

ROLE STRAIN, SATISFACTION AND SUCCESS:
THE CASE OF THE COLLEGIATE SCHOLAR

Robert J. Parelius
Rutgers University

Ann P. Parelius
Rutgers University

Robert A. Ellis
University of Georgia

Implicit in much of role analysis is the assumption that role strain necessarily interferes with role performance and satisfaction. This paper presents data which call this assumption into question. The analysis focuses on the experiences of collegiate scholars, prospective elites affiliated with both academic and social groups on campus. The data indicate that both as a group and as individuals, collegiate scholars are distinctively likely to achieve broad satisfaction and success despite high role strain.

There is in role theory a heavy emphasis upon the negative consequences of complex role- and status-sets (Parsons, 1951:280; Merton, 1957:381; Goode, 1960). Theorists have repeatedly called attention to the fact that individuals are often anxious, tense, indecisive and ineffective when faced with multiple and/or conflicting role demands (Bible and McComas, 1963; Bidwell, 1955; Getzels and Guba, 1954; Bross, et al., 1958; Grusky, 1959; Morse, 1953, Ort, 1950; Snoek, 1966). Frequent reference is made to role ambiguity, overload and conflict. These are all sources of role strain, the subjective feeling of difficulty in meeting role demands (Goode, 1960). Regarding role strain as undesirable, many analysts have stressed the mechanisms by which it can be avoided, coped with or eliminated (Merton, 1957: 371-380; Goode, 1960:468-487; Gross, et al., 1958; Toby, 1952; Gullahorn and Gullahorn, 1963:32-48; Wolfe and Shoek, 1962). In general such analyses leave the impression that high role strain precludes both satisfaction and success.

Yet there are reasons to question this negative picture. First, it must be noted that multiple roles bring prerequisites and opportunities as well as potentially burdening duties. Simmel clearly acknowledged the mixed outcomes of expanding one's social attachments and gave the following example:

The effect of marriage on both spouses is that they belong to several families; this has always been a source of enrichment, a way of expanding one's interests and relation-

ships, but also of intensifying one's conflicts (Simmel, 1955:141-142).

Seeman's study of school superintendents provides an empirical example of the simultaneous existence of role strain and satisfaction with which Simmel was concerned (Seeman, 1953). Secondly, there are individuals who define the exposure to diverse values, ideas and expectations in a positive way, as a stimulating challenge (Berger, 1964:192; Klausner, 1968). These individuals may also excel in their ability to perform under such difficult conditions. A case in point is the role strain inherent in most leadership positions and the individuals who serve successfully in them. Leaders are continually faced with multiple, conflicting and/or ambiguous demands. They must be able to reconcile differences, press for innovations and change, and define new goal-orientations. Thus, it may be common for players of certain roles to experience high levels of strain, satisfaction and success simultaneously.

One such role might well be that of the collegiate scholar (Ellis, et al., 1971). Individuals playing this role are by definition strongly committed to both the social and academic spheres of college life. The two divergent, if not contradictory, expectations of this role make it likely that individuals attempting to play the role would experience high levels of role strain. However, the role is also likely to be challenging and rewarding. Furthermore, collegiate scholars tend to have high academic talent, high socio-economic backgrounds, a history of leadership in high school and high status career goals. They are prospective regional, if not national, elites. Such individuals might well have developed the ability to excel despite role strain.

The purpose of this paper is to test the hypothesis that high levels of role strain are incompatible with satisfaction and success. The focus will be upon collegiate scholars, that group of college students committed to both academic and social success. Their pursuit of the goal of well-roundedness places them in a classic situation for the generation of role strain. But the crucial concern is whether or not the evidence indicates that among this group strain interferes with either satisfaction or success. No attempt will be made to untangle the web of causation among these variables. Rather, through testing a narrow, yet theoretically important hypothesis, significant new questions can be raised.

PROCEDURES

Sample and Data

Data for this analysis are taken from a multi-stage panel research, done during the 1960's, which was designed to evaluate how well Honors college students at the University of Oregon adjusted to the academic and social demands of college life during the 1960's. While students of both sexes are included in the original research, the focus of the present paper is on 391 male undergraduates who entered Oregon as freshmen in the early 1960's. These students were chosen by two separate procedures. The first entailed a 20 percent systematic sample, with random selection within each interval, of all males enrolling in the freshman class in 1961 (N=194). This sample, which we term the Regular Sample, provides a reliable estimate

of the social characteristics of the Oregon undergraduate population. The second consisted of a complete enumeration of three consecutive classes of male freshmen entering the Oregon Honors College in the fall of 1961, 1962, and 1962 (N=210). In both cases, only full-time, first-year unmarried freshmen who are Caucasian, native born, and between the ages of 17 and 20 were studied.

Mass-administered questionnaires were given the students at three periods during the freshman year (registration week, end of the fall quarter, and end of the spring quarter) and, so long as they remained in school, at the end of the sophomore and senior years. Those who required more than four years to graduate were given follow-up questionnaires during their terminal year at school. In all waves of questionnaire administration, non-response was kept to a minimum--usually amounting to no more than 5 percent of the sample in residence at any given time and never to more than 10 percent. What non-response bias did result was found not to be of sufficient magnitude to introduce significant distortion into the parameter estimates (Ellis, et al., 1970).

Other information was gained from administrative records and evaluations of the students by counselors residing in the freshman dormitories.

For present purposes the students have been divided into four analytical groups on the basis of their affiliation (or non-affiliation) with the Honors College and a fraternity. Collegiate scholars, members of both the Honors College and a fraternity, will be compared with other fraternity men, other Honors students, and independents. The independents represent a residual category and are composed of those not affiliated with either the Honors College or a fraternity.

COMMITMENT TO ORGANIZATIONS WITH DIVERGENT GOALS AND THE EXPERIENCE OF ROLE STRAIN

Divergent Goal Orientations

Numerous writers have represented fraternity men and scholarly undergraduates as polar types pursuing contrasting and conflicting goals and life styles (Clark, 1962:215; McConn, 1936; Johnson, 1946; Davie, 1956; Goldsen, 1960:81). It has been suggested that these two groups are hostile to one another, fraternity men seeing scholars as "grinds" and scholars seeing fraternity men as "dumb jocks". Indeed, at the University of Oregon, the Honors College was founded, in part, to provide some needed social support for traditional scholastic values. These seemed to be swamped by the "Country Club" atmosphere generated by an unchallenged fraternity system.

The data presented in Table 1 indicate that students who joined the fraternity system and those who entered the Honors College had widely divergent reasons for coming to college and placed major emphasis on very different areas of college life. Fraternity men were outstanding in the high value they placed upon enjoying the social life on campus, preparing for an occupation and developing their personality. Relatively little stress was put on broadening intellectual and cultural outlook, or increasing knowledge for the sake of knowledge. The Honors students, on the other hand, put their major stress on intellectual and cultural broadening. Compared to the

fraternity men, they stressed increasing knowledge for its own sake more, and stressed personality development, enjoyment, and occupational development less. In general, collegiate scholars were like other Honors College members in their espousal of intellectual values and like other fraternity members in terms of social values. One interesting exception is with regard to the item, "Increasing my knowledge for the sake of knowledge". Collegiate scholars are like other fraternity men and independents in their reluctance to espouse this puristic measure of intellectual outlook.

Further evidence of the divergent goals of the fraternities and the Honors College is to be found in the time budgets of members of the two groups. Table 2 indicates the amount of time spent by these four groups in four major activities: homework, organized social and extracurricular activities, dating and team sports. It is clear that fraternity men spend considerably more time than Honors students on organized social activities, dating and sports. Honors students, on the other hand, were considerably more likely to spend much of their time doing homework and participating less in other activities. These data are clearly consistent with our findings regarding reasons for coming to college. Both the fraternity men and Honors students successfully crystallized their value commitments in terms of their patterns of behavior. Collegiate scholars study more than other fraternity members, but somewhat less than other Honors College students. In extracurricular matters they are as active as other fraternity men and much more so than other Honors students. Thus, to a large extent, collegiate scholars have also crystallized their value commitments in their patterns of behavior.

The Meaning of Organizational Affiliations

If role strain is to be expected, membership in the Honors College and a fraternity must represent a meaningful social commitment, not just a nominal or symbolic identification. In order to show that these are, indeed, meaningful affiliations, data are presented on reference groups and friendship ties in Tables 3 and 4.

Reference Groups.--To document the commitment of the students to their membership groups, they were asked to indicate whether or not they would rejoin these groups if the choice were to be made again. They were also asked whether they would like to join these groups to which they did not belong. Statements of desire to join or rejoin a group are taken as indications that the student wishes to identify himself with it. Thus, it represents a positive reference group for him.

Examination of Table 3 reveals that the overwhelming majority of students in each group have positive orientations to those groups after several months of membership. There is also some positive orientation to non-membership groups, but this involves a considerably lower percentage of students and primarily reflects a positive evaluation of the Honors College by fraternity men. Especially important to this analysis is the fact that the large majority, 77%, of the collegiate scholars identify with both the Honors College and their fraternity. Maintaining membership in both groups would seem to have value for these students and the experience of dual membership has not led to a rejection of one or both of the groups.

Friendship Ties.--In spite of a positive orientation to a membership group, individuals can, of course, have little real contact with its members or activities. Becoming enmeshed in the interpersonal network of a group exposes an individual to numerous informal pressures for conformity to group norms and to increased role obligations. Thus, one way of avoiding excessive demand is to remain aloof and uninvolved. In order to determine whether or not our students were integrated into their membership groups, the students were asked to indicate the group affiliations of their three best friends.

Table 4 reveals that both fraternity men and Honors students tend to choose best friends from among the members of their own groups. All of the fraternity men report having at least one close friend in the fraternity system and 62% of the Honors students report having at least one close friend in the Honors program. Turning to the collegiate scholars, it is clear that friendship choices span both the Honors College and the fraternity. Ninety-five percent of the collegiate scholars have at least one friend in the fraternity system, a rate virtually identical to that of their non-honors fraternity brothers. Fifty-one percent have an Honors College student among their friends. This is somewhat below the percentage or in-choices for Honors students. In total, 46% of the collegiate scholars have among their three best friends both an Honors student and a fraternity member. Collegiate scholars, then, tend to rely more heavily upon the fraternities than the Honors College for close friends. However, approximately half of them draw from both groups, indicating a high degree of involvement with both sets of members. Indeed, the collegiate scholars choose Honors College friends almost as frequently as the Honors College students themselves.

In sum, a sizeable proportion of collegiate scholars would be highly susceptible to conflicting role demands. They are committed to membership in two distinct subcultures and are sufficiently intergrated into them to use both as sources of close friends. Although about half of the collegiate scholars do not have an Honors College student among their three closest friends, we would expect that many would still number Honors students among their associates. Thus, they would be exposed to peer group pressures from this source. Finally, we might mention that many of the role demands of the Honors College (high grades, independent research, etc.), are formalized ones. The student who is not caught up in the interpersonal network of the college would experience these demands nevertheless. Divergent role expectations would still exist, although without the same amount of informal pressure behind it.

Thus, the evidence strongly supports the contention that collegiate scholars have socially meaningfully commitments to two organizations with quite divergent goals. The data are clearly consistent with the idea that such students are subject to both role conflict and role overload. As stated previously, these are classic conditions for generating role strain.

Role Strain

The actual incidence of role strain on three individual measures and in terms of an index which combines the three is presented in Table 5. Two major conclusions are suggested by these data. First, of all the groups role strain is highest among collegiate scholars. Second, fraternity membership by itself engenders role strain. This appears to be due to the pressure for

social participation which the fraternities exert in addition to the academic pressures of the college. Both the regular fraternity men and the collegiate scholars show distinctly higher role strain than Honors students and independents who are not exposed to clear group expectations for extra-curricular participation.

ROLE SATISFACTION

The same groups which displayed relatively high role strain, the collegiate scholars and other fraternity men, also display high role satisfaction (see Table 6). This holds with regard to satisfaction with college life in general, opportunity structures and role performances. Thus, it appears that participation in the organized social sphere of college life is a crucial element in determining levels of satisfaction. However, access to an active intellectual, as well as social, life also appears to make some difference. This is indicated by the distinctive satisfaction of collegiate scholars with the opportunities available to them. Thus, the elemental truth of Simmel's observation that affiliation with multiple groups results in broadened opportunities is supported empirically.

ROLE PERFORMANCE

Turning from subjective role rewards in terms of satisfaction to objective rewards in terms of success, Table 7 indicates that the collegiate scholars as a group are outstanding. By the end of the freshman year, their academic average places them higher than all other groups, including the other Honors students. Socially, they are slightly more likely to date at least once a week than are other fraternity men and much more likely to do so than are Honors students or independents.

Furthermore, this pattern of success continues throughout their college career. First, they are the most likely to graduate from the University of Oregon in four years. Secondly, they do so with the highest cumulative grade point averages. Third, as measured by a continuing inventory of the students' activities, achievements and awards, the collegiate scholars are able to maintain the pattern of academic and social success established in high school.¹ Once again they virtually match or exceed other Honors students and other fraternity men in their academic and social success respectively.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ROLE STRAIN, SATISFACTION AND SUCCESS

To this point data have been presented showing that, as a group, collegiate scholars experience relatively great role strain, satisfaction and success. However, as W. S. Robinson (1950) has demonstrated, one cannot assume that group level relationships will hold at the individual level. Thus it remains to be demonstrated that, at the individual level, role strain is compatible with satisfaction and success and that collegiate scholars are more likely than others to experience role strain while at the same time being satisfied and successful.

The data presented in Table 8 do not support the proposition that high role strain precludes either satisfaction or success. Looking first at the relationships between role strain and satisfaction, although the differences are not large, among all four groups those experiencing high role strain are also more likely to experience high satisfaction with college life in general. Considering only percentage differences of ten or more as meaningful, in half of the twelve comparisons high strain is associated with high satisfaction, while in the others no difference appears between those experiencing high and low levels of strain.

The relationships between role strain and success are somewhat more complex. Among collegiate scholars and fraternity men, high role strain is unrelated to academic performance and positively related to social success. Thus, the hypothesis that role strain interferes with success is not supported. However, among Honors students and independents there is a negative relationship between high role strain and both academic and social success. Thus, for these latter two groups the hypothesis is supported.² The fact that both the collegiate scholars and fraternity men were highly active in extracurricular affairs during high school (while Honors students and independents were much less so) may provide a key to understanding these findings (Ellis, et al., 1971:37). It may well be that through previous training these students have developed the capacity to deal more effectively than others with complex role demands and the role strain generated by them. In addition, it should be noted that membership in both the fraternities and the Honors College is optional, so that self-selection has operated. Thus, collegiate scholars have opted for an especially challenging set of role expectations, and on the basis of previous experience have reason to expect success in coping with them.

The arguments above suggest that the percentage of individuals who experience high role strain simultaneously with high satisfaction and success should be highest among the collegiate scholars. The data presented in Table 9 provide consistent support for this. In all cases the co-existence of high role strain with high role satisfaction and performance is highest among the collegiate scholars. However, in only six of the cases are the differences meaningful in terms of the ten percent different criterion.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The primary importance of this paper lies in the fact that evidence has been presented which calls into question the common assumption that role strain necessarily interferes with satisfaction and success. Once our intellectual sets are broken, a number of new questions present themselves for further analysis.

1. Since it is no longer possible to assume that role strain has a simple causal, linear and negative relationship with satisfaction and success, precisely what sorts of relationships do exist among these variables? Are they causal or spurious, linear or curvilinear, positive or negative?

2. What are the relevant personality and social structural characteristics which might affect these relationships? Among the likely personality characteristics are intelligence, tolerance for ambiguity, lethargy, introversion, level of mobilization and self-confidence. Included among the social structural characteristics which are probably relevant are patterns of intergroup conflict, visibility of role performances, latitude of role demands and the distribution of prestige and power.
3. Finally, several questions are raised about the experience of role strain among prospective elites. Do such individuals actually seek strain, defining it in a positive way, as challenge? Is it the case that such individuals acquire through practicing great skill in coping with complex role demands so that role strain is not as likely to interfere with their pursuits? Or is strain, even for these exceptional individuals, simply the negative aspect of an on-balance positive cost-benefit calculation which becomes necessary when one has multiple group affiliations or leadership roles?

Unfortunately, these data are only sufficient to raise, not to answer, these questions. As always further research is needed.

Footnotes

¹Copies of the coding procedures developed for the College Achievement Scale, as well as a statement detailing the theoretical rationale underlying its construction, are available.

Examples of high achievement for each of the areas of success are:

scholastic - graduation with departmental honors or university honors for high scholarship, membership in Phi Beta Kappa or Sigma Xi.

athletic - lettering in a major varsity sport.

social - holding major office in a living organization, including being a representative on the Inter-Fraternity Council or the Inter-Dormitory Council.

extracurricular - holding a major position of leadership in a major campus organization or in student government.

general honors - being one of the approximately 40 students out of any undergraduate cohort tapped for membership in men's undergraduate honorary societies. These societies are campus-wide organizations which choose as members students who have made outstanding contributions to the university.

²It should be noted that the direction of the causal relationships between role strain, satisfaction and success are uncertain. One might well argue, for instance, that too much or too little success leads to role strain rather than vice versa. For instance, the excessive social activity of collegiate scholars and their fraternity brothers might be said to result in difficulty in keeping up academically, while the restricted social life of Honors students and independents might also produce strain in that it is difficult for them to be adequately well-rounded. Nonetheless, this mode of analysis remains appropriate in testing the assertion that role strain interferes with satisfaction and success.

References

- Berelson, Bernard and Gary A. Steiner
1964 *Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- Berger, Peter I.
1964 *The Human Shape of Work*. New York: The MacMillan Company.
- Bible, B. L. and J. D. McComas
1963 "Role consensus and teacher effectiveness." *Social Forces* 42 (December):225-232.
- Bidwell, C. E.
1955 "The administrative role and satisfaction in teaching." *Journal of Educational Sociology* 29 (September):41-47.
- Clark, Burton R.
1962 *Educating the Expert Society*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.
- Davie, James S. and A. Paul Hare
1956 "Button down college culture: A study of undergraduate life." *Human Organization* 14 (Winter):13-20.
- Ellis, Robert A. and Lucian Marquis
1964 "Evaluation of the University of Oregon Honors College." *The Superior Student* 6 (January-February):23-26.
- Ellis, Robert A., Calvin M. Endo, and J. Michael Armer
1970 "The use of potential nonrespondents for studying response bias." *Pacific Sociological Review* 13 (Spring):103-109.
- Ellis, Robert A., Robert A. Parelius, and Ann P. Parelius
1971 "The collegiate scholar: Education for elite status." *Sociology of Education* 44 (Winter):27-58.
- Getzels, J. W. and E. G. Guba
1954 "Role, role conflict and effectiveness: An empirical study." *American Sociological Review* 19 (April):164-175.

- Goldsen, Rose K., et al.
1960 What College Students Think. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc.
- Goode, W. J.
1960 "A theory of role strain." American Sociological Review 25 (August):438-496.
- Gross, Neal, A. W. McEachern and W. S. Mason
1958 "Role conflict and its resolution." pp. 447-459 in Eleanor E. Macoby, T. M. Newcomb and E. L. Hartley (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt.
- Gross, Neal, Ward Mason and Alexander McEachern
1958 Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Grusky, O.
1959 "Role conflict in organization: A study of prison camp officials." Administrative Science Quarterly 3 (June):452-472.
- Gullahorn, J. T. and Jeanne E. Gullahorn
1963 "Role conflict and its resolutions." Sociological Quarterly 4 (Spring):32-48.
- Johnson, Burgess
1946 Campus Versus Classroom. New York: I. Washburn.
- Klausner, Samuel Z. (ed.)
1968 Why Man Takes Chances: Studies in Stress-Seeking. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company.
- McConn, Max
1938 College of Kindergarten? New York: New Republic.
- Merton, Robert K.
1957 Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press.
- Morse, Nancy C.
1953 Satisfactions in the White Collar Job. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Ort, R. S.
1950 "A study of role conflicts as related to happiness in marriage." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 45 (October):691-699.
- Parsons, Talcott
1951 The Social System. New York: The Free Press.
- Robinson, W. S.
1950 "Ecological correlations and the behavior of individuals." American Sociological Review XV (June):351-57.

Seeman, Melvin

1953 "Role conflict and ambivalence in leadership." *American Sociological Review* 18 (August):373-380.

Simmel, George

1955 *Conflict and the Web of Group Affiliations*. Translated by Reinhard Bendix. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Snoek, J. D.

"Role strain in diversified role sets." *American Journal of Sociology* 71 (January):363-72.

Toby, Jackson

1952 "Some variables in role conflict analysis." *Social Forces* 30 (March):323-327.

Wolfe, Donald M. and J. D. Snoek

1962 "A study of tensions and adjustment under role conflict." *Journal of Social Issues* 18 (July):102-121.

TABLE 1

REASONS FOR COMING TO COLLEGE AMONG FOUR CAMPUS GROUPS
(Reported in Percentages)

	Campus Group			Independents (107)
	Collegiate Scholars (65) (N)	Honors Students (145)	Fraternity Men (74)	
Broaden my intellectual and cultural outlook (major importance) ^a	62	62	25	35
Increase my knowledge for the sake of knowledge (major importance)	20	41	17	17
Prepare for an occupation (major importance)	55	43	69	63
Develop personality and character (highly important)	50	40	54	44
Enjoy college social life (fairly or highly important)	73	42	79	48

^a Major reasons are those rated as being of first or second most important out of a checklist of twenty-one reasons for coming to college. Besides designating these major reasons, respondents were asked to judge each item according to whether it was Highly Important, Only Fairly Important, or Not Important.

TABLE 2
THE TIME BUDGETS OF FOUR CAMPUS GROUPS

Measure of Weekly Activity (N)	Campus Group			
	Collegiate Scholars (63)	Honors Students (120)	Fraternity Men (67)	Independents (79)
Homework				
More than twenty hours	37	50	25	23
Ten or less hours	13	09	21	10
Organized social and extracurricular activities				
Five or more hours	60	14	61	23
None	00	45	06	45
Dating				
At least once a week	54	27	49	33
None or rarely	19	39	13	37
Team sports				
Five or more hours	23	07	23	09
None	55	72	44	71

TABLE 3

POSITIVE REFERENCE GROUPS OF FOUR CAMPUS GROUPS
(Reported in Percentages)

Positive Reference Group ^a	Campus Group				
	(N)	Collegiate Scholars (63)	Honors Students (120)	Fraternity Men (67)	Independents (77)
Honors College		89	90	52	49
Fraternity		90	26	39	39
Both the Honors College and a Fraternity		77	23	47	22

^aThe Honors College was considered a positive reference group if the respondent answered "definitely yes" or "probably yes" to the question, "If you had it to do over again, would you enter the Honors College?" (for Honors Students) and "Would you enter the Honors College if given the opportunity?" (for Fraternity Students). Fraternities were considered positive reference groups if the respondent indicated he clearly expected to join a fraternity and that belonging to a fraternity was "very important" or "fairly important" to him.

TABLE 4
 FRIENDSHIP PATTERNS AMONG FOUR CAMPUS GROUPS
 (Reported in Percentages)

	Campus Group			
	Collegiate Scholars (63)	Honors Students (120)	Fraternity Men (67)	Independents (77)
(N)				
Number of three best friends who are in the Honors College				
None	49	39	94	77
One or more	51	62	16	23
Number of three best friends who are fraternity members				
None	05	56	00	45
One or more	95	44	100	55
Percent who have included among their three best friends both a member of the Honors College and a fraternity member	46	29	14	12
Number of three best friends who are collegiate scholars				
None	71	89	90	96
One or more	29	11	10	04

TABLE 5

INCIDENCE OF ROLE STRAIN WITHIN FOUR CAMPUS GROUPS
(Reported in Percentages)

Measure of Role Strain (N)	Campus Group		
	Collegiate Scholars (65)	Honors Students (145)	Fraternity Men (74) Independents (107)
Percent indicating some concern with:			
Keeping a balance between course work and social activities	71	54	64
Having too many organizations to join	14	02	10
Keeping a balance between course work and extracurricular activities	62	42	57
Index of role strain ^a			
0	16	36	22
1 - 3	51	49	55
4 - 6	33	15	22
X	2.49	1.61	2.08
			1.59

^aThe index was formed by assigning a score to the response on each of the three items and summing these scores. A score of zero was given if the respondent reported not experiencing the difficulty. Experience with no concern or slight concern was scored one. Expression of moderate or great concern was given a score of two.

TABLE 6
 INCIDENCE OF HIGH ROLE SATISFACTION AMONG FOUR CAMPUS GROUPS
 (Reported in Percentages)

	Campus Group			
	Collegiate Scholars (63)	Honors Students (120)	Fraternity Men (67)	Independents (73)
(N)				
High satisfaction with college life in general	41	17	49	29
Broad scope of satisfaction with opportunity structure ^a	43	25	30	21
Broad scope of satisfaction with role performance	19	07	22	06

^a Broad satisfaction means high satisfaction with two or more of the following items: intellectual level of your courses, opportunities for extracurricular participation, opportunities for informal contact with teachers, opportunities for athletic participation.

^b Broad satisfaction means high satisfaction with three or more of the following six items: your grades, part taken in extracurricular activities, part taken in athletics, your actual informal relationships with teachers, popularity with members of your own sex, popularity with members of the opposite sex.

TABLE 7

SUCCESSFUL ROLE PERFORMANCE AMONG FOUR CAMPUS GROUPS

	Campus Group			
	Collegiate Scholars (63) (N for freshmen) (65) (N for career data)	Honors Students (120) (145)	Fraternity Men (67) (74)	Independents (73) (107)
<u>End of Freshman Year</u>				
Mean first year grade point average	2.92	2.84	2.31	2.00
Percent dating at least once a week	54	27	49	33
<u>Collegiate Career</u>				
Percent graduated in four years	72	61	57	32
Mean cumulative grade point average ^a	2.84	2.74	2.36	2.10
<u>Areas of Success</u>				
Scholastic	15	19	01	03
Nonscholastic ^b				
Athletic	53	22	42	03
Social	02	03	05	01
Extracurricular	39	10	10	03
General Honors	35	16	22	04
	25	07	00	01

^aBased only on grades actually obtained and the University of Oregon, with grades being computed on a four-point scale and 4.00 being the highest possible.

^bSuccess has been achieved in athletics and/or social organizations (i.e., living groups) and/or extracurricular activities--including student government.

TABLE 8
 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ROLE STRAIN AND MEASURES OF
 ROLE SATISFACTION AND SUCCESS
 (Reported in Percentages)

	Collegiate Scholars		Honors Students		Fraternity Men		Independents	
	High Strain	Low Strain	High Strain	Low Strain	High Strain	Low Strain	High Strain	Low Strain
(N)	(21)	(42)	(18)	(102)	(15)	(51)	(10)	(66)
<u>Role Satisfaction</u>								
College life in general	48	33	22	16	60	46	40	26
Opportunity structure	48	41	44	22	33	33	60	14
Actual role performance	29	28	11	20	33	31	40	14
<u>Successful Role Performance</u>								
Cumulative grade point average is 3.00 or above	33	41	33	58	07	08	00	11
Has dated at least once a week on the average	62	50	17	28	73	40	20	31

TABLE 9
 THE COEXISTENCE OF HIGH ROLE STRAIN WITH SATISFACTION
 AND SUCCESS AMONG FOUR CAMPUS GROUPS
 (Reported in Percentages)

	Campus Group			
	Collegiate Scholars (63)	Honors Students (120)	Fraternity Men (66)	Independents (76)
(N)				
<u>High Strain and High Satisfaction</u>				
College life in general	16	03	14	05
Opportunity structure	16	07	09	03
Actual role performance	10	02	03	05
<u>High Strain and High Success</u>				
Cumulative grade point average is 3.00 or above	11	05	01	00
Has dated at least once a week on the average	21	02	17	03