A REPLICATION STUDY OF SELECTED

BUREAUCRATIC CHARACTERISTICS

AND STUDENT ALIENATION IN

THE PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL

By

JAMES DWIGHT DAVIDSON

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1972

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1975

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1980

A REPLICATION STUDY OF SELECTED

BUREAUCRATIC CHARACTERISTICS

AND STUDENT ALIENATION IN

THE PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL

Thesis approved:

_____
Thesis Adviser

_____

_____

_____

_____
Dean of the Graduate College

ii

1069470

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

When one performs a study in the realm of scientific behavioral
research, that person has dealt with certain factors and developed
certain conclusions from the analysis of his research findings. The
question arises: Will the research findings remain essentially con-
stant as long as prescribed guidelines related to the behavioral re-
search study remain constant? One of the greatest necessities of being
consistent within a study is that replication of that study can be per-
formed. Thus, as studies are replicated and consistency is maintained,
these studies remain nearly constant and the hypotheses upon which
these studies are based are strengthened. As noted by Kerlinger, rep-
lication is too seldom practiced in any research and it is particularly
needed in factor analytic studies. The "reality" of factors is much
more compelling if found in two or three different and large samples.[1]

This writer will attempt to replicate the Anderson study by using
the same basic structure and premise which he used. Anderson's study,
"Selected Bureaucratic Characteristics and Student Alienation in the
Public High School," will provide the basic design which this replica-
tion study will employ.[2]

As one enters into the study of school administration it quickly

becomes apparent that certain theories are recognized as fitting into the conceptualized structure of that which is school organization. There are certain areas in which organizational theories are recognized as being a part of today's schools. The main area which this writer will be concerned is the interactional relationships between participating groups and their members in relation to the organization's various activities.

Participants within a given educational organization will attempt to fulfill certain needs, perhaps unique to themselves; furthermore, they will establish certain goals, perhaps to assist in fulfilling their perceived needs. The actions taken by the participants will vary at times. The necessity for personal, as well as group, interactions will exist. But the prime factor which will act as a limiting boundary to the activities in this organization is the structural limitations imposed by the school's environment.

The public high school was the focus of this study. For the purpose of this study only the social system located within the public high school will be examined. This school social system has certain defined and undefined purposes composed of various concrete and intangible elements. For the purposes of this study the primary concrete elements were administrative staff, professional teaching staff, students, and the school's environmental structure.

The main intangible elements which existed were the teaching staff's perception as related to the administrative staff's organizational structuring of the school. The other element was the relationship which existed between the teaching staff and the students. Granted, there are more concrete and intangible areas related to the

school; but there is no necessity to identify or elaborate these areas any further in this particular study.

It has been suggested that persons within a certain organizational structure develop particular orientations toward that organization. These orientations are the results of the individual's relationship to that organization.[3] In an attempt to replicate the basic constructs of the previous study it will be necessary to determine the relationship of certain constraints imposed by the organization to the selected orientations of participants within the organization. Stated in simpler terms, this replication study will show the relationship of selected bureaucratic characteristics and student alienation in the public high school.

Definition of Terms

In order to maintain consistency between Anderson's original study and this replication study, this writer will use the same sources for definitions that were used in that study.

Bureaucracy: For the purpose of this investigation, this will be described by the following characteristics: hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, and impersonalization.

Hierarchy of Authority. The extent to which the locus of decision making is prestructured by the organization.[4]

Rules and Regulations. The degree to which the behavior of organizational members is subject to organizational control and the extent to which organizational members must follow organizationally defined procedures.[5]

Impersonality. The extent to which both organizational members

and outsiders are treated without regard to individual qualities.[6]

Alienation: For the purpose of this investigation, this term will be described by the following characteristics: powerlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement.

Powerlessness. Is "the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes or the reinforcements he seeks."[7]

Isolation. Is "assigning low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in a given society."[8]

Self-Estrangement. Is "the degree of dependence of the given behavior upon anticipated future rewards."[9]

Supplementary Data Terms:

Academically Oriented Course of Study. For the purposes of this study, an academically oriented course of study needs to be more fully defined. This means that more than half of the courses in which the student is enrolled consist of courses which have traditionally been considered as "academic". These courses include the language arts, social sciences, mathematics, science, and foreign languages. They do not include such courses as music, art, home economics, physical education, industrial arts, business education courses, journalism, speech, and drama.

Non-Academically Oriented Course of Study. Also for purposes of this investigation, non-academically oriented course of study needs to be clearly defined. This would be a course of study that consisted of more than half of the courses in which the

student is enrolled, being courses which have traditionally been considered as "non-academic". This would mean that more than half of the courses being taken would be such courses as music, art, home economics, industrial arts, physical education, business education courses, journalism, speech, and drama.

Minority Group. This group is defined as those students who perceive themselves as not fitting into the mainstream of the school and its activities. It does not necessarily refer to race.

Non-Minority. This group is defined as those students who perceive their situation in relationship within the school as "fitting in" with the majority of the students in that school.

Assumptions

Paramount to this study is the basic assumption that the procedures used by this investigator did not adversely affect in any fashion the original research framework. The use of the building principal as administrator of the instruments and his proper use of the itemized procedural list must be assumed to have been done properly. The itemized list was so constructed that upon following each step in sequence, the principal should be able to administer the two instruments with no difficulty. It was assumed that the responses provided by the teachers in the School Organizational Inventory and the responses of the students in the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire were representative of their present attitudes toward the school system of which they are a member. It is further assumed that the populations which were asked to respond were

representative of persons in school systems throughout Oklahoma.

Limitations of the Study

The primary limitation of this study is that the investigation must be performed very closely to the framework set forth by Anderson in his original study. For replication to be assimilated, it will be necessary for the investigator to adhere very closely to the structural body of Anderson's manuscript.

Although a necessity does exist to adhere closely to the original study, certain modifications were made between the two studies. Whereas Anderson was directly involved with the administration of the teacher and pupil questionnaires, in this study that task was the function of the building principal. Slightly different approaches were taken in selection and determination of those schools which involved themselves in these studies. It should also be noted that a different number of students were given the questionnaires in each case. The primary reason for this was to improve on the response factor from the schools. Also, certain statistical analysis methods were present in the Anderson study, whereas other types were present in this study which will hopefully shed more light on the data collected.

Thus it is readily apparent that various problems of replication quite probably do exist. Though the differences are somewhat varied, this researcher was satisfied that there was enough comparison in the two studies to warrant the title of a replication study. Granted, the two studies in question are not identical; yet the same basic research framework was maintained in this replication study.

There are certain variables which are distinctly unique to this

study. The relationship which exists between the alienation exhibited by the students' responses and the bureaucratic structure as perceived by the teachers is, of course, the crux of this study. This interactional force must be recognized and interpreted by the researcher. Furthermore, any extraneous variables need to be removed so as not to affect the basic assumptions of such a project.

This study involved only the scope of the organizational structure as perceived by its teachers' and the students' attitudes within each system. The study was limited to those findings which were supplied by the two questionnaires. Any generalized statements can only be linked to those settings which were investigated. The limitation of this study is the analysis of the relationship between certain bureaucratic characteristics and certain selected areas of student alienation. There are other possible variables such as environmental factors or the location of the school district within the state which were not considered due to the structural framework of this study.

Significance of the Study

For the full effectiveness of the need for such a study, one might refer back to the basic theory of bureaucracy as proposed by Weber. Max Weber, the noted German economist and sociologist, is generally considered to be the father of bureaucratic theory.[10] According to Hall, the bureaucratic form of administration of formal organizations is the most efficient type of organizational structure in its pure form.[11] The rationale developed to support this type structure consists of five specific areas. These areas defined by Blau and Scott are as follows:

1. Division of labor which makes possible specialization

2. Hierarchial authority structure

3. Rules and regulations govern official decisions

4. Officials maintain an impersonal orientation

5. Organization employment is a career for the officials within[12]

Albert Einstein once said, "We had clear goals before, but imperfect means; but now we have perfected the means but have confused the goals."[13] Perhaps this is the notion many writers have when they are addressing the idea that Weber's bureaucratic structure, though theoretically the most efficient, may have confused the goals of educating the participants (students) of that organization. If educators are missing the goals of education due to the bureaucratic system, they are a part of the changes that must be made. If certain aspects of the bureaucratic structure cause certain types of alienation within the student participants, a need exists for the school to develop various alternate structures to aid the students in their prime task, learning. As Einstein noted, educators must not lose sight of their "goal"--the goal of facilitating the learning process of the students in the most effective manner.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Fred N. Kerlinger, _Foundations of Behavioral Research_ (New York, 1973).

[2]Carl Ray Anderson, "Selected Bureaucratic Characteristics and Student Alienation in the Public High School" (Ed. D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, 1970), p. 1-41.

[3]Chester I. Bernard, _The Functions of the Executive_ (Cambridge, Mass., 1938).

[4]Richard Hall, "Some Organizational Considerations in the Professional-Organizational Relationship," _Administrative Science Quarterly_, Vol. 12 (December, 1967), p. 465.

[5]Ibid., p. 465.

[6]Ibid., p. 465.

[7]Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," _American Sociological Review_, Vol. 24 (December, 1959), p. 784.

[8]Ibid., p. 789.

[9]Ibid., p. 790.

[10]Otto Stammer, _Max Weber and Sociology Today_ (New York, 1971), p. 1.

[11]Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, _Formal Organizations: A Comparative Study_ (San Francisco, 1960), p. 32-33.

[12]Ibid., p. 32-33.

[13]William R. Rogers, _The Alienated Students_ (Nashville, 1969), p. 19.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE,

RATIONALE AND HYPOTHESES

Introduction

The voluminous amount of literature related to the variables being
used in this study was a concern to this researcher. It was felt that
selectivity should be exercised. Even though a selected review of the
literature is reported, it is felt that the salient and significant
literature is reported. This chapter will consist of a review of lit-
erature which will include those concepts that are related to the re-
search of this study. The second part of this chapter will deal with
support rationale and the statement of the hypotheses tested.

Review of Selected Literature

Bureaucracy

In this study of selected bureaucratic characteristics the prime
theorist used was Max Weber. While there are numerous other organiza-
tional theorists which were quite perceptive in their thought, none fit
the needs of this study better than Weber. This noted German scholar's
principles of bureaucracy were so perceptive that careful theoretical
analysis would only seem to predicate statements made concerning formal
organization's structure. Consequently, Weber's concept of bureaucracy

has had a dramatic influence on much of the research and thinking within

the field of formal organization. Blau and Scott recognized the major

role of Max Weber when they wrote:

> Max Weber's perceptive and incisive theoretical analysis of
> the principles of bureaucracy is undoubtedly the most impor-
> tant general statement on formal organization. Since its
> publication in Wirtschaft and Gesellschaft about forty years
> ago, it has had a profound influence on almost all subse-
> quent thinking and research in the field.[1]

Developed by Weber were five basic characteristics of bureaucracy.

Weber identified these and later other individuals have expanded upon

them. Stated in a concise form by Blau the following are Weber's

bureaucratic characteristics:

(1) hierarchy of authority

(2) rules and regulations

(3) impersonalization

(4) career status

(5) specialization[2]

Other persons besides Blau have derived basically the same character-

istics from Weber's works. Etzioni noted these characteristics in

Modern Organizations[3] and Howton did likewise in Functionaries.[4] Thus,

this generally accepted view of Weber's work sets the groundwork for

this study's structural basis.

These characteristics which Weber identified were further dis-

cussed by Blau and Scott in this manner:

> In Weber's view, these organizing principles maximize ration-
> al decision-making and administrative efficiency. Bureauc-
> racy, according to him, is the most efficient form of
> administrative organization, because experts with much
> experience are best qualified to make technically correct
> decisions, and because disciplined performance governed by
> abstract rules and coordinated by the authority hierarchy
> fosters a rational and consistent pursuit of organizational

objectives.[5]

Furthermore, Weber's work prompted Etzioni to write:

> Max Weber was very concerned with the distribution of power among the organizational positions in the bureaucratic structure, and this represents the 'formal' element of his work. At the same time, in this exploration of legitimation he opened up a whole new perspective on the study of satisfaction derived from participation in the organization.[6]

Of the three basic types of authority that Weber mentions, the one he identifies as legal authority seems to be best suited to study the structure of bureaucracy in today's complex organizations. Weber emphasized that obedience is not owed to anyone personally but to a position enacted by rules and regulations which specify to whom and to what rule people owe obedience. Furthermore, persons of authority must also stay within the framework of "the law" and the "rules and regulations".[7] Stated another way by Weber:

> That every body of law consists essentially in a consistent system of abstract rules which have normally been intentionally established. Furthermore, administration of law is held to consist in the application of these rules to particular cases; the administrative process is the rational pursuit of the interests which are specified in the order governing the corporate group within the limits laid down by legal precepts and following principles which are capable of generalized formulation and are approved in the order governing the group, or at least not disapproved in it.[8]

Through legal authority the bureaucratic administration is able to break the hold of tradition and social customs. This frees the organization from the rule by a single individual, and from the dead hand of past traditions.[9]

Keeping in mind that Weber developed his pure type of bureaucracy as a theoretical framework, certain concepts need to be established. The "superior", that person in command, has a certain degree of "competence" and/or "jurisdiction". This in turn affords this person

the legitimized position to govern over those subordinates of lower offices and positions. This defined chain of command as established by the two above-mentioned tenets prompts the obedience to the hierarchy of offices (hierarchy of authority). Furthermore, in the bureaucratic (legal) system the "superior" official proceeds without regard to the person (impersonalization) and by following rational rules with strict formality set forth by the organization (rules and regulations). When or where established rules are not sufficient, this "superior" adheres to "functional" considerations of expediency.[10]

Upon review of the five characteristics of bureaucracy enumerated by Weber, it was decided by this writer that only three would be of use in relation to the rationale development in this study. Due to this it was desirable to further expound on these areas within this review of literature. These three areas are as follows: (1) hierarchy of authority, (2) impersonalization, (3) rules and regulations.

Hierarchy of Authority. As defined by Hall, hierarchy of authority is: "The extent to which the locus of decision making is pre-structured by the organization."[11] In simpler terms, in bureaucracy the organization is such that various levels of hierarchial positions do exist. These levels (offices) exist to the degree that there is a clear and apparent order of structure within the organization. In each case the lower offices are subject to the upper or supervisory offices that are pre-structured in the organization.

This hierarchy of authority must allow by its own nature the official in his given office to be superior to his subordinates. He must be able to dictate tasks to be done to his subordinates as long as they are within the realm or scope of the organizations. Furthermore, this

administrator in turn is a subordinate to his own superior. He should
be held accountable and responsible for his as well as his subordinates'
works and actions. F. William Howton stated in this manner:

> An organization is hierarchial if, at its core, it has a body
> of officials arranged pyramidally in graded ranks. It is a
> ladder-like structure of nearly equivalent levels of author-
> ity. One can always tell, in principle, who outranks whom.[12]

The "power" which is necessary for various administrative actions
to be taken is made available to each officer due to his office (posi-
tion) within the hierarchy of authority.[13] But, a fundamental criter-
ion which Weber assumed in relation to authority was that there was a
certain minimum of voluntary submission by those members of the organi-
zation. This voluntary compliance (submission) to superiors' direc-
tives is that which separates authority (voluntary) from power (imposed
upon despite resistance). Weber sees this voluntary compliance as
being of paramount importance to the concept of authority in a bureau-
cratic system.[14]

Victor Thompson has also done extensive work in the area of hier-
archial structure. Through his works, it is readily detectable that
the superordinate-subordinate relationship is the core of the hier-
archial arrangement. Furthermore, certain rights are afforded the
superordinate in relation to the subordinates under his authority.
These rights might be listed in the following manner:

(1) superior has the right to expect obedience and
loyalty from his subordinates

(2) superior has the right to monopolize communi-
cation (going through channels)

(3) superior has the right to deference from his
subordinates, the right to be treated with
extra care and respect in a one-way fashion
toward the superior

(4) superior has a right to be somewhat insensitive
as to subordinate's personal needs[15]

The rights of the superior as previously mentioned in turn help to

establish certain secondary rights. These secondary rights are so

related to the organization that they are the areas of true interaction

between the superior, subordinate, and the organization.[16] There is

one other area which should be mentioned in relation to the super-

ordinate's position in the hierarchy; that is, how they are chosen for

this position of authority.

It has been suggested that a major consideration, in terms of an

individual being selected to advance within the organizational hier-

archy, is to show a superior knowledge or technical competency in his

work. This was established by Weber in his original works in this

field. Presthus noted such a fact in his comparative study of Middle-

Eastern organizational development. He stated:

> Officials are selected on the basis of technical qualifi-
> cations, usually tested by examination or guaranteed by
> diplomas certifying technical training. In sociological
> terms, the bases of recruitment are 'universalistic', ie.,
> recruitment is broadly based throughout the society and
> cuts across class, ethnic and religious lines, since it
> is determined largely on objective bases of training and
> competence.[17]

Ideally, the superordinate will be able to oversee in the area of

which he is charged with responsibility. By manipulation of personnel

within this area, the superordinate should be able to adjust to the

demands placed on his segment of the organization. This, however, is

not always the case. That which gives the superior his authority in

actuality may be part of the deterrent to innovation that is needed.

The definition of the superordinate's role may be such that the super-

ordinate allows it to become dysfunctional. By strictly adhering to

his rights as a superordinate and yet passing all the obligations on to
the subordinates, an unhealthy organizational problem might exist.
Granted, the concept of delegation of authority does exist; but when
all obligations of a position are passed on from the superordinate to
the subordinate, the position of the superordinate is no longer one
which is necessary in the bureaucratic structure. This problem can
become somewhat more apparent when discussed in relation to "the right
to veto or affirm" as illustrated by Abbott. He states:

> Moreover, hierarchial relationships tend to overemphasize
> the right to veto and to underemphasize the right to af-
> firm . . . Such a system obviously favors the status quo
> and inhibits innovation from below.[18]

These hierarchial breakdowns weaken the Weberian model. For
Weber's "ideal-type bureaucracy" to be maintained in a working fashion,
the members of that organization need to know precisely what the organ-
izational blueprints are.[19] By assuming one's role and staying within
the "line" of authority (going through the proper channels of communi-
cation) the hierarchy of authority is maintained.[20] The need to adhere
to the principles set forth in the hierarchy of authority organization
is almost an absolute necessity. Non-adherence to the hierarchial
structure is looked upon "as the epitome of immoral organizational
behavior".[21]

Impersonalization. Of the five bureaucratic characteristics set
forth by Weber the second one which pertains to this study is the con-
cept that decisions must be made without regard of the individual who
might be involved. When explaining this relationship in relation to
the superior, Weber stated, "he (the superior) is subject to an imper-
sonal order to which his actions are oriented." Weber further ex-
pounded, "It is held that the members of a corporate group, in so far

as they obey a person in authority, do not owe this obedience to him as an individual, but to the impersonal order."[22]

In this same line of thought Hall defined impersonality as: "The extent to which both organizational members and outsiders are treated without regard to individual qualities."[23] By using Hall's definition it becomes evident that for optimum efficiency impersonality must be maintained on all levels of interaction.

Stated in yet another manner Blau and Scott seem to place the restrictions of impersonality in a more applicable fashion for the superior (official), subordinate, and client. Blau and Scott wrote:

> Officials are expected to assume an impersonal orientation in their contacts with clients and with other officials. Clients are to be treated as cases, the officials being expected to disregard all personal considerations and to maintain complete emotional detachment, and subordinates are to be treated in a similar impersonal fashion . . . Impersonal detachment is designed to prevent the personal feelings of officials from distorting their rational judgment in carrying out their duty.[24]

This supposed need for impersonality was also noted by Abbott. Not only did he think the need existed, he thought that it was an absolute necessity for the officials to be impersonal. Otherwise, there would be no assurance that rationality in decision making would exist. Without this rationality, equitable treatment for the subordinates would be a thing of the past.[25]

Regardless of how an organization may be based in bureaucratic theory, the problem of individualism and personality will, to a certain degree, appear. Anderson attributed this to three primary reasons:

(1) individual (personal) interaction outside of the scope of their roles in the organization

(2) environmental pressure upon the organization's structure (formal and informal)

(3) how persons regard goals of the organization[26]

These personalized aspects of the organization may well lead to dys-
functions for the organization as well as being disruptive to the
bureaucratic framework.

Merton set forth the idea that due to the reduction of personal-
ized relationships and the increase of internalized rules, that a
"behavior of rigidity" is produced within the members of the partici-
pating organization. This "rigidity" becomes quite dysfunctional in
certain ways. The following are three such areas in which this "rigid-
ity" dysfunction is noted by Merton:

> (1) increases in the defensibility of individual
>   action
>
> (2) increases the amount of difficulty with clients
>
> (3) increase in the extent of the use of trappings
>   of authority by subordinates[27]

By surveying these "behavior of rigidity" factors the possibilities of
dysfunction toward the organization's goal can be established. Through
the structure of organization these certain schisms have been produced.

A rigid adherence to the bureaucratic code of impersonalization is
thought by certain theorists and researchers to be a source of student
problems within our schools.[28] If this does lead to a dysfunctional
attitude on the part of the client (student), the question might be
asked, "What are some of the consequences that theorists see in this
dysfunction?"

James Anderson noted certain of these dysfunctional consequences:

> (1) goal displacement
>
> (2) role distortion
>
> (3) reinforcement of apathy

(4) avoidance of responsibility

(5) legalism

(6) formation of informal groups[29]

Taken separately each of these can be detrimental to the organizational structure, the reason for this being that each in its own way does not represent the bureaucratic characteristics necessary to maintain the ideal type system proposed by Weber. Thus, perceptions by the client (student) may be disorientation toward the goals of the organizations which serves that client. The school (organization) would not be in tune with that which is its prime purpose for existence, the student (client).

Rules and Regulations. Of the bureaucratic organizational requirements which will be pertinent to this study the third main area developed is that of rules and regulations. Weber identified the rules and regulations as the ways in which an organization controlled its participants. The formal organization has a definite need for these guidelines and procedures to be specified so as to govern the activities of the organization. These rules must be consistent and applicable to the instances which may arise in relation to the various rules and regulations. Abbott elaborated on the rules and regulations around which Weber structured his bureaucratic theory. Abbott wrote:

> The management of activities is controlled by general rules which are more or less stable, more or less exhaustive, and which can be learned. These rules are general and abstract, and they constitute standards which assure reasonable uniformity in the performance of tasks. They preclude the issuance of directives based on whim or caprice, but require the application of general principles to particular cases. Together with the hierarchial authority structure, rules provide for the coordination of organizational activities and for continuity of operations, regardless of changes in personnel.[30]

Also, in a similar fashion of definition Hall stated that the presence

of rules was the degree to which the behavior of organizational members

is subject to organizational control.[31]

When strict adherence to the rules and regulations set forth by the

organization is demanded, certain responses within the rank and file of

the organization occur. Though the rules and regulations are actually

designed to facilitate in the most efficient manner the attainment of

organizational goals, there are instances where the rules actually work

in opposition to this end product. Merton noted such behavior and

stated it as follows:

> (1) An effective bureaucracy demands . . . strict
> devotion to regulations.
> (2) Such devotion to the rules leads to their
> transformation into absolutes; they are no
> longer perceived as relative to a set of
> purposes.
> (3) This interferes with ready adaptation under
> special conditions not clearly envisioned by
> those who draw up the general rules.
> (4) Thus, the very elements which conduce toward
> efficiency in general produce inefficiency
> in specific instances.[32]

This very strict adherence to the rules and regulations by organi-

zational participants is considered to be a standard practice. So

common is the practice the catchall term of "bureaucrat" has been

coined. This "bureaucrat" is a person who is identified as one who

hides himself in the framework of the organizational structure.

Merton sees the bureaucrat as a person who by the nature of his task

in the organization possesses certain traits. These traits are as

follows:

> (1) strong tendency toward conformance
> (2) strong adherence to regulations
> (3) being timid
> (4) conservative

(5) technical

(6) sentiments displaced from goals

A further problem which arises due to this strict adherence to rules is that of "goal displacement". March and Simon observed that participants over a period of time would internalize the organization rules. Rules originally intended to achieve organizational goals assumed a new value independent of the organizational goals. This phenomenon brought about the term "goal displacement". This culminates in an organization in which the organizational setting brings about new personal or subunit consequences through participation in organizationally motivated actions.[33] In other words, the bureaucrat is acting for the sake of the specific rule or regulation and forgetting to put this into a true context of what is the prime function of that organization.

When an official of an organization follows the abstract rules governing the amount, the kind, and the functional jurisdiction of the authority of his office, he, too, is subject to this goal displacement.[34] Such behavior of this official will in turn be passed on in certain ways to the subordinates. Their behavior will more than likely be affected to the degree that they in turn may show this type of organizational detachment from actual goals.

When taking such personal behavior in terms of the Getzels-Guba dimensions of social behavior, the nomothetic dimension would completely become internalized so that the individual is actually allowing these rules to be a part of his person. Consequently, the instituional role is in a controlling position of that person's personality (because of internalization of rules alluded to by March and Simon). Finally the role expectations become such that they are the "displaced goals" of that person as he sees them for the organization. Thus, the ultimate

observed behavior is that of a "bureaucrat" in his "goal displaced" role.[35]

So where does this lead? Is it possible to keep the organization on an even keel and working efficiently toward the goal of that organization? Many organizational theorists believe that it is quite possible. It is necessary to adhere to the rules and regulations of the organization but temper such adherence by allowing a certain degree of discretion in the performance of one's duty in the assigned task. A balance must be reached between the institutional role (rules and regulations) and the individual as he appears in that role. Anderson sees developing and maintaining this orientation of balance between rigid adherence to formal rules and unlimited exercise of discretion as one of the key (if not the key) areas in which an organization may meet its prescribed goals and yet still retain the flexibility to deal with the individual, thus enhancing the relationship between person and organization.[36] When this is not accomplished the problem of alienation toward the organization may well arise.

Alienation

It seems that alienation is such a powerful concept that it has prompted sociological thought to be pervaded by it for years. Kahler stated: "The history of man could very well be written as a history of the alienation of man."[37] Seeman sees alienation as a central theme of such noted sociologists as Marx, Weber, and Durkheim. The diversity of alienation has been noted through the years by many such sociologists. They have examined such widespread areas as prejudices, voting behaviors and actual vehicles for societal changes in relationship to

alienation.[38]

Etzioni also recognized alienation as a major limitation in the ex-
ercise of power as needed in the organization of a bureaucracy. He
stated that the exercise of power kept the subject, as he conformed,
alienated. However, once the subject started to legitimize or "inter-
nalize" the rules of the organization, the subject found the discipline
(power) less alienating. Consequently, this reaches a point where he
(subject) will continue to follow rules and orders even after the or-
ganization has lost its power. This original use of power does not
necessarily make the subject want to comply. On the contrary, it may
not be pleasant or gratifying, but it does fulfill the need to follow
norms which match those of one's own values.[39]

This concept of alienation is not only quite prevalent in many
theorists' historical writings but very evident in recent years in our
own society in many fashions. Rogers addressed this problem when writ-
ing about student alienation in relation to the responsibility they
felt toward certain moral action.[40] Flemings made it a central theme
in his study on student unrest in high schools in 1970.[41] Illich also
centralized on this theme in his book Schooling: The Ritual of
Progress.[42]

Of course, probably the largest and most paramount reason for
alienation within the ranks of the youth in the past ten years was the
Vietnam conflict. This process of alienation was so well documented
that one cannot begin to find a starting point in searching for one
particular aid in understanding the magnitude of effect this had on
youth. Geller and Howard did discover one very interesting fact in
their survey study of the late 1960's.[43] They found that regardless of

the degree of activism an individual might exhibit, he was still not totally alienated from the system as many might have expected. This may well explain why such activists as Tom Hayden recently ran for the Senate and Rennie Davis is now selling life insurance.

Since so many see alienation as being such a crucial issue in modern society the need must exist to attempt to research it empirically. The problem which exists is fairly straightforward; it is quite difficult to identify that from which people are alienated.[44] Consequently, very little empirical research has been done on the subject of alienation.

By studying such a work as Das Kapital by Marx and numerous other works by Weber, the German sociologist Melvin Seeman began putting together the sociological frameworks of alienation with a contemporary backdrop of the behavioral scientist. This research of various other sociologists' work culminated with Seeman identifying five dimensions of alienation. These dimensions are:

(1) powerlessness
(2) meaninglessness
(3) normlessness
(4) isolation
(5) self-estrangement

Seeman saw a dual role in his task of clarifying the theme of alienation; (1) to make organized sense of this area of sociological thought, and (2) to make alienation more amenable to empirical statement.[45]

Powerlessness. Marx viewed powerlessness as an extension of alienation reflected in the worker's condition within a capitalist's society, the worker being powerless to the extent that the means for decisions and rights to make these decisions are expropriated by the

ruling class. Weber extended this Marxian notion of powerlessness into areas other than just the industrial scope. By Weberian standards, in any and all bureaucratic organizations where the hierarchial structure of superordinate-subordinate relationship exists there will be exhibited this concept of powerlessness in the subordinates of that organization.[46]

Thus, this variant view of alienation, known as powerlessness, might be defined as "the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes or reinforcements he seeks."[47]

At the time Seeman wrote his article on alienation he felt the idea of powerlessness was the most frequent form of "alienation" usage in the literature. Seeman made it quite clear that this concept of powerlessness implied two main ideas. They were:

(1) it (powerlessness concept) is a distinctly social-psychological view.
(2) its (powerlessness concept) construction clearly departs from the Marxian tradition by removing the critical, polemic element in the idea of alienation.[48].

Seeman views powerlessness as being the frustrated view of an individual who expects or desires a certain degree of control and does not receive it. Further, it should be noted in defining powerlessness that an individual's expectancy for control of events is clearly distinguished from the objective situation. Thus, the observer's judgmental interpretations against some ethical standard and the individual's sense of a discrepancy between expectancy for control and desire for control must be reconciled.

Finally, Seeman sees the need to relate the idea that powerlessness should only be related to socio-political events and in no way

related to the personal adjustment of the individual. The person's individual maladjustment due to his expectations should not be considered as a true form of powerlessness.[49]

Isolation. Another type of alienation referred to by Seeman was isolation. This might be noted as the "intellectual role" of alienation. By this terminology writers mean to infer that there is a detachment by the intellectual from the popular cultural norms. This does not mean to imply that this isolation is due to a lack of "social adjustment" of warmth, security, or intensity in the person's social interactions.[50] Isolation might best be characterized as "assign(ing) low values to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society".[51]

Certain nicknames are attached to this behavior such as "rebellious", "innovator", and "apartness from society". All of these point to the concept that this individual is not a part of the popular cultural standards. Merton suggests that modifications that individuals make to their environment may be brought about due to situations where goals and means are not well coordinated. These adaptations to the "normal" social structure lead men outside of the mainstream of present cultural standards. Thus, they are alienated from the reigning goals and standards of that culture.[52]

Self-Estrangement. In defining this dimension of alienation Seeman stated, "Self-estrangement is the degree of dependence of the given behavior upon anticipated future rewards." The rewards mentioned in the definition lie outside the activity itself. Another simplified way of stating this is the idea of acting "only for its effect on others".[53]

In defining this concept of self-estrangement Seeman drew heavily from Fromm, Mills and Hoffer. This form of alienation is not intrinsically motivated. Quite to the contrary, any activity which is initiated is only to accomplish a task and get it over with. This inability of the individual to draw any self-reward from their activities was perhaps best stated by Riesman when he wrote, "Nothing in his character, no possession he owns, no inheritance of name nor talent, no work he has done, is valued for itself, but only for its effect on others..."[54]

Empirical Studies of Organization and Alienation

A number of studies have been done which parallel the current one. Adams did such a study related to teacher alienation and organizational structure. Using selected factors of the school's organizational structure as the teachers perceived them, Adams determined the degree to which these factors were related to a teacher's sense of alienation. A basic assumption of Adams in this study was that the school was bureaucratically structured. Furthermore, it was assumed that the bureaucratic characteristic most likely to affect a teacher's alienation from his work is centralization of authority and rule structure.

The Adams study was so developed that an organizational structure measure was obtained by using two subscales from MacKay's School Organizational Inventory. This form of measure was based on how the teachers perceived the schools. Also the "Scale for Measuring Alienation" was used to measure the teacher's sense of alienation from work. By rewording the original work by Dwight Dean, this measuring instrument was held to be valid by Adams. Both of the above-mentioned instruments were administered to four hundred ninety teachers in an eastern state.[55]

Upon correlation of data received, Adams drew the following conclusions:

I. There was a positive relationship between the degree of centralization of authority and rule structure of the school and the alienation teachers felt from their work and fellow workers.

II. Inversely, the less formal the structure in the areas of centralization of authority and specification of rules, the less alienated are teachers from work and fellow workers.[56]

Due to results of this study, Adams felt the contention that how a teacher perceived his power to affect conditions of his work and his sense of involvement are directly related to certain perceptions of the school. Thus, his perception of how the organizational structure of the school was developed was reinforced. Consequently, Adams saw the relationship of organization to teacher perception as the key factor of this study.

To collect data for his study, Kolesar administered the School Organizational Inventory to more than four hundred teachers in twenty Alberta high schools. This was in an effort to support his study's test hypothesis which predicted the degree of alienation of students in different types of bureaucratic high schools. By using information collected from the teachers on the Inventory instrument, Kolesar was able to select and name the four types of bureaucratic schools listed below:

(1) monocratic

(2) punishment - centered

(3) collegial or representative

(4) mock

Kolesar also developed the _Pupil Attitude Questionnaire_ to be the prime source of measurement of the degree of student alienation in this study. This instrument was designed to provide scores on five dimensions of alienation. The dimensions of alienation which were studied by Kolesar with his _Questionnaire_ were: powerlessness, normlessness, meaninglessness, self-estrangement, and isolation. Furthermore, this instrument provided a total score for alienation of the students. Data for this part of the study were gathered by administering the instrument to more than seventeen hundred students in twelve of the twenty original sample high schools.

Results of this study suggested that there was a significant difference in the types of bureaucratic structure and that there was a consistency between the degree of student alienation on the powerlessness dimension and the scores of student alienation total. In punishment-centered schools studied, powerlessness and total alienation were significantly higher. Alienation was associated with schools where the authority dimension of bureaucracy was emphasized as opposed to schools where it was not.

Kolesar was of the opinion that of the five-dimensional measure of alienation, a definitional problem existed in two areas. He felt the items of powerlessness and meaninglessness were predicting behavior outcomes. Due to this, such predictions might be sources of inconsistencies in other research. Another item he suggested for study was the relationship between isolation and normlessness. This relationship if related to rejection of school norms as he suggests, might well lead to breaking of various school rules.[57]

In a study done by Arquitt,[58] the alienation subject was investi-

gated as it was related to the feeling of powerlessness in adolescents. The two main variables he studied were support of family and peer support and how these in turn effected this feeling of powerlessness. It was found that familial support was inversely correlated to the feeling of powerlessness. Surprisingly, it was found that there was no correlation, inverse or otherwise, between peer support and the feeling of powerlessness.

Additional results showed that when both peer and familial support were lacking, a very high degree of alienation could be expected. The opposite was true when peer and familial support were provided. Very little alienation was generally expected. Other variables such as socio-economic status, family size, mother's employment, sex, school classification, membership in school organizations, and organizational membership outside of the school were also included in this study. They could be seen as being influences toward a feeling of powerlessness or alienation, yet they were secondary in nature and not prime contributors to this feeling.

Arquitt suggested, for further advancement in this area, that the concepts of male as opposed to female might be studied in relation to the "other" or secondary variables. For this to be accomplished, the basic concept of peer and familial support would still be necessary to develop such a study. Of course, need for such studies as this are quite evident. Nisbet felt investigations toward the "unattached", "marginal", "obsessive", "normless", and the "isolated" individuals testify to such a need for alienation studies.[59]

Rationale and Hypotheses

Since this paper was based on the assumption that school organi-
zations were bureaucratic in nature, the Weberian model was used as the
structural theory. According to Weber the offices follow the princi-
ples of hierarchy; that is, each lower office is under the control of a
higher one. Furthermore, Weber's theories also stated that upon joining
an organization the participant would then submit to the powers of that
organization and the hierarchial structure within.[60]

Hierarchy of Authority

In the Weberian model the concept of a "line" of authority is rec-
ognized as being part of the hierarchial framework.[61] This "line" is
composed of those members making up the superordinate-subordinate
framework of the organization. Through this structure of authority in
the hierarchy, the flow of decisions move from point to point within
the organization in an orderly manner. Thus the subordinate receives
his instructions from his direct superordinate. Though Weber did not
view his "ideal-type" bureaucracy as being authoritarian, of necessity
it is generally considered as such by others.[62]

Thus a major problem which arises ina system of bureaucracy is
how to use control or exercise power so as to keep the members of the
organization working in a cooperative manner. This maintaining of con-
trol can be brought about by manipulation of the participants in the
organization. Yet manipulation is not always totally successful. Ex-
ercise of power is needed at certain times to control situations. This
exercising of power leads to alienation.

Barnard's theory of organization was so constructed that coopera-

tion is the overriding idea. His concept of willingness to serve is vital to the well-being of the organization. If the organizational member is unwilling or refuses to serve, the organization may well be unable to fulfill its goals.[63] Since Barnard sees the cooperative system and organizational processes as being dependent upon each other for the life of the organization to be maintained, it becomes apparent he feels certain aspects are necessary for this survival. Willingness to serve is the one major factor on which organizational life and well-being is dependent.[64]

Willingness, the surrender of control of personal conduct, the depersonalization of personal action, is the necessary item by which the individual becomes and stays an active, vital member of an organization. As Barnard stated:

> Willingness to cooperate, positive or negative, is the expression of the net satisfactions or dissatisfactions experienced or anticipated by each individual in comparison with those experienced or anticipated through alternative opportunities.[65]

When, due to dissatisfactions experienced, there is no longer a willingness to serve by that participant, the organization suffers and may not be able to reach its prescribed goals.

Karl Marx, who is embraced as the arch-enemy of conservative industrialists, thought and also noted in his writings the idea that workers and the organization can be at odds with each other.[66] Marx saw the capitalist system as exploiting the working class. This, of course, would be a factor for alienating the worker from the controlling organization of which he might be a member. The separation of the workers from any means of decision making which would positively affect them also is a factor for alienation in society.[67]

This sense of powerlessness felt by workers in such a society as mentioned by Marx was then redefined by Weber to fit into his concept of bureaucracy. This extension by Weber of the Marx notion was very well explained by Gerth and Mills:

> Marx's emphasis upon the wage worker as being "separated" from the means of production becomes, in Weber's perspective, merely one special case of a universal trend. The modern soldier is equally 'separated' from the means of violence; the scientist from the means of enquiry, and the civil servant from the means of administration.[68]

Thus the sense of powerlessness as defined by Seeman would incorporate these various forms of alienation mentioned previously.

Seeman defined powerlessness as "the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements, he seeks."[69] When the definition of powerlessness is compared to the definition of hierarchy of authority, "the extent to which the locus of decision making is pre-structured by the organization,"[70] it becomes apparent that the area of who controls the behavior of the participant differs in the two definitions. When the organization controls the situation, the feeling of being "powerless" becomes part of the participant's reaction toward such a situation. To test this concept in the public school, the following hypothesis was formulated by Anderson:

> H.1. Students in schools classified as relatively high in hierarchy of authority will feel significantly more powerless than students in schools classified as relatively low in hierarchy of authority.[71]

Rules and Regulations

Blau and Scott stated that a formally established system of rules and regulations governs official decisions and actions. These rules

and regulations also insure uniformity of operation's coordination of activities. The behavior of the members of such a system are controlled by these rules and regulations.[72]

Barnard stated that when decision is involved, there are consciously present two terms—the end to be accomplished and the means to be used. When this decision making task is completed in the formal organization setting, all acts are those of persons dominated by organizational rather than personal ends. When the decision making process of an organization is based on certain organizational designs, the goals of that organization are pre-determined. Thus, the means which are necessary to accomplish the ends for the participants are also pre-determined to a large degree. Consequently, the organizational goals are so designed in such a rigid hierarchial system that little or no input can be incorporated by the individual into the decision making process of such a system.[73]

Whereas rules and regulations dictate the proper course of action to be taken in an organizational setting, what is the result when this course is not taken? Alienation may well be a product of such a decision. Since most rules are "internalized" by the subjects of a formal organization, a decision opposite to the one defined by the dictates of the organization will be alienating for the person making such a decision.[74] This increased alienation may lead to a variant form of alienation called self-estrangement.

Weber saw a need for intrinsic (internalization) meaning for organizational participants in his conceptualization of bureaucracy. When this is lost, the self-estrangement type of alienation develops. Riesman states that this loss of intrinsic meaning is at stake in the

child when he learns "that nothing in his character, no possession he owns, no inheritance of name nor talent, no work he has done, is valued for itself, but only for its effect on others."[75]

Self-estrangement is defined by Seeman as follows: the degree of dependence of the given behavior upon anticipated future rewards which lie outside the activity itself.[76] Although it is hard to be specific, it seems this type of alienation involves separation from one's self. This can be brought about when one makes one's self an instrument of one's chosen role in an organization and yet becomes opposed in some fashion to the organization of which he has become such an integral part. The eventual actions of such a situation may well be where other-directed activities occur in a given setting. One acts "only for its effect on others"; such is the case when a housewife cooks simply to get it over with.[77]

When rules and regulations of a formal organization are such that they have an effect on the student to the point that he becomes unable to find any self-reward in his actions, the likelihood that self-estrangement may occur is markedly increased. To test this statement in the public schools, the following hypothesis was formulated by Anderson:

H.2. Students in schools classified as relatively high in rules and regulations will feel significantly more self-estranged than students in schools classified as relatively low in rules and regulations.[78]

Impersonalization

Weber's conceptualization of bureaucracy demands that for maximum efficiency, impersonalization must be maintained within the formal

organization. Writing on this subject, Abbott stated the following:

> Bureaucracy developes the more perfectly the more completely
> it succeeds in eliminating from official business love,
> hatred, and all purely personal, irrational, and emotional
> elements which escape calculation. The essence of bureau-
> cratic arrangements is rationality. A spirit of formalistic
> impersonality is necessary to separate organizational rights
> and duties from the private lives of employees. Only by per-
> forming impersonally can officials assure rationality in
> decision making, and only thus can they assume equitable
> treatment for all subordinates.[79]

Impersonality as defined by Hall is, "the extent to which both organiza-
tional members and outsiders are treated without regard to individual
qualities." By using the two above-mentioned views of impersonality,
one can readily be made aware of the view of impersonality as seen
from a bureaucratic organization.

In the realm of affectivity, Getzels described two dimensions of
interpersonal relationships. The first dimension to be described is
that of particularistic. In this type of interpersonal relationships
the nature of the interaction between the participants is determined by
what the individuals mean to each other personally rather than by the
offices they occupy within the institution. In the universalistic type
of relationship the nature of the interaction between the participants
in the relationship is determined by the offices they occupy within the
given institution rather than by what the individuals mean to each
other. In this arrnagement no "favorites" are played.[80]

In later writings Getzels combined with Guba to develop the model
of nomothetic and idiographic dimensions of social behavior. In this
model the nomothetic dimension is composed of factors such as institu-
tion, role, and role expectations. These three specific areas show that
the concept of bureaucratic structure permeates this framework. This
nomothetic dimension is simply stating how the organization works in

relation to the individual in the idiographic dimension. Thus, the idea that within the framework of one's surroundings one can become separated from the society due to the bureaucratic structure.[81]

Seeman alludes to the idea that the isolation dimension of alienation is described as the intellectual role. The reason for such a statement is that there seems to be a detachment of the intellectual from popular cultural standards. Thus, the definition Seeman uses is quite understandable. Seeman defines isolation in the following manner: "assign low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society."[82] This definition is not meant to infer that there is necessarily a lack of social adjustment by this person. Nor is it intended to lead one to believe there is any deficiency in warmth, security, or intensity of an individual's social contacts.

Nettler's alienation scale reflected largely on the fact that isolation occurred when accepted social norms were not observed as readily by the observer. Merton saw isolation as a form of rebellion in which the act of adaptation led men outside the existing social structure. This greatly modified social structure resulted in alienation from the present goals and standards set forth by the society.[83] Garner alludes to such incidents in history as the Russian Revolution, the American Revolution, and the changing toward modern capitalism as being cases of major social structural changes, or rebellions, as Merton defines it.[84]

Upon discovering that the bureaucratic structure is impersonal in its formal organization structure, the individual may well feel an increasing degree of isolation as Seeman suggested. When this universalistic approach is perceived by that person, the impersonality may

well cause the individual to operate outside the norms of the present social structure of which the individual is a part. In an effort to modify this social structure the individual may well feel a further sense of isolation. To test this statement in the public schools, the following hypothesis was formulated by Anderson:

> H.3. Students in schools classified as relatively high in impersonalization will feel significantly more isola-tion than students in schools classified as relatively low in impersonalization.[85]

FOOTNOTES

[1]Blau and Scott, _Formal Organizations: A Comparative Study_, pp. 27-28.

[2]Peter M. Blau, _Bureaucracy in Modern Society_ (New York, 1965), pp. 28-31.

[3]Amitai Etzioni, _Modern Organizations_ (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1964), pp. 54-55.

[4]F. William Howton, _Functionaries_ (Chicago, 1969), pp. 106-107.

[5]Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, _Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach_ (San Francisco, 1962), p. 33.

[6]Etzioni, p. 50.

[7]Max Weber, "Three Types of Legitimate Rule," _Complex Organizations_, Amitai Etzioni, editor (New York, 1962), p. 7.

[8]Max Weber, "The Essentials of Bureaucratic Organization: An Ideal-Type Construction," _Reader in Bureaucracy_, Robert K. Merton, Ailsa Gray, Barbara Hockey, Hanan C. Selurn, editors (New York, 1952), pp. 18-19.

[9]Robert Dubin, _World of Work_ (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1958), p. 371.

[10]Weber, p. 27.

[11]Hall, p. 465.

[12]Howton, p. 107.

[13]Daniel E. Griffiths, "Administration as Decision-Making," _Organizations and Human Behavior_, Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni, editors (New York, 1969), pp. 145-146.

[14]Peter M. Blau, "Critical Remarks on Weber's Theory of Authority," _The American Political Science Review_, Vol. 57 (June, 1963), pp. 106-107.

[15]Victor A. Thompson, "Hierarchy, Specialization and Organizational Conflict," _Administrative Science Quarterly_, Vol. 5 (1961), pp. 485-486.

[16]Ibid., pp. 486-487.

[17]Robert V. Presthus, "The Social Base of Bureaucratic Organization," Bureaucracy and the Public, Elihu, Katy and Brenda Dent, editors (New York, 1973), p. 53.

[18]Max G. Abbott, "Hierarchial Impediments to Innovation in Educational Organizations," Change Perspectives in Educational Administration (Auburn, Alabama, 1965), pp. 46-48.

[19]Cyril Sofer, Organizations in Theory and Practice (New York, 1972), p. 238.

[20]Talcott Parsons, "Some Ingredients of a General Theory of Formal Organizations," Administrative Theory in Education, A. W. Halpin, editor (New York, 1967), p. 40.

[21]Abbott, p. 47.

[22]Weber, p. 19.

[23]Hall, p. 465.

[24]Blau and Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach, pp. 33-35.

[25]Abbott, p. 44.

[26]James G. Anderson, "Bureaucratic Rules: Bearers of Organizational Authority," Educational Administration Quarterly (Winter, 1966), p. 12.

[27]James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, Organizations (New York, 1958), pp. 36-46.

[28]Ibid, pp. 36-46.

[29]Anderson, "Bureaucratic Rules," p. 13.

[30]Max G. Abbott and John T. Lovell, editors, Change Perspectives in Educational Administration (Auburn, Alabama, 1965), pp. 42-43.

[31]Hall, p. 465.

[32]Robert Merton, "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality," Complex Organizations, Amitai Etzioni, editor (New York, 1962), p. 53.

[33]March and Simon, pp. 36-46.

[34]Howton, p. 8.

[35]Jacob W. Getzels and Egon Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review, Vol. 65 (1957), p. 429.

[36]Anderson, "Bureaucratic Rules," p. 13.

[37]Seeman, p. 783.

[38]Ibid., p. 783.

[39]Etzioni, p. 51.

[40]William R. Rogers, The Alienated Student (Nashville, Tennessee, 1969), p. 49.

[41]Vincent C. Flemmings, "Student Unrest in the High Schools: A Position Paper," Center for Urban Education (New York, June, 1970), pp. 9-46.

[42]Ivan Illich, "Schooling: The Ritual of Progress," New York Review of Books (New York, December, 1970), pp. 20-26.

[43]Jesse D. Geller and Gary Howard, Student Activism and the War in Vietnam, Department of HEW, Department of Education (Washington, D. C., August, 1969), pp. 1-39.

[44]Leonard I. Pearlin, "Alienation from Work: A Study of Nursing Personnel," American Sociological Review, Vol. 27 (June, 1962), p. 325.

[45]Seeman, p. 783.

[46]Ibid., p. 784.

[47]Ibid., p. 784.

[48]Ibid., p. 784.

[49]Ibid., p. 785.

[50]Ibid., p. 788.

[51]Ibid., p. 789.

[52]Ibid., p. 789.

[53]Ibid., p. 790.

[54]Ibid., p. 790.

[55]Charles F. Adams, "The Relationship of Teacher Alienation to the Organizational Structures of Schools" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, State University of New York, 1968).

[56]Ibid.

[57]Henry Kolesar, "An Empirical Study of Client Alienation in the Bureaucratic Organization" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Alberta, 1967).

[58]George E. Arquitt, Jr., "Social Contributors to Feelings of Alienation Among Adolescents" (Ph. D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1968).

[59]Robert A. Nisbet, *Community and Power* (New York, 1962), p. 15.

[60]Etzioni, pp. 51-53.

[61]James D. Thompson, *Organizations in Action* (New York, 1967), p. 11.

[62]Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, *Educational Organization and Administration* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1967), p. 101.

[63]Barnard, p. 82.

[64]Ibid., p. 59.

[65]Ibid., pp. 84-85.

[66]Morphet, Johns, and Reller, pp. 154-155.

[67]Seeman, p. 784.

[68]Ibid., p. 784.

[69]Ibid., p. 784.

[70]Hall, p. 465.

[71]Anderson, "Selected Bureaucratic Characteristics," p. 26.

[72]Blau and Scott, pp. 33-35.

[73]Barnard, pp. 185-186.

[74]Etzioni, p. 51.

[75]Seeman, p. 790.

[76]Ibid., p. 790.

[77]Ibid., p. 790.

[78]Anderson, "Selected Bureaucratic Characteristics," p. 28.

[79]Abbott and Lovell, pp. 42-43.

[80]J. W. Getzels, "Psycho-Sociological Framework for the Study of Educational Administration," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 22 (1952), pp. 236-239.

[81]Getzels and Guba, p. 429.

[82]Seeman, p. 789.

[83]Ibid., p. 789.

[84]Roberta Ash Garner, Social Change (Chicago, 1977), pp. 154-163.

[85]Anderson, "Selected Bureaucratic Characteristics," p. 30.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

In preparation for the explanation of the research design, it is necessary to specify those areas which will be included within this chapter. First, the method of sampling will be discussed. Greater detail concerning the instrumentation will be provided. How the instruments were administered will be discussed. The chapter will conclude with a detailed explanation of the procedures used to analyze the data.

Method of Sampling

In an effort to test and evaluate the hypotheses, teachers and students in twenty Oklahoma public high schools were asked to respond to the instrument which was appropriate for that individual within that school system. Those public school systems in Oklahoma which involved themselves with this study were selected to participate by means of a stratified-random selection process. Responses received from the students on the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire were then used to test each hypothesis.

The stratified-random selection process was essential to the sampling technique required in this study. All public high schools in the state of Oklahoma were stratified into classifications based on the

number of secondary teachers present in that high school setting. Those high schools with thirty or more teachers were classified as large and schools which had twenty-nine or fewer teachers were classified as small high schools. Of the four hundred eighty-six schools in Oklahoma, ninety-five were classified as large and three hundred ninety-one were classified as small. This process of classification then allowed for the randomized selection of ten schools from each classified area.

It was necessary to differentiate the schools into the large and small categories for the sake of comparison of sizes to bureaucracy and alienation responses. Thus the responses were correlated with the school sizes when the statistical breakdown was obtained via computer.

A randomized list of high schools was developed by this researcher. The first ten schools which were randomly selected from the list in both the large and small school classifications were then contacted. An explanation of the testing procedure was supplied as well as an explanation of why this study was being performed. A postcard was also included so that these schools could respond to the researcher regarding whether or not they would be willing to participate in the study. Whenever a school stated that it would not be interested in participating in the study, another school was randomly selected from the appropriate size classification to replace the school which chose not to participate. This process was repeated until ten large school and ten small school participants were obtained.

The process of the selection of students to respond to the questionnaire was outlined to the school officials via a letter of explanation. These officials were to randomly select ten members of the sophomore class and ten members of the senior class to participate in

this study. If the total membership of a class did not include ten students, all members of that particular class responded. As noted earlier in Chapter I, this was a slight modification from the original study by Anderson.

All secondary teachers in each of the high schools participated in the study with the exception of those not present in the building at the time of the administration of the instrument. The items of the School Organizational Inventory received responses from 361 teachers.[1] The items of the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire received responses from 399 students.[2]

Instrumentation

The School Organizational Inventory was the instrument which was used in each of the high schools to measure the level of bureaucracy as perceived by the high school professional teaching staff in each particular school setting.

This instrument was originally developed by Richard H. Hall[3] to measure bureaucracy in commercial and governmental organizations. Hall used a group of subscales which were specified as follows: (1) Hierarchy of Authority, (2) Specialization, (3) Rules for Members, (4) Procedural Specifications, (5) Impersonality, (6) Technical Competence. The cumulative score of each of these subscales combined to provide a total score for the bureaucratization score for a particular organization.

The pilot instrument originated by Hall contained one hundred forty-six specific items. Through further development the instrument was modified by Hall to contain sixty-two short descriptive statements

in a Likert-type scale. The Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficient for internal consistency of the stated scales ranged between .80 and .90. Validation of the instrument by selection of organizations which were judged to be either high or low in one or more of the six dimensions by independent observers was used by Hall. Significant relationships were obtained by Hall between the total bureaucratization scores and the judgments of the independent observers.

MacKay adapted Hall's instrument to be used in the schools by restructuring the terminology to fit into educational settings. It should be further noted that special effort was made by MacKay not to change any major concepts originally developed, so as not to harm the original structure as provided by Hall. Upon testing the refined instrument, MacKay discovered that two dimensions seemed to correlate negatively with the other four. These two dimensions, Specialization and Technical Competence, were determined by him to be measuring some different aspect in bureaucracy than were the other dimensions set forth by the original Hall instrument.

Robinson[4] further modified the instrument by rewriting certain items in an additional effort to improve and clarify the existing structure. Through this process the original sixty-two items were reduced to forty-eight. Robinson's process was further refined by testing the scales for internal consistency using correlational methods. Furthermore, the items were tested for their discriminating power. The final product of these improvements, Robinson felt, was as follows: (1) increased discriminating power of the items, (2) increased correlational value between each subscale item and total subscale score. It was also found by Robinson that there was a significant and negative correlation

between two distinct groups of dimension. Specialization and Technical Competence were proved to be positively related to each other, this forming one group. The group consisting of Hierarchy of Authority, Rules for Members, Procedural Specifications, and Impersonality also had positive, significant correlation among these four members. But, there was significant and negative correlation between the two groups of scales.

Further study done by Punch took the form of measuring the five dimensions of bureaucracy as defined by Blau:

(1) hierarchy of authority

(2) rules and regulations

(3) impersonalization

(4) career status

(5) specialization[5]

Punch also concluded that Specialization and Technical Competence should be excluded from the dimensions of bureaucracy. He was of the opinion that Specialization and Technical Competence should be considered measures of professionalization. The study by Punch reaffirmed previous conclusions of MacKay and Robinson that Specialization and Technical Competence did not belong in the same grouping with the other subscales.

For the purposes of this study only items from the bureaucracy sub-scales of Hierarchy of Authority, Procedural Specifications, Rules for Members, and Impersonality were used. Upon extraction of these areas from the original instrument, only thirty-three items remained which were related to the four "authority dimensions of bureaucracy." An inventory instrument of these thirty-three items culminated in the formation of the instrument items which were used in this study. This

stated instrument was the School Organizational Inventory. Its use was to measure the four "authority dimensions of bureaucracy" as they appeared in each of the sample schools of this study. The instrument is included in Appendix A of this study.

For each listed, there were five possible response categories, from "always true" to "never true", to be selected by that teacher. These responses were obtained from the teachers and were used to ascertain agreement or disagreement on each statement presented in the questionnaire. This response was in turn used to determine the relative bureaucracy of that teacher's school as perceived by that school's teachers.

The Pupil Attitude Questionnaire was used to measure student alienation levels in the sample high schools. This particular instrument was developed and refined by Henry Kolesar. Kolesar used dimensions of alienation which had been developed by Seeman as follows:

(1) powerlessness

(2) meaninglessness

(3) normlessness

(4) isolation

(5) self-estrangement

These were the basis for Kolesar's instrument used to measure students' alienation in the secondary schools.

In the development of the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire, Kolesar started with one hundred sixty-seven items in his first set of questions. Through the use of a panel of judges and further reworking of the original questions, a pilot instrument of one hundred sixty-four items was developed. The pilot instrument was first used in a project

involving one hundred sixty-three students in a large urban high school setting. Again the number of items was reduced, this time because of analysis of the items for discriminative ability. Upon this reduction the number of items left were one hundred forty-five. Further analysis by use of Pearson r correlations reduced twenty more questions from the remaining total of one hundred forty-five. Calculated correlation coefficients with a level of reliability set at .01 was the determining factor which removed the twenty additional questions. This reduction left one hundred twenty-five items to be considered. Of these one hundred twenty-five items ninety-eight were factor analyzed and categorized into five dimensions of alienation. Sixty items were then randomly selected from the ninety-eight item group. These remaining items were found to have acceptable coefficients of stability for the five dimensions of alienation for which the instrument was designed. The following coefficients were reported:

> 0.73 - powerlessness
>
> 0.74 - self-estrangement
>
> 0.71 - normlessness
>
> 0.63 - meaninglessness
>
> 0.66 - isolation

The end product of Kolesar's work was the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire which consisted of sixty statements. Each statement had a corresponding set of five response categories. The responses were designed to show the degree of agreement or disagreement that a student felt toward each individual statement presented and its corresponding dimension of alienation. The instrument is included in Appendix E.

Administration of the Instruments

The methods used to administer the instruments in this study are modified to a degree from the original Anderson study. For a complete and itemized comparison of the difference, one might wish to refer to the original study.

This researcher contacted the chief school district administrative officer as well as the building principal of each school district and building used in the sample to obtain permission to administer the instruments. Upon receiving permission for the testing, a date was scheduled for the instrument to be administered to the staff and students of that school.

One week prior to the scheduled test date a packet consisting of a letter of explanation, the step-by-step procedure for administering the test, necessary instructions needed to enable the building principal to see that the proper methods were used for the testing of the staff and students, proper number of tests for each school, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope (for the purpose of return mailing of the tests) was mailed to the participating school.

Appendix I is a copy of the letter which was sent to each building principal. This letter was an introductory and explanatory letter which was the preliminary contact with that school.

Appendix J and K include the instruction sheets which were supplied to the building principal for explaining the proper procedure for administering the School Organizational Inventory to his staff at the pre-scheduled faculty meeting. Also included in this instruction sheet to the building principal were the necessary instructions for the random selection and testing of students within his school. This instrument,

Pupil Attitude Questionnaire, required the principal to assign identification numbers to all the students and then by use of a random table of numbers select those students which would respond to the questionnaire.

Upon completion of the required tasks the building principal then returned the completed instruments to the researcher via the self-addressed, stamped envelope which was supplied for this task. Thus, through a coordinated effort, the researcher was able to receive the instruments and responses after they had been administered at the selected schools.

It should further be noted the school officials were helpful in many areas. They, of course, allowed the tests to be given. The building principal actually saw to it that both instruments were properly administered. The school supplied a satisfactory room in which the testing would take place. The building principals were cooperative enough to see that the responses were returned to the researcher promptly.

Scoring and Processing of Data

Those specifications set forth by MacKay and Robinson were used in scoring the responses received. Upon receiving the responses of the School Organizational Inventory, scoring was processed by the computer in compliance with the proper scaling technique. The score for the various dimensions of bureaucracy was ascertained by summing the scores of the statements related to each particular dimension. Also, personal information obtained via the response sheet was coded and placed into the computer. This information was used in the formulation of future possible areas of study.

In an effort to maintain consistency between the two studies, those statistical operations performed in Anderson's original paper were very closely replicated. The following is a description of these operations as it appears in Anderson's study:

> Mean scores were computed for each of the subscales and a total bureaucracy score was computed for each of the schools. A division of the mean scores was made at the median. For each dimension of bureaucracy, the schools with a mean score above the median were classified as relatively high on that dimension. Those schools with a mean score below the median on each of the dimensions of bureaucracy were classified as relatively low in that dimension.[6]

Specifications set forth by Kolesar were those used in scoring the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire. Upon receiving the student responses to the sixty statements, these responses were processed and entered into the computer system for scoring. The score for the various dimensions of alienation was arrived at by taking the summation scores of the statements related to each particular dimension. A detailed description for the scoring of this instrument is provided in Appendix H of this study.

Statistical Treatment of Data

Each of the proposed hypotheses under investigation were tested using the parametric t test, which was calculated by means of a computer system programmed at East Central University, Ada. Further computer work was programmed and calculated on the Kellyville Public Schools' computer system. All programming was done by a computer specialist. The computations were then performed by the researcher.

FOOTNOTES

[1]D. A. MacKay, "An Empirical Study of Bureaucratic Dimensions and Their Relations to the Characteristics of School Organization" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964).

[2]Kolesar.

[3]Richard H. Hall, "Interorganizational Structure Variation: Application of the Bureaucratic Model," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 7 (1962-63), pp. 295-308.

[4]Norman Robinson, "A Study of the Professional Role Orientations of Teachers and Principals and Their Relationship of Bureaucratic Characteristics of School Organizations" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966).

[5]Keith Francis Punch, "Bureaucratic Structure in Schools and Its Relationships to Leader Behavior: An Empirical Study," (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto, 1967), pp. 192-197.

[6]Anderson, "Selected Bureaucratic Characteristics," p. 26.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

OF THE DATA

Introduction

In this chapter the rank order listing of the top and bottom quarters based on the mean scores of the _School Organizational Inventory_ will be presented for each of the dimensions of hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, and impersonalization. These listings will be presented in Tables I through III at the beginning of this chapter.

Also presentation and analysis of the data will be reported as they relate to each of the hypotheses examined. This writer accepted hypotheses which were supported at the 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis One

H.1. Students in schools classified as relatively high in hierarchy of authority will feel significantly more powerless than students in schools classified as relatively low in hierarchy of authority.

The calculated t value for the analysis was 3.183, with 198 degrees of freedom. Therefore, at the 0.05 level of significance, the hypothesis was not supported. Data relevant to this hypothesis are summarized in Table IV.

TABLE I

RANK ORDER LISTING OF TOP AND BOTTOM QUARTILE
BASED ON MEAN SCORE OF HIERARCHY OF
AUTHORITY DIMENSION OF THE
SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL
INVENTORY

	School	Mean Score Hierarchy of Authority
	L1	30.688
	S2	30.250
(Top Quarter)	L4	30.200
	S6	29.200
	L6	28.900
	Median Score of Sample	26.915
	S10	24.500
	S4	24.375
(Bottom Quarter)	S9	24.250
	L2	23.790
	S5 *	23.000

* In reporting of this study's results, a capital L in the School
 column will designate a large school. Likewise, a capital S will be
 used to designate a small school.

TABLE II

RANK ORDER LISTING OF TOP AND BOTTOM QUARTILE
BASED ON MEAN SCORE OF RULES AND
REGULATIONS DIMENSION OF THE
SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL
INVENTORY

	School	Mean Score Rules and Regulations
	S5	25.833
	L6	25.300
(Top Quarter)	L4	24.467
	S6	24.300
	L7	23.844
	Median Score of Sample	23.181
	L2	22.316
	S4	21.882
(Bottom Quarter)	L5	21.474
	S10	21.267
	S9	21.125

TABLE III

RANK ORDER LISTING OF TOP AND BOTTOM QUARTILE
BASED ON MEAN SCORE OF IMPERSONALIZATION
DIMENSION OF THE SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL
INVENTORY

	School	Mean Score Impersonalization
	L6	48.650
	S6	46.800
(Top Quarter)	S2	46.750
	L1	46.710
	L3	43.167
	Median Score of Sample	41.788
	S8	39.000
	S1	38.700
(Bottom Quarter)	S3	38.667
	S7	35.750
	S10	33.688

TABLE IV

POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF STUDENT ALIENATION

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power-lessness Score	t
Top Quarter *	100	7.9339	35.29	3.183
Bottom Quarter **	100	8.4606	39.00	

p<.05 ***

* In Tables IV through XII, the top quarter will be referring to those schools which were determined by the rank order listing of the School Organizational Inventory to be relatively high in hierarchy of authority dimension.

** In Tables IV through XII, the bottom quarter will be referring to those schools which were determined by the rank order listing of the School Organizational Inventory to be relatively low in hierarchy of authority dimension.

*** Even though the calculation indicated a significant difference between the means, the difference was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

Supplementary Data

Sex. A t test was used to determine if there was a significant difference at the 0.05 level between male students on the powerlessness dimension of alienation in schools that were classified as high and low in hierarchy of authority. The value of the calculated t was 1.359 with 81 degrees of freedom. There was no significant difference. The data related to this test are summarized in Table V.

A t test was used to determine if there was a significant difference between female students on the powerlessness dimension of aliena-

tion in schools that were classified as high and low in hierarchy of authority. The value of the calculated t for females was 3.173 with 115 degrees of freedom. There was a significant difference. The data related to this test are summarized in Table VI.

TABLE V

POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
MALE STUDENTS

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power-lessness Score	t
Top Quarter	42	6.9934	37.02	1.359
Bottom Quarter	41	6.1140	39.05	
		$p > .05$		

Grade Level in School. A t test was used to ascertain if there was a significant difference between sophomore students on the power-lessness dimension of alienation in schools that were classified as high and low in hierarchy of authority. The value of the calculated t was 1.853 with 98 degrees of freedom, there was a significant difference. The data related to this test are summarized in Table VII.

A t test was used to determine if there was a significant differ-ence at the 0.05 level between senior students on the powerlessness dimension of alienation in schools that were classified as high and low in hierarchy of authority. The value of the calculated t for seniors

was 3.210 with 98 degrees of freedom. There was a significant differ-
ence. The data related to this test are summarized in Table VIII.

TABLE VI

POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
FEMALE STUDENTS

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power-lessness Score	t
Top Quarter	58	8.0273	34.24	
Bottom Quarter	59	8.3905	39.10	3.173
		p $<$ .05 *		

* Even though the calculation indicated a significant difference be-
tween the means, the difference was in the opposite direction from
that predicted.

TABLE VII

POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
SOPHOMORES

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power-lessness Score	t
Top Quarter	50	8.2202	36.00	
Bottom Quarter	50	9.1238	39.25	1.853
		p $>$ .05		

TABLE VIII

POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF STUDENT ALIENATION
SENIORS

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power- lessness Score	t
Top Quarter	50	7.7124	34.59	
				3.210
Bottom Quarter	50	7.7975	39.62	
		$p < .05$ *		

* Even though the calculation indicated a significant difference be-
tween the means, the difference was in the opposite direction from
that predicted.

Minority Group. A t test was used to determine if there was a
significant difference between those who considered themselves to be in
the minority of that particular school. The powerlessness dimension of
alienation in schools that were classified as high and low in hierarchy
of authority were then determined by these results. The t value for
students who considered themselves as being in a minority group was
3.680. With 49 degrees of freedom, the means were significantly
different. Data germane to this test are presented in Table IX.

A t test was used to determine if significant difference existed
between students who did not consider themselves as being in a minority
group of a particular school. The test was in relation to the power-
lessness dimension of alienation in schools that were classified as
high and low in hierarchy of authority, the t value for students who
did not consider themselves as being in a minority group was 4.107.

With 147 degrees of freedom, the means were significantly different. Data related to this test are presented in Table X.

TABLE IX

POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
MINORITY GROUP

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power- lessness Score	t
Top Quarter	26	7.9876	32.65	3.680
Bottom Quarter	25	6.1160	40.15	
		$p < .05$ *		

* Even though the calculation indicated a significant difference be- tween the means, the difference was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

Academic Consideration. To determine if there was a significant difference on the powerlessness dimension of alienation between those students who were enrolled in an academically oriented course of study in schools classified as high and low in hierarchy of authority, a t test was calculated. The value of the calculated t for students enrolled in an academically oriented course of study was 2.360 with 130 degrees of freedom. There was a significant difference. The data related to this test are summarized in Table XI.

A t test was calculated to determine if there was a significant difference between those students who were enrolled in a non-academi-

cally oriented course of study on the powerlessness dimension of alienation in schools classified as high and low in hierarchy of authority. The value of the calculated t for those students enrolled in a non-academically oriented course of study was 2.176 with 66 degrees of freedom, there was a significant difference. Data related to this test are summarized in Table XII.

TABLE X

POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
NON-MINORITY

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power-lessness Score	t
Top Quarter	74	6.8944	37.91	4.107
Bottom Quarter	75	8.6673	43.22	

$$p < .05 *$$

* Even though the calculation indicated a significant difference between the means, the difference was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

Hypothesis Two

H.2. Students in schools classified as relatively high in rules and regulations will feel significantly more self-estranged than students in schools classified as relatively low in rules and regulations.

The calculated t value for the analysis was 1.994 with 198 degrees of freedom. Therefore, at the 0.05 level of significance, the hypothe-

sis was not supported. Data relevant to this hypothesis are summarized in Table XIII.

TABLE XI

POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
ACADEMICALLY ORIENTED COURSE OF STUDY

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power-lessness Score	t
Top Quarter	68	7.0305	34.33	2.360
Bottom Quarter	64	8.0341	37.45	
		$p < .05$ *		

* Even though the calculation indicated a significant difference between the means, the difference was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

Supplementary Data

Sex. To ascertain if there was a significant difference between male students on the self-estrangement dimension of alienation in schools classified as high and low in rules and regulations, a t test was calculated. The value of the calculated t for males was 2.321 with 80 degrees of freedom. There was a significant difference. Data related to this test are summarized in Table XIV.

A t test was calculated to determine if there was a significant difference between female students on the self-estrangement dimension

of alienation in schools classified as high and low in rules and

regulations. The calculated t value for females was 2.296 with 116

degrees of freedom. There was a significant difference. Data relevant

to this test are summarized in Table XV.

TABLE XII

POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF ALIENATION NON-ACADEMICALLY
ORIENTED COURSE OF STUDY

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power-lessness Score	t
Top Quarter	32	7.2000	36.39	2.176
Bottom Quarter	36	7.3958	40.31	

p < .05 *

* Even though the calculation indicated a significant difference be-
tween the means, the difference was in the opposite direction from
that predicted.

Grade Level in School. A t test was calculated to determine if

there was a significant difference between sophomore students on the

self-estrangement dimension of alienation in schools that were classi-

fied as high and low on the rules and regulations dimension of

bureaucracy. The value of the calculated t for sophomores was

1.420 with 98 degrees of freedom. There was no significant difference.

Data germane to this test are summarized in Table XVI.

TABLE XIII

SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF STUDENT ALIENATION

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self-estrangement Score	t
Top Quarter *	100	6.7476	33.62	
Bottom Quarter **	100	6.4438	35.49	1.994
		$p < .05$ ***		

* In Tables XIII through XXI, the top quarter will be referring to those schools which were determined by the rank order listing of the School Organizational Inventory to be relatively high in rules and regulations dimensions.

** In Tables XIII through XXI, the bottom quarter will be referring to those schools which were determined by the rank order listing of the School Organizational Inventory to be relatively low in rules and regulations dimensions.

*** Even though the calculation indicated a significant difference between the means, the difference was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

The same procedure was repeated to determine if a significant difference could be found between senior students on the self-estrangement dimension of alienation in schools that were classified as high and low on the rules and regulations dimension of bureaucracy. The calculated t value for seniors was 1.378. With 98 degrees of freedom, there was no significant difference. Data relative to this test are summarized in Table XVII.

Minority Groups. A t test was calculated to determine if there was a significant difference between minority group members on the self-

estrangement dimension of alienation in schools classified as high and low in the rules and regulations dimension of bureaucracy. The value for the calculated t for minority group members was 3.168. With 60 degrees of freedom, there was a significant difference. The data relevant to this test are summarized in Table XVIII.

TABLE XIV

SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
MALE STUDENTS

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self-estrangement Score	t
Top Quarter	37	4.3683	33.33	
Bottom Quarter	45	4.9192	35.77	2.321
		$p < .05$ *		

* Even though the statistic calculation indicated a significant difference between the means, the difference was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

The procedure was repeated to determine if there was a significant difference between non-minority group members on the self-estrangement dimension of alienation and the rules and regulations dimension of bureaucracy. The value of the calculated t for non-minority group members was 4.160. With 136 degrees of freedom, there was a significant difference. Data relative to this test are summarized in Table XIX.

TABLE XV

SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
FEMALE STUDENTS

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self-estrangement Score	t
Top Quarter	63	7.0969	33.56	
Bottom Quarter	55	6.3034	36.44	2.296

p<.05 *

* Even though the calculation indicated a significant difference
between the means, the difference was in the opposite direction from
that predicted.

TABLE XVI

SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
SOPHOMORES

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self-estrangement Score	t
Top Quarter	50	6.5977	33.51	
Bottom Quarter	50	6.5083	35.39	1.420

p>.05

Academic Consideration. To determine if there was a significant

difference on the self-estrangement dimension of alienation between

those students who were enrolled in an academically oriented course of study in schools classified as high and low in rules and regulations, a $\underline{t}$ test was calculated. The calculated $\underline{t}$ value for students enrolled in an academically oriented course of study was .273 with 123 degrees of freedom. There was no significant difference. The data related to this test are summarized in Table XX.

TABLE XVII

SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
SENIORS

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self-estrangement Score	$\underline{t}$
Top Quarter	50	6.8975	33.73	
Bottom Quarter	50	6.3797	35.58	1.378
		p > .05		

The $\underline{t}$ test procedure was repeated to determine if there was a significant difference between students who were enrolled in a non-academically oriented course of study on the self-estrangement dimension of alienation in schools classified as high and low in the rules and regulations dimension of bureaucracy. The value of the calculated $\underline{t}$ for students enrolled in a non-academically oriented course of study was 1.810. With 73 degrees of freedom, there was no

significant difference. Data relevant to this test are summarized in Table XXI.

TABLE XVIII

SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
MINORITY GROUP

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self-estrangement Score	t
Top Quarter	34	5.3124	33.35	
				3.168
Bottom Quarter	28	6.2252	38.07	

$p < .05$ *

*   Even though the calculation indicated a significant difference between the means, the difference was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

Hypothesis Three

H.3. Students in schools classified as relatively high in impersonalization will feel significantly more isolation than students in schools classified as relatively low in impersonalization.

The calculated t value for the analysis was 3.182, with 198 degrees of freedom. Therefore, at the 0.05 level of significance, the hypothesis was not supported. Data relevant to this hypothesis are summarized in Table XXII.

TABLE XIX

SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
NON-MINORITY GROUP

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self-estrangement Score	t
Top Quarter	66	6.8920	35.73	
Bottom Quarter	72	6.7527	40.60	4.160

$$p < .05 *$$

* Even though the calculation indicated a significant difference between the means, the difference was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

TABLE XX

SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
ACADEMICALLY ORIENTED COURSE OF STUDY

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self-estrangement Score	t
Top Quarter	61	6.5434	31.77	
Bottom Quarter	64	6.0520	32.08	.273

$$p > .05$$

TABLE XXI

SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
NON-ACADEMICALLY ORIENTED COURSE OF STUDY

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self-estrangement Score	t
Top Quarter	39	4.1749	35.02	
				1.810
Bottom Quarter	36	5.3272	37.04	

p>.05

TABLE XXII

ISOLATION DIMENSION OF STUDENT ALIENATION

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	t
Top Quarter *	100	2.8696	22.65	
				3.182
Bottom Quarter **	100	2.9235	23.96	

p<.05 ***

* In Tables XXII through XXIX, the top quarter will be referring to those schools which were determined by the rank order listing of the School Organizational Inventory to be relatively high in the impersonalization dimension.

** In Tables XXII through XXIX, the bottom quarter will be referring to those schools which were determined by the rank order listing of the School Organizational Inventory to be relatively low in the impersonalization dimension.

*** Even though the calculation indicated a significant difference between the means, the difference was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

Supplementary Data

Sex. When a t test was used to ascertain if there was a significant difference between male students on the isolation dimension of alienation in schools classified as high and low in the impersonalization dimension of bureaucracy, the calculated t value for males was 2.767 with 99 degrees of freedom. There was a significant difference. Data germane to this test are summarized in Table XXIII.

TABLE XXIII

ISOLATION DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
MALE STUDENTS

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	t
Top Quarter	49	2.1364	23.13	2.767
Bottom Quarter	52	2.3795	24.39	
		p $<$ .05 *		

* Even though the calculation indicated a significant difference between the means, the difference was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

A t test was used to determine if there was a significant difference between female students on the isolation dimension of alienation in schools classified as high and low in impersonalization. The value of the calculated t for females was 0.880. With 97 degrees of

freedom, there was no significant difference. The data related to this test are summarized in Table XXIV.

TABLE XXIV

ISOLATION DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
FEMALE STUDENTS

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	t
Top Quarter	51	2.8663	22.73	0.880
Bottom Quarter	48	2.8417	23.24	
		$p > .05$		

Grade Level in School. A t test was used to determine if there was a significant difference between sophomore students on the isolation dimension of alienation in schools classified as high and low on the impersonalization dimension of bureaucracy. The value for the calculated t for sophomores was 1.261. With 98 degrees of freedom, there was no significant difference. The data related to this test are summarized in Table XXV.

When a t test was used to ascertain if there was a significant difference between senior students on the isolation dimension of alienation in schools classified as high and low in impersonalization, the calculated t value was 3.421 with 98 degrees of freedom. There was a significant difference. The data relevant to this test are summar-

ized in Table XXVI.

TABLE XXV

ISOLATION DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
SOPHOMORES

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	t
Top Quarter	50	3.2017	23.11	
				1.261
Bottom Quarter	50	3.0757	23.91	

$$p > .05$$

TABLE XXVI

ISOLATION DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
SENIORS

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	t
Top Quarter	50	2.5375	22.19	
				3.421
Bottom Quarter	50	2.7533	23.02	

$$p < .05 *$$

* Even though the calculation indicated a significant difference between the means, the difference was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

Minority Groups. A t test was computed to determine if there was
a significant difference between minority group members on the isola-
tion dimension of alienation in schools classified as high and low on
the impersonalization dimension of bureaucracy. The value for the
calculated t for minority group members was 1.549. With 36 degrees of
freedom, there was no significant difference. The data related to this
test are summarized in Table XXVII.

TABLE XXVII

ISOLATION DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
MINORITY GROUP

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	t
Top Quarter	20	3.8004	22.56	1.549
Bottom Quarter	18	2.1009	24.17	
		p > .05		

The same procedure was used to determine if there was a signifi-
cant difference between non-minority group members on the isolation
dimension of alienation in schools classified as high and low in
impersonalization. The value of the calculated t for non-minority
group members was 2.883 with 160 degrees of freedom. There was a
significant difference. The data relevant to this test are summar-
ized in Table XXVIII.

TABLE XXVIII

ISOLATION DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
NON_MINORITY GROUP

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	t
Top Quarter	80	3.1507	24.35	
Bottom Quarter	82	3.2518	25.81	2.883

$p < .05$ *

* Even though the calculation indicated a significant difference between the means, the difference was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

Academic Consideration. A t test was used to determine if there was significant difference between students who were enrolled in an academically oriented course of study on the isolation dimension of alienation in schools classified as high and low on the impersonalization dimension of bureaucracy. The value for the calculated t for students enrolled in an academically oriented course of study was 4.204 with 140 degrees of freedom. There was a significant difference. The data related to this test are summarized in Table XXIX.

A t test was used to determine if there was a significant difference between students who were enrolled in a non-academically oriented course of study on the isolation dimension of alienation in schools classified as high and low on the impersonalization dimension of bureaucracy. The value of the calculated t for students enrolled in a non-academically oriented course of study was 4.305. With 56

degrees of freedom, there was a significant difference. Data related to this test are summarized in Table XXX.

TABLE XXIX

ISOLATION DIMENSION OF ALIENATION ACADEMICALLY
ORIENTED COURSE OF STUDY

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	t
Top Quarter	67	2.4583	21.82	
Bottom Quarter	75	2.7447	23.68	4.204
		$p < .05$ *		

* Even though the calculation indicated a significant difference between the means, the difference was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

TABLE XXX

ISOLATION DIMENSION OF ALIENATION NON-ACADEMICALLY
ORIENTED COURSE OF STUDY

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	t
Top Quarter	33	3.0314	21.22	
Bottom Quarter	25	1.8841	24.24	4.305
		$p < .05$ *		

* Significance was indicated but opposite that which was predicted.

Additional Data Analysis

Throughout the remainder of this chapter, a presentation and analysis of additional information collected will be examined. This information, though not directly related to the presented hypotheses, will give a degree of institutional as well as biographical data in relation to the respondents in this study. Hopefully, such further information might provide the reader with a greater and more defined clarity into the institutions and persons which responded.

A group of summary tables will be presented, thereby providing a clear and concise method of presenting additional information to the reader. These summary tables will cover the following areas:

1. School size as determined by the number of teachers employed in each high school.

2. Number of teachers who responded in large and small school settings.

3. School size as related to the number of students enrolled in the high school.

4. Range of large (L) and small (S) schools' mean scores received as results of the School Organizational Inventory.

5. Composite of large (L) and small (S) schools' mean scores received as results of the School Organizational Inventory.

6. Number of male or female students who responded to the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire in both the large and small schools.

7. Number of minority or non-minority students who responded to the _Pupil Attitude Questionnaire_ in both the large and small schools.

8. Number of academic or non-academic students who responded to the _Pupil Attitude Questionnaire_ in both the large and small schools.

TABLE XXXI

SCHOOL SIZE AS DETERMINED BY THE NUMBER OF TEACHERS
EMPLOYED IN EACH HIGH SCHOOL *

Large-School	Teacher Number		Small School	Teacher Number	
L1	–	32	S1	–	12
L2	–	34	S2	–	25
L3	–	39	S3	–	8
L4	–	43	S4	–	19
L5	–	31	S5	–	10
L6	–	35	S6	–	22
L7	–	61	S7	–	12
L8	–	13	S8	–	13
L9	–	51	S9	–	11
L10	–	37	S10	–	20
		412 = Total surveyed			152 = Total surveyed

* As derived from the Oklahoma Educational Directory, 1978-1979.[1]

TABLE XXXII

NUMBER OF TEACHERS WHO RESPONDED
IN EACH SCHOOL SETTING

Large School	Teacher Number	Small School	Teacher Number
L1 -	16	S1 -	10
L2 -	19	S2 -	12
L3 -	18	S3 -	6
L4 -	15	S4 -	16
L5 -	18	S5 -	6
L6 -	20	S6 -	10
L7 -	32	S7 -	8
L8 -	34	S8 -	10
L9 -	33	S9 -	8
L10 -	31	S10 -	16
	236 = Total Respondents		102 = Total Respondents

TABLE XXXIII

SCHOOL SIZE AS RELATED TO THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS
ENROLLED IN THE HIGH SCHOOL *

Large Schools	Average Daily Membership	Small Schools	Average Daily Membership
L1	356	S1	119
L2	333	S2	341
L3	367	S3	62
L4	641	S4	200
L5	395	S5	96
L6	412	S6	245
L7	651	S7	122
L8	812	S8	100
L9	559	S9	161
L10	355	S10	260

* This information was derived from the Oklahoma Secondary Schools
Activities Association A.D.M. bulletin of 1978-1979.[2]

TABLE XXXIV

RANGE OF LARGE (L) AND SMALL (S) SCHOOLS' MEAN SCORES RECEIVED
AS RESULTS OF THE SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY

| | H I G H | | L O W | |
	Large (L)	Small (S)	Large (L)	Small (S)
Hypothesis 1	L1 - 3.069	S2 - 3.025	L2 - 2.379	S5 - 2.3
Hypothesis 2	L6 - 1.687	S5 - 1.722	L5 - 1.432	S9 - 1.408
Hypothesis 3	L6 - 6.081	S6 - 5.85	L7 - 4.997	S10 - 4.211

TABLE XXXV

COMPOSITE OF LARGE (L) AND SMALL (S) SCHOOLS' MEAN SCORES RECEIVED
AS RESULTS OF THE SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY

Large Schools	Small Schools
L1 - 10.464	S1 - 8.959
L2 - 8.959	S2 - 10.363
L3 - 9.385	S3 - 9.111
L4 - 10.001	S4 - 8.919
L5 - 9.603	S5 - 9.126
L6 - 10.658	S6 - 10.39
L7 - 9.195	S7 - 8.54
L8 - 9.578	S8 - 9.068
L9 - 9.749	S9 - 8.817
L10 - 9.066	S10 - 8.089

TABLE XXXVI

NUMBER OF MALE OR FEMALE STUDENTS WHO RESPONDED
TO THE PUPIL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE IN
BOTH THE LARGE AND SMALL SCHOOLS

	Number of Male Students	Number of Female Students
Large Schools	94	106
Small Schools	91	109
Total Respondents	185	215

TABLE XXXVII

NUMBER OF MINORITY OR NON-MINORITY STUDENTS WHO RESPONDED
TO THE PUPIL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE IN
BOTH THE LARGE AND SMALL SCHOOLS

	Number of Minority Students	Number of Non-Minority Students
Large Schools	66	134
Small Schools	41	159
	107	293

TABLE XXXVIII

NUMBER OF ACADEMIC OR NON-ACADEMIC STUDENTS WHO RESPONDED
TO THE PUPIL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE IN
BOTH THE LARGE AND SMALL SCHOOLS

	Number of Academic Students	Number of Non-Academic Students
Large Schools	140	60
Small Schools	145	55
Total Respondents	285	115

FOOTNOTES

[1]David Smith, <u>Oklahoma Educational Directory</u>, Bulletin No. 110A
(1978-79), pp. 47-123.

[2]Claude E. White, Executive Secretary, <u>Oklahoma Secondary School
Activities Association</u>, 1978-79 Classification Bulletin (1978-79),
pp. 1-4.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The basic intent and purpose of this study was to examine certain

aspects of the structural characteristics of the public high school as

an organization and the prevailing student attitudes toward the school.

The high school characteristics which were examined were based on a

conceptualization of bureaucracy. The student attitudes examined were

based on the concept of alienation. The inter-dependency of these two

areas was examined, keeping in mind the basic underlying question: Do

certain selected bureaucratic characteristics of the public high school

correspond to selected characteristics of student alienation?

Three hypotheses were tested in relation to the basic question of

this research. Furthermore, certain student attitudes were also con-

sidered in the terms of sex, grade level, whether the student was a mem-

ber of a minority group, and if the student was involved in an academi-

cally oriented course of study.

Findings

Hypothesis One

1. In this study Hypothesis One was stated as follows:

   Students in schools classified as relatively high in
   hierarchy of authority will feel significantly more power-
   less than students in schools classified as relatively low

in hierarchy of authority.

This hypothesis was not supported by research findings although students in the schools classified as relatively low in hierarchy of authority felt significantly more powerless than those classified as relatively high in hierarchy of authority.

2. Whereas there was no significant difference between this sense of powerlessness felt by the male students in schools classified as relatively high and relatively low in the hierarchy of authority, females in the schools classified as relatively low in hierarchy of authority felt significantly more powerless than those classified as relatively high in hierarchy of authority.

3. Whereas there was no significant difference between this sense of powerlessness felt by the sophomore students in schools classified as relatively high and relatively low in the hierarchy of authority, seniors in the schools classified as relatively low in hierarchy of authority felt significantly more powerless than those classified as relatively high in hierarchy of authority.

4. Both minority group members and non-minority group members in the public schools classified as relatively low in hierarchy of authority felt significantly more powerless than minority and non-minority group members in schools classified as relatively high in hierarchy of authority.

5. Students which were enrolled in an academically oriented course of study as well as those students enrolled in a non-academically oriented course of study in the schools classified as relatively low in hierarchy of authority felt significantly more powerless than the academically and non-academically oriented group members which existed in

the schools classified as relatively high in hierarchy of authority.

Hypothesis Two

    1. Hypothesis Two was stated as follows:

        Students in schools classified as relatively high in rules and regulations will feel significantly more self-estranged than students in schools classified as relatively low in rules and regulations.

This hypothesis was not supported by research findings.

    2. Both male and female group members in the public schools classified as relatively low in rules and regulations were significantly higher on the self-estrangement dimension of alienation than those male and female student group members in schools classified as being relatively high in rules and regulations dimension of bureaucracy.

    3. Although both sophomores and seniors in schools classified as relatively low in rules and regulations were higher on the self-estrangement dimension of alienation than sophomores and seniors in schools classified as being relatively high in rules and regulations dimension of bureaucracy, there was no significant difference in the sense of self-estrangement felt by either sophomores or seniors in schools classified as relatively high and relatively low in rules and regulations.

    4. Student members of the minority group as well as the non-minority group in the public schools classified as being relatively low in rules and regulations were significantly higher on the self-estrangement dimension of alienation than those minority and non-minority student group members in schools classified as being relatively high in rules and regulations dimension of bureaucracy.

    5. Neither the academically oriented students nor the non-academ-

ically oriented students from schools classified as relatively high in
rules and regulations were significantly higher on the self-estrange-
ment dimension of alienation than those academically and non-academ-
ically oriented students from schools classified as being relatively
low in rules and regulations in the dimension of bureaucracy.

Hypothesis Three

1. Hypothesis Three was stated as follows:

Students in schools classified as relatively high in
impersonalization will feel significantly more isolation than
students in schools classified as relatively low in
impersonalization.

This hypothesis was rejected on the grounds that the difference
was in the opposite direction from that predicted. Thus, this hypothe-
sis was not supported even though a significant difference did exist
between the means.

2. Male students in schools classified as low on the imperson-
alization dimension of bureaucracy were significantly higher on the
isolation dimension of alienation than male students in schools classi-
fied as high on the impersonalization dimension of bureaucracy. No
significant difference seemed to exist in the isolation felt by female
students in relation to the relatively high or low school classification
in the dimension of impersonalization.

3. Senior students were significantly higher on the isolation
dimension of alienation in schools classified as low on the impersonal-
ization dimension of bureaucracy than seniors in schools classified as
high on the impersonalization dimension of bureaucracy. Sophomores in
schools classified as relatively high and relatively low in the imper-

sonalization dimension of bureaucracy showed no significant difference in the sense of isolation felt.

4. There was no significant difference in the sense of isolation felt by minority student group members in schools classified as relatively high and relatively low in the bureaucratic dimension of impersonalization. However, non-minority group members in schools classified as low in impersonalization were significantly higher on the isolation dimension of alienation than non-minority student group members in schools classified as high on the impersonalization dimension of bureaucracy.

5. Both academically and non-academically oriented students enrolled in public schools classified as low in the bureaucratic dimension of impersonalization were significantly higher on the isolation dimension of alienation than academically and non-academically oriented student group members in schools classified as being high on the impersonalization dimension of bureaucracy.

Implications

1. As stated earlier in this study, this is a replication study based on Anderson's original study.[1] Due to this fact, it seems quite necessary and proper to compare these two studies at this point.

Upon comparison of conclusions developed by Anderson and this researcher, it is reasonable to suggest that Anderson's study has been substantiated by data collected in this study.

Both the Anderson study and this study are based on the rationale that certain characteristics of bureaucracy are dysfunctional to the students in a school. Such rationale led to the development of the hy-

potheses tested in both studies. As in Anderson's study, these selected bureaucratic characteristics which might be expected to alienate students in public high schools proved not to be of significant difference. As a matter of fact, in analysis of the data collected and presented, not only must the rationale and hypotheses be rejected, but a slight drift of significant difference seems to be detected in the opposite direction from the predicted outcome. This directional drift was more apparent in this study than in the original Anderson study.

Since the Anderson study is supported, it is quite conceivable that the implications suggested by Anderson may well be valid. For this reason, this writer will conceptualize the Anderson implications as well as suggest others.

The following are derived from the four implications present in the Anderson study:

A.1. Apparently the selected bureaucratic characteristics do not result in student alienation as predicted by the hypotheses; in fact, they may reduce it. Furthermore, it was stated that bureaucracy is probably not dysfunctional to the membership of a school and its alienation toward the organization.

A.2. It is possible that the methodological approach to data collection may need to be modified. It was suggested that teachers and students do not perceive the organizational structure of the school in the same way. One way of reconciling this problem would be to rearrange the measurement of bureaucracy as well as alienation so that it will be a product of the same persons.

A.3. Even though the presence of impersonality in a formal organization is an accepted theory, it appears that the organizational representative (classroom teacher) the student most often comes in contact with does not present the formalistic impersonality impression to the student.

A.4. Some organizations, in an effort to clarify the behaviors expected of its participants, may not be using all sources available to them before decisions concerning the participants are made. This in turn may mean that such an organization may not be as effective as possible.

2. A further implication of the traditional bureaucratic/alienation theory relationship could be the modification of certain bureaucratic organizational structure. It is conceivable that in an attempt to accommodate for the theoretical bureaucratic/alienation student relationship, school administrators over years of decision making have so modified large school organizations that they are no longer as alienating to the student participants of such organizations. At a major university in the southwest, a program, "Emphasis People," was developed with the intent of helping students acclimate themselves to the large, impersonal organization known as Oklahoma State University. This "Emphasis People" program was an example of the organizational representatives attempting to decrease the degree of alienation which might be associated with the impersonalization aspect of a bureaucratic organization by having greater interaction with the students. Due to the data produced and presented in these two studies, such organizational modification may not be necessary or even worthwhile to the student

participant.

A further implication derived from this study may be a relation-
ship the students have developed which may not have previously been
noted. In school settings, numerous intra-organizations tend to develop
for students. Various clubs, groups, and other organizations may act as
reducing agents so students do not face the bureaucratic/alienation re-
lationship theorists have suggested. Instead, these intra-organization-
al groups may actually be acting as a small group structure. Due to the
overall size of certain large organizations, these intra-organizations
quite possibly could become even smaller than groupings which might
occur in a small school setting. Due to the research done and now
re-substantiated, it could conceivably be stated that for various
reasons the larger organizations may well exhibit fewer signs of aliena-
tion than smaller organizations. Consequently, size of a bureaucratic
structure would not be the factor in alienation. On the contrary, the
representatives and groups within each organization will determine how
alienated participants might become.

Such existence of these intra-organizational groupings could sup-
port the traditional theorists's stance if they were to be modified to
accommodate for the intra-organizational groupings as proposed by this
researcher. Thus, the concept that organizations are merely composed of
intra-organizational groups which actually are the basis of each larger
organization can be supported by this research.

If such an existence as discussed above were refined and developed
so as to fit in a practical school setting, certain adjustments might
well be made by school administrators in their school's setting. A
greater emphasis would probably be placed in the development of smaller

sub-units or intra-organizational groups within the school setting. By such actions, it might well be expected by these administrators that a reduction of alienation would be the end product of their administrative actions.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study in conjunction with the original Anderson study may well have a marked effect in the area of theory regarding school organizations. A review of some present theories of school structuring may well be appropriate due in part to this study. Consequently, future modifications toward greater emphasis on intra-organizational groupings may be worthy of consideration. Views of school structuring may further change in existing schools as a by-product of greater acceptance of this and similar research. Further research could also be a very important result of this study. Not only are school organizations and student attitudes involved but an interacting, ongoing response by the organization and the students could be considered in future studies. More specifically, the following questions might be considered:

1. In a time longitudinal study, would there be a fluxuation of significant difference pertaining to the alienation of students and their attitudes toward the school organizations' bureaucratic structure?

2. Are efforts made by school organizations to reduce the alienation factor of students really necessary? If so, are they actually working in the fashion they were intended to?

3. Is it possible that intra-organizational groupings ac-

tually reduce the degree of alienation that participants

feel in a given organizational setting? And if so, could

this be studied further by isolating such groups and running

a statistical analysis on their group members' responses?

From this and other similar studies, what conclusions can be drawn?
This researcher feels that neither the size of an organization nor the
bureaucratic structural framework need to be an inhibiting factor toward
the student participants. Alienation is a process which might well be
modified if certain changes are allowed or instituted in a school's or-
ganizational setting.

It seems that the most logical step for educators to take would be
to attempt to incorporate appropriate research findings into the struc-
tural framework of their school systems. This researcher feels that the
next logical step demands review by school representatives to see if, in
fact, such research findings could benefit their schools, thereby ulti-
mately aiding their students by the reduction of the students' feelings
of alienation toward school.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Anderson, "Selected Bureaucratic Characteristics."

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

Abbott, Max G. Change Perspectives in Educational Administration.
    Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University Press, 1965.

Abbott, Max G. and John T. Lovell. Change Perspectives in Educational
    Administration. Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University Press, 1965.

Bernard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Mass.:
    Harvard University Press, 1938.

Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott. Formal Organizations.
    San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.

Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott. Formal Organizations: A Compara-
    tive Study. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1960.

Blau, Peter M. Bureaucracy in Modern Society. New York: Random House,
    1965.

Dubin, Robert. World of Work. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-
    Hall, Inc., 1958.

Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:
    Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Garner, Roberta Ash. Social Change. Chicago: Rand McNally Publishing,
    1977.

Griffiths, Daniel E. "Administration as Decision-Making." Organiza-
    tions and Human Behavior. Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergio-
    vanni, editors. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.

Howton, F. William. Functionaries. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1969.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York:
    Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

March, James G. and Herbert A. Simon. Organization. New York: John
    Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

Merton, Robert. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality." Complex

99

Organizations. Amitai Etzioni, editor. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

Merton, Robert. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality." _Complex Organizations_. Amitai Etzioni, editor. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

Morphet, Edgar L., Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller. _Educational Organization and Administration_. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Nisbet, Robert A. _Community and Power_. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Parsons, Talcott. "Some Ingredients of a General Theory of Formal Organizations." _Administrative Theory in Education_. A. W. Halpin, editor. New York: MacMillian Company, 1967.

Presthus, Robert V. "The Social Base of Bureaucratic Organization." _Bureaucracy and the Public_. Elihu, Katy and Brenda Dent, editors. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973.

Rogers, William R. _The Alienated Students_. Nashville: Division of Higher Education. Board of Education of United Methodist Church, 1969.

Sofer, Cyril. _Organizations in Theory and Practice_. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1972.

Stammer, Otto. _Max Weber and Sociology Today_. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1971.

Thompson, James D. _Organizations in Action_. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1967.

Weber, Max. "Three Types of Legitimate Rule." _Complex Organizations_. Amitai Etzioni, editor. New York: Hall, Rinehart, and Winston, 1962.

Weber, Max. "The Essentials of Bureaucratic Organization: An Ideal-Type Construction." _Reader in Bureaucracy_. Robert K. Merton, Ailsa Gray, Barbara Hockey, Hanan C. Selurn, editors. New York: Free Press, 1952.

B. Periodicals

Anderson, James G. "Bureaucratic Rules: Bearers of Organizational Authority." _Educational Administration Quarterly_ (Winter, 1966), p. 12.

Blau, Peter M. "Critical Remarks on Weber's Theory of Authority."

The American Political Science Review, Vol. 57 (June, 1963), pp. 106-107.

Flemmings, Vincent C. *Student Unrest in the High Schools: A Position Paper*. New York: Center for Urban Education, June, 1970, pp. 9-46.

Geller, Jesse D. and Gary Howard. *Student Activism and the War in Vietnam*. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association, Department of HEW, Department of Education, August, 1969, pp. 1-39.

Getzels, J. W. "Psycho-Sociological Framework for the Study of Educational Administration." *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 22 (1952), pp. 236-239.

Getzels, Jacob W. and Egon Guba. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process." *School Review*, Vol. 65 (1957), p. 429.

Hall, Richard H. "Interorganizational Structure Variation: Application of the Bureaucratic Model." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 7 (1962-63), pp. 295-308.

Hall, Richard. "Some Organizational Considerations in the Professional-Organizational Relationship." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 12 (December, 1967), p. 465.

Illich, Ivan. "Schooling: The Ritual of Progress." *New York Review of Books*. New York: December, 1970, pp. 20-26.

Pearlin, Leonard I. "Alienation from Work: A Study of Nursing Personnel." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 27 (June, 1962), p. 325.

Seeman, Melvin. "On the Meaning of Alienation." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 24 (December, 1959), p. 784.

Smith, David. *Oklahoma Educational Directory*, Bulletin No. 110A, 1978-79, pp. 47-123.

Thompson, Victor A. "Hierarchy, Specialization and Organizational Conflict." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 5 (1961), pp. 485-486.

White, Claude E. Executive Secretary, *Oklahoma Secondary School Activities Association*, 1978-79 Classification Bulletin, 1978-79, pp. 1-4.

C. Unpublished Materials

Adams, Charles F. "The Relationship of Teacher Alienation to the Organizational Structures of Schools." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, State University of New York, 1968.)

Anderson, Carl R. "Selected Bureaucratic Characteristics and Student Alienation in the Public High School." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1970.)

Arquitt, Jr., George E. "Social Contributors to Feelings of Alienation Among Adolescents." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1968.)

Kolesar, Henry. "An Empirical Study of Client Alienation in the Bureaucratic Organization." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, 1967.)

MacKay, D. A. "An Empirical Study of Bureaucratic Dimensions and Their Relations to the Characteristics of School Organization." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964.)

Punch, Keith Francis. "Bureaucratic Structure in Schools and Its Relationship to Leader Behavior: An Empirical Study." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto, 1967.)

Robinson, Norman. "A Study of the Professional Role Orientations of Teachers and Principals and Their Relationship to Bureaucratic Characteristics of School Organizations." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966.)

APPENDIX A

SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY

INSTRUCTIONS: In this series of statements, you are asked to indicate how well each one describes the organizational characteristics of your school. For each statement, circle the answer on the answer sheet which you feel comes closest to describing your own school organization. The five possible choices are: Always True, Often True, Occasionally True, Seldom True, and Never True.

1. A person who wants to make his own decisions would quickly become discouraged in this school.

2. Rules stating when teachers arrive and depart from the building are strictly enforced.

3. The use of a wide variety of teaching methods and materials is encouraged in this school.

4. We are expected to be courteous, but reserved, at all times in our dealings with parents.

5. Staff members from this school always get their orders from higher up.

6. The time for the informal staff get-togethers during the school day is strictly regulated by the administration.

7. In dealing with student discipline problems teachers are encouraged to consider the individual offender, not the offense, in deciding on a suitable punishment.

8. Staff members are allowed to do almost as they please in their classroom work.

9. The teacher is expected to abide by the spirit of the rules of the school rather than stick to the letter of the rules.

10. We are to follow strict operating procedures at all times.

11. The administration sponsors staff get-togethers.

12. Nothing is said if you get to school just before roll call or

leave right after dismissal occasionally.

13. Going through proper channels is constantly stressed.

14. Teachers are encouraged to become friendly with groups and individuals outside the school.

15. There can be little action until an administrator approves a decision.

16. The teachers are constantly being checked for rule violations.

17. Teachers who have contact with parents and other citizens are instructed in proper procedures for greeting and talking with them.

18. Each staff member is responsible to an administrator to whom the member regularly reports.

19. The school has a manual of rules and regulations for teachers to follow.

20. A person can make his own decisions without checking with anyone else.

21. There is only one way to do the job — the Principal's way.

22. In dealing with student behavior problems the school has standard punishments for standard offenses regardless of the individual involved.

23. I have to ask the principal before I do almost anything.

24. No one can get necessary supplies without permission from the principal or vice-principal.

25. Written orders from higher up are followed unquestioningly.

26. The same procedures are to be followed in most situations.

27. Students are treated within the rules of the school, no matter how serious a problem they have.

28. Even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.

29. Teachers are expected not to leave their classroom without permission.

30. Whenever we have a problem we are supposed to go to the same person for the answer.

31. No matter how special a pupil's or parent's problem appears to be, the person is treated the same way as anyone else.

32. Any decision I make has to have my superior's approval.

33. Red tape is often a problem in getting a job done in this school.

SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY RESPONSE SHEET

Biographical Data

School_____

1. Sex (1 = male, 2 = female)   1._____

2. Age (to nearest year)   2._____

3. Formal Preparation Completed
   Most advanced degree plus additional hours   3._____

4. Teaching experience in years including this year
   a. Total teaching   4a._____

   b. In present position   4b._____

SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY ANSWER SHEET

AT = Always True   OFT = Often True   OCT = Occasionally True
ST = Seldom True   NT = Never True

Please circle the appropriate response on the basis of the key provided.

1.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT		18.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT
2.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT		19.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT
3.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT		20.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT
4.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT		21.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT
5.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT		22.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT
6.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT		23.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT
7.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT		24.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT
8.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT		25.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT
9.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT		26.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT
10.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT		27.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT
11.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT		28.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT
12.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT		29.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT
13.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT		30.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT
14.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT		31.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT
15.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT		32.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT
16.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT		33.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT
17.	AT	OFT	OCT	ST	NT							

CATEGORICAL BREAKDOWN OF SCHOOL

ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY

Key to the Categorical Breakdown of

The School Organizational Inventory

<u>Hierarchy of Authority</u> is measured by the items in the questionnaire
which correspond to the following numbers:

  1, 5, 8, 15, 19, 20, 23, 24, 28, and 32

<u>Rules for Members</u> is measured by the items in the questionnaire which
correspond to the following numbers:

  2, 6, 9, 12, 16, 18, 25, and 29

<u>Professional Specifications</u> is measured by the items in the question-
naire which correspond to the following numbers:

  3, 10, 13, 21, 26, 30, and 33

<u>Impersonalization</u> is measured by the items in the questionnaire
which correspond to the following numbers:

  4, 7, 11, 14, 17, 22, 27, and 31

APPENDIX D

KEY TO SCORING ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY

Items 3, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, and 20 are scored:

AT = 1, AFT = 2, OCT = 3, ST = 4, and NT = 5.

Items 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33 are scored:

AT = 5, OFT = 4, OCT = 3, ST = 2, and NT = 1.

PUPIL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. White lies are justified when they help to avoid punishment.

2. It is a good policy to tell teachers only what they want to hear.

3. In this school success is to be aimed for by any means that pupils can devise.

4. It is most important that right always be achieved even if it requires tremendous effort.

5. Schools are run by others and there is little that pupils can do about it.

6. I think that I now predict what I can achieve in an occupation after graduation.

7. The school experience of pupils are controlled by plans devised by others.

8. There really isn't much use complaining to the teachers about the school because it is impossible to influence them anyway.

9. The reason that I endure some unpleasant things now is because I feel that it will benefit me later on.

10. Pupils should have most of their time free from study.

11. Sometimes it is necessary to make promises to school authorities which you don't have any intention of keeping.

12. In order to get ahead in this school pupils are almost forced to do some things which are not right.

13. Pupils are often given the opportunity to express their ideas about how the school ought to be run.

14. It is possible on the basis of the level of my present school achievement to predict with a high degree of accuracy the level of achievement I can expect in adulthood.

15. It is very desirable that pupils learn to be good citizens.

16. I think my teachers would have given me the same marks on the last report card no matter how well I really had done.

17. My school experiences will help me to become a good citizen.

18. It doesn't matter too much if what I am doing is right or wrong as long as it works.

19. At school we learn habits and attitudes which will guide us in the achievement of a good life.

20. I know that I will complete my high school education.

21. These days a pupil doesn't really know who he can count on.

22. I often worry about what my teachers think of me.

23. Pupils must try to develop an interest in their school subjects even when the content is dull.

24. It is more important to achieve enjoyment and personal satisfaction than to sacrifice yourself for others.

25. I study hard at school mainly because I want to get good grades.

26. I often read and study in my courses beyond what is required by my teachers.

27. Really, a pupil has done wrong only if he gets caught.

28. The school principal is really interested in all pupils in this school.

29. In discipline cases the pupil's explanation of the circumstances is carefully weighed by the school authorities before punishment is decided upon.

30. The teachers will not listen to pupil complaints about unfair school rules.

31. Usually I would rather play hookey than come to school.

32. I would rather go to work now than go to school, but more education now will help me get a better job later.

33. What I am doing at school will assist me to do what I want to do when I graduate.

34. Pupils have adequate opportunities to protect themselves when their interests conflict with the interests of those who run the school.

35. Copying parts of essays from books is justified if this results in good marks on the essays.

36. I get more satisfaction from doing an assignment well than from the marks which I receive on the assignment.

37. What we do at school will help us to affect the world in which we live.

38. Participation in student council activities will help me in anything I try to do in the future.

39. As a result of my school experiences I know what I will do when I graduate.

40. No matter how I try I don't seem to understand the content of my courses very well.

41. In this school the teachers are the rulers and the pupils are the slaves.

42. It is unlikely that in this school the pupils will achieve the goals in which they believe.

43. If homework assignments were not required, I would seldom do homework.

44. I like to do extra problems in mathematics for fun.

45. I understand how decisions are made regarding what we are to study in this school.

46. My school studies will help me to make predictions about the kind of world in which I will live in the future.

47. My present school studies will help me to understand others.

48. Pupils must be very careful to make the best possible impression with their teachers.

49. If I had my way, I'd close all schools.

50. Having lots of friends is more important than in getting ahead at school.

51. In this school pupils can complain to the principal and be given a fair hearing.

52. Copying another pupil's homework is justified if he agrees to let you do it.

53. Pupils' ideas about how the school should be run are often adopted in this school.

54. I find it easy to please my teachers.

55. I want to finish high school.

56. It is necessary to misbehave at school if you're going to have any fun.

57. Giving an answer to someone else during an examination is not really cheating.

58. Pupils must take advantage of every opportunity, fair or unfair, because good opportunities occur very infrequently at this school.

59. Pupils in this school are given considerable freedom in planning their own programs to meet their future needs.

60. Participation in student council activities will assist one to become a good citizen.

APPENDIX F

PUPIL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE SHEET

Biographical Data

1. Sex (male = 1, female = 2)   1. _____

2. Classification in school
        (senior = 1, sophomore = 2)   2. _____

3. Age (to nearest year)   3. _____

4. Are you a member of a group that
        some would call "minority"?   4. _____
        (yes = 1, no = 2)

5. Are you enrolled in a course of
        study where more than half of
        your courses are "academic"?   5. _____
        (yes = 1, no = 2)

PUPIL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE ANSWER SHEET

SA = Strongly Agree;   A = Agree;   U = Undecided;   D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

1. SA A U D SD	21. SA A U D SD	41. SA A U D SD
2. SA A U D SD	22. SA A U D SD	42. SA A U D SD
3. SA A U D SD	23. SA A U D SD	43. SA A U D SD
4. SA A U D SD	24. SA A U D SD	44. SA A U D SD
5. SA A U D SD	25. SA A U D SD	45. SA A U D SD
6. SA A U D SD	26. SA A U D SD	46. SA A U D SD
7. SA A U D SD	27. SA A U D SD	47. SA A U D SD
8. SA A U D SD	28. SA A U D SD	48. SA A U D SD
9. SA A U D SD	29. SA A U D SD	49. SA A U D SD
10. SA A U D SD	30. SA A U D SD	50. SA A U D SD
11. SA A U D SD	31. SA A U D SD	51. SA A U D SD
12. SA A U D SD	32. SA A U D SD	52. SA A U D SD
13. SA A U D SD	33. SA A U D SD	53. SA A U D SD
14. SA A U D SD	34. SA A U D SD	54. SA A U D SD
15. SA A U D SD	35. SA A U D SD	55. SA A U D SD
16. SA A U D SD	36. SA A U D SD	56. SA A U D SD
17. SA A U D SD	37. SA A U D SD	57. SA A U D SD
18. SA A U D SD	38. SA A U D SD	58. SA A U D SD
19. SA A U D SD	39. SA A U D SD	59. SA A U D SD
20. SA A U D SD	40. SA A U D SD	60. SA A U D SD

APPENDIX G

CATEGORICAL BREAKDOWN OF PUPIL

ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

Key to the Categorical Breakdown of the

Pupil Attitude Questionnaire

Powerlessness is measured by the items in the questionnaire which
    correspond to the following numbers:

5, 7, 8, 13, 28, 29, 30, 34, 41, 51, 53, and 59

Self-Estrangement is measured by the items in the questionnaire which
    correspond to the following numbers:

10, 12, 16, 21, 26, 31, 32, 36, 40, 43, 44, and 54

Normlessness is measured by the items in the questionnaire which
    correspond to the following numbers:

1, 2, 3, 11, 15, 18, 24, 27, 35, 42, 52, 56, 57, and 58

Meaninglessness is measured by the items in the questionnaire which
    correspond to the following numbers:

6, 14, 17, 19, 33, 37, 38, 39, 45, 46, 47, and 60

Isolation is measured by the items in the questionnaire which correspond
    to the following numbers:

4, 9, 20, 22, 23, 25, 48, 49, 50, and 55

APPENDIX H

KEY TO SCORING PUPIL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

The Pupil Attitude Questionnaire is divided into three groups. Group I includes items: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 18, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 35, 40, 41, 42, 43, 48, 49, 50, 52, 56, 57, and 58. The scoring for this group is: SA = 5, A = 4, U = 3, D = 2, and SD = 1.

Group II includes items: 4, 6, 13, 15, 20, 23, 26, 28, 29, 34, 36, 44, 45, 46, 51, 53, 54, 55, and 59. The scoring for this group is: SA = 1, A = 2, U = 3, D = 4, and SD = 5.

Group III includes items: 14, 17, 19, 33, 37, 38, 39, 47, and 60. The scoring for this group is: SA = 1, A = 3, U = 5, D = 3, and SD = 1.

VITA

James Dwight Davidson

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: A REPLICATION STUDY OF SELECTED BUREAUCRATIC CHARACTERISTICS AND STUDENT ALIENATION IN THE PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Tulsa, Oklahoma, May 9, 1951, the son of Mr. and Mrs. J. H. Davidson.

Education: Graduated from Kellyville High School, Kellyville, Oklahoma, in May, 1969; received Bachelor of Science degree in Biological Sciences from Oklahoma State University in 1972; enrolled in Masters program at Oklahoma State University in 1973; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1975, with a major in Educational Administration; attended Oklahoma State University and completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in July, 1980.

Professional Experience: Science teacher and coach at Stroud High School, Stroud, Oklahoma, 1973-1974; Research Technologist for Amoco Research Center, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1974-1975; Junior High School Principal and Senior High basketball and baseball coach at Kellyville High School, Kellyville, Oklahoma, 1975-1980.