.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
12.	My teachers take into account what I need and what I am interested in.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
13.	During exams I worry that I might fail or do badly.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
14.	I do not really enjoy anything about school.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
15.	At this school I don't have as many friends as I would like.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
16.	Normally I feel quite relaxed at school.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
17.	Some teachers are really against me.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
18.	The way this school is run leaves me so confused, I don't know where to turn.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
19.	I tense up when the teachers ask me questions in class discussion.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
20.	In this school people like me don't have any luck.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
21.	What happens in this school goes on no matter what the pupils do.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
22.	I wish we were free to do things our own way instead of being told exactly what to do.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
23.	I am making good progress with my work.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
24.	I am accepted and liked by most of the kids in my class.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
25.	I think that people like me will never do well at this school no matter how hard we try.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
26.	During exams I worry a lot about how I am doing.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
27.	I like school better than most other kids.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
28.	Nobody in this school seems to notice me or care what happens to me.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
29.	It is hard for me to do as well at school as my parents and teachers expect.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]
30.	My teachers are friendly towards me.	T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]

31. A good deal of school work is just to keep us busy. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]

32. I am often afraid I will make a fool of myself in class. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]

33. When exams are due, I feel quite confident I will do well. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]

34. My teachers take into account what I need and what I am interested in. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]

35. I get upset when my teachers don't come to my help when I need it. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]

36. I am quite satisfied with how my schoolwork is going. T[ ] U[ ] F[ ]

STUDENT OPINIONS PART B

On this page please show us how you feel about school in general and about some of the subjects you study. Please mark an X in each row between the words on the right and left-hand sides of the page. If, for example, you feel school is very good, you would put your X at the right hand side of the row next to good. Your paper would look like this. Example:

bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	good

If you feel school is average, you would put your X in the middle of the row. Example:

bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	good

SCHOOL

interesting	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	dull
bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	good
easy	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	difficult
useless	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	useful
confusing	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	clear

ENGLISH

interesting	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	dull
bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	good
easy	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	difficult
useless	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	useful
confusing	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	clear

MATH

interesting	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	dull
bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	good
easy	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	difficult
useless	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	useful
confusing	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	clear

SOCIAL STUDIES

interesting	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	dull
bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	good
easy	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	difficult
useless	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	useful
confusing	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	clear

SCIENCE

interesting	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	dull
bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	good
easy	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	difficult
useless	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	useful
confusing	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	clear

TEACHERS AT SCHOOL

interesting	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	dull
bad	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	good
easy	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	difficult
useless	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	useful
confusing	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	clear

Please turn the page and continue answering the questions.

PART C:

Please answer the following two questions as completely as possible.

1. Name three things that you enjoyed this year in junior high school. Explain.

2. Name three problems which you had this year in junior high school. Explain.

Thank you again for you help.

APPENDIX B

CONCERNS QUESTIONNAIRE

BEGINNING JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: _____

Sex: _____ Girl _____Boy

Name of elementary school you attended last year:

_____

Do you have an older brother or sister who lives at home:

Yes _____ No_____

We are studying what happens when students go from elementary school to junior high school. The questions in this booklet are about your problems and concerns as a seventh grader. We are interested in learning about <u>your</u> experience. We are trying to help sixth grade students to understand what the seventh grade will be like.

On the following pages, please tell us the concerns you have felt as a seventh grader. It's okay to say that you have had no particular concerns or that you have had a lot of problems. Just describe <u>your</u> experience. We promise that what you say will remain a secret. <u>No</u> one else will see what you say.

Part A

As you may remember, we asked you at the end of sixth grade to write down your thoughts about the seventh grade. In addition, we asked older students, teachers, principals, and parents to name the problems students have when they go to junior high school. From this information, we made a list of concerns about junior high school.

This booklet lists 32 concerns about junior high school. We would like to know which concerns you have experienced since coming to junior high school. On the pages which follow, please tell us about your concerns by marking an X. Please tell us whether each problem has been a great concern, a small concern, or no concern at all. Remember, you should tell us only about those concerns you have had since you started junior high school.

Here is an example. Suppose you were very worried about how to use your locker at the beginning of the school year. You would tell us that you were very concerned by putting an X in the column marked "A Great Concern."

Your answer sheet would look like this.

	My Level of Concern		
	A Great Concern	A Small Concern	No Concern at All
Since starting junior high school,			
using my locker has been	X	_____	_____

You should mark an X in the column labeled "A Great Concern" if you were very concerned about this at any time since starting junior high school. If you are no longer concerned about using your locker, but you were concerned, you should still tell us about your concern by marking an X.

Here is another example. Suppose you had only a small concern about using your locker. In that case, your paper should look like this.

	My Level of Concern		
	A Great Concern	A Small Concern	No Concern at All
Since starting junior high school, using my locker has been	_____	X	_____

Here is another example. Suppose you were not concerned about using your new locker in junior high school. In that case, your paper should look like this.

	My Level of Concern		
	A Great Concern	A Small Concern	No Concern at All
Since coming to junior high school, using my locker has been	_____	_____	X

This answer shows that at no time since you came to junior high school have you been concerned with the use of your locker.

Remember, we want to know about your concerns since you started junior high school.

Here is another example. Pretend that you were <u>not</u> worried about remembering to do your homework each night. Where would you mark the X in the following example?

	My Level of Concern		
	A Great Concern	A Small Concern	No Concern at All
Since coming to junior high school, remembering to do my homework each night has been	_____	_____	_____

You should have put your X in the far right column marked No Concern at All. In this example your paper should look like this.

	My Level of Concern		
	A Great Concern	A Small Concern	No Concern at All
Since coming to junior high school, remembering to do my homework each night has been	_____	_____	X

If you have any questions about how to mark your answers, please raise your hand and your teacher will help you.

Remember, <u>this is not a test</u>. There are no correct answers. Students have different concerns about junior high school and that is OK. Please tell us honestly about <u>your own</u> concerns.

There are 32 concerns listed below. Please read each one and mark an X on the space which best describes your experience.

Questions	My Level of Concern		
	A Great Concern	A Small Concern	No Concern at All
Since coming to junior high school,			
1. the difficulty of school work has been	_____	_____	_____
2. the difficulty with meeting new friends has been	_____	_____	_____
3. not seeing old friends as much has been	_____	_____	_____
4. stricter teachers have been	_____	_____	_____
5. being the youngest student in the new school after being the oldest in elementary school has been	_____	_____	_____
6. dating (not having a girl or boy friend) has been	_____	_____	_____
7. difficulty in talking to other students has been	_____	_____	_____
8. difficulty in talking to teachers has been	_____	_____	_____
9. fearing that older students might make fun of me has been	_____	_____	_____
10. fearing that older students might bully or beat me has been	_____	_____	_____
11. knowing how to act and what to do in school has been	_____	_____	_____
12. knowing how to use my locker and combination has been	_____	_____	_____

Questions	My Level of Concern		
	A Great Concern	A Small Concern	No Concern at All
Since coming to junior high school,			
13. finding the rooms of different teachers has been	_____	_____	_____
14. going to the restroom has been	_____	_____	_____
15. the difficulty of homework has been	_____	_____	_____
16. undressing for gym has been	_____	_____	_____
17. being able to understand what teachers say in class has been	_____	_____	_____
18. being able to get work done on time has been	_____	_____	_____
19. having too much homework to to do has been	_____	_____	_____
20. finding classes are too easy has been	_____	_____	_____
21. feeling I don't have the teachers who are best for me has been	_____	_____	_____
22. feeling other students expect me to do things that don't seem right to me has been	_____	_____	_____
23. being tired from spending more time in class has been	_____	_____	_____
24. not having recess has been	_____	_____	_____
25. having more opportunities to get into trouble has been	_____	_____	_____

Questions	My Level of Concern		
	A Great Concern	A Small Concern	No Concern at All
Since coming to junior high school			
26. getting to class on time has been	_____	_____	_____
27. feeling I am expected to act like a high school student (e.g., stay out late, go on dates) has been	_____	_____	_____
28. boring classes have been	_____	_____	_____
29. gym and successfully doing athletic activities have been	_____	_____	_____
30. teachers not taking a personal interest in me. have been	_____	_____	_____
31. my parents and teachers not communicating with each other have been	_____	_____	_____
32. the fear that my personal possessions will be stolen has been	_____	_____	_____

Part B

You have just told us about your concerns since starting junior high school. Sometimes students are concerned about things at the beginning of school, but they find these problems go away after a while. Other times students are still concerned about these things at the end of school.

On the next few pages we have listed the 32 concerns we already asked you about. Please tell us whether you are still concerned about these things.

Here is an example. Suppose a student was worried about losing her textbooks during the first week of school, but she is no longer concerned about this. She would tell us this by marking her paper like this.

	My Level of Concern		
	A Great Concern	A Small Concern	No Concern at All
Today, losing my textbooks is	_____	_____	X

Now you try one. Suppose a student was still very concerned about remembering to do his homework at night. Where would he mark his X?

	My Level of Concern		
	A Great Concern	A Small Concern	No Concern at All
Today, remembering to do my homework is	_____	_____	_____

You should have marked an X in the far left column labeled A Great Concern. Your paper should look like this.

	My Level of Concern		
	A Great Concern	A Small Concern	No Concern at All
Today, remembering to do my homework is	X	_____	_____

If you have any questions about what you are supposed to do, please raise your hand and your teacher will answer them.

Questions	My Level of Concern		
	A Great Concern	A Small Concern	No Concern at All
Today,			
1. the difficulty of school work is	_____	_____	_____
2. the difficulty with meeting new friends is	_____	_____	_____
3. not seeing old friends as much is	_____	_____	_____
4. stricter teachers are	_____	_____	_____
5. being the youngest student in the new school after being the oldest in elementary school is	_____	_____	_____
6. dating (not having a girl or boy friend) is	_____	_____	_____
7. difficulty in talking to other students is	_____	_____	_____
8. difficulty in talking to teachers is	_____	_____	_____
9. fearing that older students might make fun of me is	_____	_____	_____
10. fearing that older students might bully or beat me is	_____	_____	_____
11. knowing how to act and what to do in school is	_____	_____	_____
12. knowing how to use my locker and combination is	_____	_____	_____

Questions	My Level of Concern		
	A Great Concern	A Small Concern	No Concern at All
Today,			
13. finding the rooms of different teachers is	_____	_____	_____
14. going to the restroom is	_____	_____	_____
15. the difficulty of homework is	_____	_____	_____
16. undressing for gym is	_____	_____	_____
17. being able to understand what teachers say in class is	_____	_____	_____
18. being able to get work done on time is	_____	_____	_____
19. having too much homework to to do is	_____	_____	_____
20. finding classes are too easy is	_____	_____	_____
21. feeling I don't have the teachers who are best for me is	_____	_____	_____
22. feeling other students expect me to do things that don't seem right to me is	_____	_____	_____
23. being tired from spending more time in class is	_____	_____	_____
24. not having recess is	_____	_____	_____
25. having more opportunities to get into trouble is	_____	_____	_____

Questions	My Level of Concern		
	A Great Concern	A Small Concern	No Concern at All
Today,			
26. getting to class on time is	_____	_____	_____
27. feeling I am expected to act like a high school student (e.g., stay out late, go on dates) is	_____	_____	_____
28. boring classes are	_____	_____	_____
29. gym and successfully doing athletic activities are	_____	_____	_____
30. teachers not taking a personal interest in me are	_____	_____	_____
31. my parents and teachers not communicating with each other are	_____	_____	_____
32. the fear that my personal possessions will be stolen is	_____	_____	_____

Part C

Thank you for telling us about your concerns as a seventh grader. Please write your answers to the following questions in the space below. Again, we are interested in your own experiences, so please tell us about it in your own words.

(1) How is the seventh grade different from the sixth?

(2) How is the seventh grade the same as the sixth?

(3) Looking back at the start of the seventh grade, would you say you had a good start or a bad start? Why? What were the first three weeks in junior high like for you? What was good? What was bad?