

ROLE STASIS: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY IN ALIENATION
AND ANOMIE AMONG FEMALE ADMINISTRATIVE
ASSISTANTS

By

JAMES CHARLES ROMEIS

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1969

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1970

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
OCT 28 1970

ROLE STASIS: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY IN ALIENATION
AND ANOMIE AMONG FEMALE ADMINISTRATIVE
ASSISTANTS

Thesis Approved:

Larry M. Perkins

Thesis Adviser

Richard Dodder

Gene Ray

N. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

763654

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study is the synthesis of ideas, readings, and conversations by whom a number of individuals should be acknowledged.

The writer wishes to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Larry Perkins, Associate Professor of Sociology and advisor, for his time, patience, understanding, and encouragement throughout this study. Indebtedness is also expressed to Dr. Richard Dodder, Assistant Professor of Sociology, for the amount of time he spent with the methodological aspects of this study, and to Dr. Gene Acuff, Professor and Head of the Department of Sociology, for his encouragement throughout the writer's undergraduate and graduate study.

Special thanks is extended to Dr. Donald Allen, Professor of Sociology, for his invaluable time in writing the computer programs which aided significantly in meeting the deadlines and in the accuracy of the computations. Also, thanks is extended to Miss Velda Davis for typing this thesis, and to the Graduate College, and the National Science Foundation for providing financial assistance.

Personal appreciation and gratitude is given to my wife, Dana, for the special kind of encouragement, patience, and work that made the preparation of this thesis a little easier. Personal acknowledgements are also extended to Mr. and Mrs. Bob Swaffar for their sincere friendship and understanding throughout this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Significance of the Problem.	1
Objectives of the Study.	2
Limitations of the Study	3
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.	4
Alienation	4
Anomie	10
Role Stasis.	13
III. DATA AND METHODOLOGY.	21
Operational Definition	21
Sample Selection	21
Instrument Selection and Description	24
Variable Description	26
Hypothesis	27
Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment.	28
IV. FINDINGS.	31
Descriptive.	31
Role Stasis, Anomie, and Alienation.	32
Limitations and Discussion	39
V. CONCLUSIONS	42
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.	45
APPENDIX A - QUESTIONNAIRE	47
APPENDIX B - SELF-ESTRANGEMENT ITEMS	54
APPENDIX C - ALIENATION--GENERAL ITEMS AND ALIENATION--SPECIFIC ITEMS	56
APPENDIX D - ANOMIA--GENERAL AND ANOMIA--SPECIFIC ITEMS.	58
APPENDIX E - ROLE STASIS ITEMS	60
APPENDIX F - CORRELATION COEFFICIENT PROGRAM	62
APPENDIX G - MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ALIENATION/ANOMIA MEASURES (n = 27)	64

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Correlation Coefficients Between Role Stasis, Alienation and Anomia-General, and Alienation and Anomia-Specific Scales (n = 27).	33
II. Correlation Coefficients of Alienation, Anomia, and Role Stasis Scales With Age, Total Secretarial Experience, Specific Organizational Experience, Number of Prior Positions, and Number of Different Departments Within Sampled Organization (n = 27).	35
III. Educational Orientations and Alienation, Anomia and Role Stasis Measures (n = 27)	36
IV. Marital Status and Alienation, Anomia, and Role Stasis Measures (n = 27).	38

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

With the advent of the urban-industrialized society, the concepts of alienation and anomie have become pronounced in social theory, empirical inquiry, and in the lives of many members of such a society. There are probably no two concepts that have operationally plagued scholars more, yet, at the same time, added significantly to the understanding of social processes. Hence, it is to this endeavor that this study will be addressed, while also providing a new conceptual perspective that could add to these elusive abstractions.

Significance of the Problem

This study is being conducted to explore, quantify and analyze the extent of a new conceptual phenomenon associated with, and possibly a contributor to, what is popularly viewed as alienated or anomic behavior. Furthermore, in a mass society the frequency of alienation and anomie seems to be undoubtedly greater and, thus, leads the sociologist to look for causality within the inherent forms of social organization.

The new conceptual phenomenon under investigation has been termed role stasis. Simply defined, role stasis occurs when a social role becomes fixed or rigid. Role stasis, or the "standing still" of a social role, appears when an actor experiences a narrowing, a

constriction, or a delimitation, of an otherwise dynamic, by definition, social role via a socially organized entity. In other words, there seems to be a great possibility that an organization possesses the capabilities of defining a role so narrowly that the uniqueness of the individual actor, in Mead's terms, the actors "I" is by organizational arrangement defined away. Furthermore, the organizational definition that delimits a significant part of the self has the logical consequences of producing varied forms of personal disturbances. The specific personal disturbances under study here are alienation and anomie. A more extensive treatment of the role stasis concept and the two logical consequences will be found near the end of Chapter II.

Although not an aspect of this study, an extension of the role stasis idea could, in fact, yield understanding and insight to the growing disenchantment that is found in many of today's institutions. The charges of oppression, discontent, and violence, I feel, are directly related to social organizations, structurally, although inadvertently rationalized under the auspices of the industrial system, usurping a portion of the individual's uniqueness.

Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of the research are basically three in number:

1. To develop an exploratory perspective which alludes to a more delineated insight into the conceptual understandings of alienation and anomie.
2. To examine, quantitatively, the relationships between instruments attesting to measure alienated and anomic attitudes.

3. To explore the methodological consequences of modifying those same instruments to a specific situation and examining that specific setting relationship to general alienation and anomie instruments.

Limitations of the Study

Methodology, from the start, has been problematic; however, it should not preclude a dismissal of role stasis as a rejection criteria. Moreover, the exploratory nature of the study lends itself to modifications for future evaluations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Alienation

Faunce charges, "... the most persistent indictment of industrial society is that it has resulted in the alienation of industrial man."¹ Societal and personal consequences of such a charge bring sociologists, psychologists, and psychiatrists to the social milieu trying to objectively discern the ramifications and causal relationships of such a social organization. Faunce goes on to describe this social form by stating:

Loneliness in the midst of urban agglomeration; loss of social anchorage in mass society; the absence of a predictable life trajectory in an era of unprecedented social change; and the powerlessness of man within the complex social, economic, and political systems he has created are common themes in the social criticism of the industrial way of life.²

Although this phenomenon is not a unique one to the present, Nisbet, quite cogently, suggests two fundamental and distinguishable perspectives of alienation to be found in nineteenth-century sociological thought. The first depicts an alienated perspective of the individual, while the second is from the perspective of the society.³

In the first perspective we see modern man as uprooted, alone, without secure status, cut off from community or any system of clear moral purpose. Estrangement is sovereign: estrangement from others, from work, from place, and even from self. Far from possessing within himself the resources of reason and stability, man feels these resources threatened and himself metaphysically beleaguered, as it were. Suffering

from, rather than rejoicing in, the liberation that history has given him, the individual is unable to establish the resistences necessary to living with the world and with himself. Gone, in this view, is the historic rationalist conviction of the self-sustaining nature of the individual. The price of individual liberation from tradition may be, we learn, loss of individuality - to be seen in suicide, unreason, robotization, and other forms of pathological deviation from the norm of personality... Loss of community isolates man, and the mounting pressures of vast institutions and organizations, far from shoring up his being, only intensifies the alienative process: by fragmenting him into the mechanical roles he is forced to play, none of them touching his innermost self but all of them separating man from this self, leaving him, so to speak, existentially missing in action.⁴

Nisbet's second perspective is somewhat analagous to his first, except the emphasis is placed on the society, the people, and the general will. More accurately stated: "... modern society is inaccessible because of its remoteness, formidable from its heavy structures of organization, meaningless from its impersonal complexity."⁵ It should be noted here that Nisbet's second perspective will be more fully dealt with below in the anomie subsection.

Specifically then, Nisbet points out that alienated behavior is characterized by withdrawal - a withdrawal of social energy from social ends and social purposes.⁶ Moreover, one could therefore expect to find varied patterns of alienated behavior in all realms of social organizations and institutions. Hence, this concept of alienation is much broader than the initial exploration of alienation in industrial society developed by Karl Marx.

While influenced by Hegel, Marx borrowed the concept from him, but changed the Hegelian metaphysical analysis to a social structural based causality. That is, Marx saw the developing modes of social organization being directed in such a way as to exclude the individual from his rightful place in the policy making. This point is central to the study

and will be elaborated on later. Alienation for Marx, Horowitz claims, was a social scientific occurrence from class economics, and obviated only through political revolution.⁷ While Marx approached alienation within a specific institutional context-economics, he

... held that four types of alienation emerged directly from the work situation: (1) alienation from the process of work, (2) alienation from the product of work, (3) alienation of the worker himself, and (4) the alienation of the worker from others.⁸

Succinctly, according to Marx, alienation is experienced on two broad levels. First, man is alienated from the product of his labor: "He has no control over the disposition of the commodities he produces."⁹ In other words, "... the object which labor produces, its product, is encountered as an alien entity, a force that has become independent of its producer."¹⁰ Secondly, the worker is alienated from the means of production. With the advent of the factory system and the industrial revolution, the worker no longer need own the machinery or tools with which he worked. While on the one hand, the individual worker was experiencing a new freedom of job selection; on the other, he lost the power to control his product. Through the new contractual wage agreements he was, via the economical institution, forced to objectify a significant part of his "self" by selling his labor not as an essential part of his being, but a product that was institutionally defined away from him. Control over his work life was now being minimized by a pervasive social system, and he was estranged from his activity at work. Hence, work for Marx was the "... existential activity of man, his free conscious activity - not a means for maintaining his life but for developing his universal nature."¹¹

Eric Fromm, who has written extensively on the alienation of industrial man, depicted Marx's view as:

Alienation (or 'estrangement') means, for Marx, that man does not experience himself as the acting agent in his grasp of the world, but that the world (nature, others, and he himself) remain alien to him. They stand above and against him as objects, even though they may be objects of his own creation. Alienation is essentially experiencing the world and oneself passively, receptively, as the subject separated from the object.¹²

Turning now to a more current conceptual theme, Seeman posits five variants of alienation which have aided greatly in operationally working with this idea. Seeman treats alienation from a social-psychological point of view and synthesizes much of the theoretical work done in this area. These five variants are: (1) powerlessness, (2) meaninglessness, (3) normlessness, (4) isolation, and (5) self-estrangement.¹³

Of these five, powerlessness is perhaps the most popular in current literature and even more so when empirical investigation is sought. Seeman, drawing from Gouldner and Mills, claims this variant of alienation to be conceived of as "... the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements, he seeks."¹⁴ It should be emphasized that Seeman's powerlessness is a social-psychological perspective. Even though the objective conditions of society are relevant and cannot be ignored, powerlessness is not viewed from objective societal structures.¹⁵ In other words, this dimension of alienation implies an individual discernment of his power, or lack of power, to control those events significant to his social self.

The second variant and major usage is meaninglessness. This type of alienation refers to the understanding the individual connotes from his social world. Definitively then, meaninglessness is found when "... the individual is unclear as to what he ought to believe -- when the individual's minimal standards for clarity in decision-making are not met."¹⁶

The third variant, normlessness, is derived from Durkheim's classic description of anomie. Although Seeman claims this dimension is independent of the anomie concept, like all of his variants, it should be noted that this point is controversial. However, following Merton's idea, the anomic situation is defined from the individual's perspective as a "... high expectancy that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve given goals."¹⁷

Isolation, Seeman's fourth type of alienation, applies to the individual experiencing the popular culture from without. Usually this variant is associated with the intellectual's predicament of assigning "... low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in a given society."¹⁸ This dimension was taken from Nettler's definition in which she largely tried to measure the individual's "... apartness from society."¹⁹

The final variant is self-estrangement and has been treated extensively in the writings of Mills,²⁰ Hoffer,²¹ and Fromm.²² Here, as has already been stated by Fromm, self-estrangement approximates the Marxian concept. "To be self-alienated, in the final analysis, means to be something less than one might ideally be if the circumstances in society were otherwise -- to be insecure, given to appearances, conformist."²³

Concluding Seeman's analysis, it should be noted again that the mere language restriction involved is perhaps to blame for the seemingly lack of independence between these variants. Seeman demonstrates that the five above categories are varieties of alienation which are substantially found in the literature. The semantic change of variants to dimensions might prove more useful. The justification being that these variants have been extracted from the literature; but when operationalized, all five can be scaled, which leads to the contention that these five and possibly more are valid dimensions of this concept. This last point should become clearer when some of the frequently cited studies are examined.

For example, Dean, in 1961, constructed scales to measure three of these dimensions -- social isolation, powerlessness, and normlessness.²⁴ Reliability of these sub-scales, tested by the "split-half" technique, indicated a .78, .73, and .84 (N = 384), respectively. Also, inter-correlations of the sub-scales provided significance considerably above the .01 level.²⁵ This suggests that the sub-scales do belong to the general concept, but independence has probably not been effective due to the amounts of correlation existing among the sub-scales. For example, Simmons shows social isolation and powerlessness having the highest correlation, .53; normlessness and powerlessness, .43; and social isolation with normlessness at .33.²⁶

In sum, many theorists have posited even further correlates of the alienation theme.²⁷ The one aspect of the concept that is certainly recurrent is that psychologically the term is contextually depicting a "lessness" -- powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness.²⁸ In this sense the alienation concept leads to an allusion of universality, via

its connection to the personality structure as well as the social structure; but alienation is generally thought to be primarily a psychological or subjective dimension while anomie is its sociological or objective counterpart.²⁹

Anomie

As with alienation, anomie, at the operational level, is another elusive abstraction. In order to establish a frame of reference for anomie, the format to be used will be similar to the one used for alienation. The originator's position of the concept will be advanced, followed by other theoretical clarifications, and finally some empirical studies.

Etymologically, anomie means "normlessness." However, sociologically speaking, all social behavior is accompanied by a degree of normative order, save the extreme mentally deficient. What is meant by normlessness, is that there are conditions in a society that produce conflicts within the actor's translations of norm expectations. This is exactly what the originator, Durkheim, had in mind when he coined the term in 1897.

In his classic, Suicide, he observed a notable rise in suicides, which he attributed to the societal conditions of the time. The Durkheimian approach to alienation was leveled at special societal controls that affected the individual. Durkheim found a high rate of suicide associated with both kinds of economic upheaval, felt to be caused by an excessive lack of societal mediation between the individual's economic goals. Anomic suicide proceeds from normative conflicts, arising out of economics, which become insupportable for the

individual.³⁰ More clearly stated,

At the moment when traditional rules have lost their authority, the richer prize offered these appetites stimulates them and makes them more exigent and impatient of control. The state of de-regulation or anomie is thus further heightened by passions being less disciplined, precisely when they need more disciplining. Nothing gives satisfaction and all this agitation is uninterruptedly maintained without appeasement. Above all, since this race for an unattainable goal can give no other pleasure but that of the race itself, if it is one, once it is interrupted the participants are left empty-handed. At the same time the struggle grows more violent and painful, both from being less controlled and because competition is greater. All classes contend among themselves because no established classification any longer exists. Effort grows, just when it becomes less productive. How could the desire to live not be weakened under such conditions?³¹

The important thing for Durkheim was "... not what excessive individualism produces, but individualism itself that is the cause of suicidal currents in society and of all other manifestations of disorganization and alienation."³² All in all, anomie is "... a breakdown of moral community just as egoism is a breakdown of social community."³³

A more illuminating, contemporary broadening of the anomie concept was proposed by Merton in 1949. While retaining the economic basis, Merton felt that not only were the de-regulation of societal goals a contributing factor, but socially unapproved means to achieve the socially approved goals were another viable cause. He defined anomie as:

... a 'breakdown' in the cultural structure between the cultural norms, the goals, and the socially structured capacities of members of the group to act in accord with them ... The imperfect coordination between the goals results in anomie.³⁴

Anomic conditions were characterized by a discrepancy between a means-ends schema at the societal level.

Most empirical research designed to test the validity of Merton's thesis has been based on a scale developed by Srole.³⁵ His anomia^{*} scale hypothesized a continuum of social integration. Eunomia, at one extreme, refers to "... well ordered conditions in a society or state, ..." or a "... self to others belongingness." Anomia, at the other extreme, is a "... self to others alienation ..." or "... self to others distance."³⁶

Each of his five eunomia-anomia items, according to factor analysis, are measuring one dimension.³⁷ Mizruchi,³⁸ Bell,³⁹ Meier and Bell,⁴⁰ Roberts and Rokeach,⁴¹ and others have worked with the anomia items and have found them to scale; however, some of the discrepancies found when correlated with socio-economic class could be due to different operational definitions. Further analysis indicates Srole's scale is perhaps not measuring the same phenomenon that Dean's subscales test. The correlation of social isolation with Srole's scale is .23, and a .25 correlation with normlessness and Srole's scale. There is, though, a .35 correlation between powerlessness and Srole's scale.⁴²

In sum,

... anomie is, in short, behavior characterized by tensions and distresses that arise from the effort of an individual to meet the obligations of two or more irreconcilable norms. That is, they are irreconcilable within the framework of response of the individual concerned.⁴³

Thus, it should be obvious that the distinction between alienation is not all that clear. There is indeed an overlap between the two concepts, and much to be said for alienation may also be said for anomie.

* Anomia refers to the scale while anomie refers to the concept.

In fact, there have been suggestions of abandoning the distinctions between alienation and anomie.⁴⁴ Indeed, there are anomic manifestations of alienation, and inversely, degrees of alienation in anomie. However, conceptually there is merit for retaining the distinctions; it is at the methodological level where discrepancies are notable.

Clearly then:

We have dealt with alienation as a form of withdrawal of energy, and this largely means withdrawal from social roles, statuses, and social groups. But, as we have seen, anomie is not, fundamentally, withdrawal from norms or roles in a given social aggregate. Anomie is a condition or behavior resulting from perceived conflicts of norms. The tension deriving from seemingly irreconcilable norms or desires within a single situation accounts for nearly all anomie.

Alienation is not primarily conflict-ridden behavior -- although previous, irreconcilable conflicts within one's personality may lead eventually to alienation. Instead, alienation produces behavior that is withdrawn, passive, or apathetic. An alienated individual is beyond even the stimulus of anomic conflict. The difference between alienation and anomie is real and worth emphasizing, even if there is very often a functional relation between the two.⁴⁵

Role Stasis⁴⁶

The social role is basic to many of the social sciences, and through role analysis one can gain considerable insight and understanding in human behavior patterns. Associated with roles are rights, duties, obligations, and expectations of a particular part in the social scheme, or in general, a behavior expectation level.

As mentioned in Chapter I, role stasis was simply defined as the phenomenon of a social role becoming fixed or rigid. There is not any real dynamic attachment given to the role, as perceived by the actor within the specific role, or by the social organization that has defined the role boundaries. There appears to be a distinct possibility that a

social role can be defined so narrowly by the division of labor that the result is that the role is perceived as static. A formal definition would be: role stasis occurs when an individual actor perceptually experiences a narrowing, or a constriction, or a delimitation of self, while learning or completing the learning of the expectations of the role as defined by any socially organized entity. Clearly then, role stasis is an organization denial of human uniqueness. In Mead's terms, the actor's "I" has, by organizational arrangement and efficiency, been defined away, resulting, theoretically, in forms of personal disturbances.

Specifically, role stasis could very well be an antecedent to both alienation and anomie. By previous definitions, alienation and anomie are undoubtedly intertwined within the role stasis concept. When organizational role definitions are not cognizant of the individuality of its participants, how can norm formation or meaning be experienced, or how can one keep from intuiting anything else but isolation and powerlessness, or how can that role relationship be totally fulfilling?

In order to give some historic substantiation to the concept, there must be a return to Marx. Marx believed in the infinite perfectability of man and throughout his life hoped for a truly human society.⁴⁷ He felt "... man's essential powers -- his latent and potential human powers -- are unlimited in their capacity for development."⁴⁸ Marx's imagery of work was that through individual work selection man could optimize those essential powers and creatively fulfill his life and social system. His contempt for the capitalist-industrial system was anchored around the perspective that this type of system was debasing,

deforming, and dehumanizing; and that the alienation of man was the consequence.⁴⁹

It is, of course, here that the alienation process begins for Marx -- the separation of men from their means of production.

The alienation of the worker from his product means not only that his labor becomes an object, an external existence, but that it exists outside him, independently, as something alien to him, and that it becomes a power on its own confronting him; it means that the life which he has conferred on the object confronts him as something hostile and alien.⁵⁰

In similar style, Marx proceeds in attacking the highly organized division of labor which usurped part of man's being. Thus, "... man, as worker, has become something less than human for he is separated from his potential human qualities."⁵¹

More contemporary theory and research indicates alienation is possibly a by-product of the industrial system. Blauner's monumental work with alienation was, in a sense, based on the Marxian hypothesis.

Along with trends toward an increasingly mechanized technology and more subdivided work organization, there has been an historic shift from traditional to bureaucratic principles of industrial social organization. This is reflected by the fact that a system of general standards and specific rules governing the situation of workers in economic organizations [including their relations with employers] has matured in advanced industrial societies, and the norm of universal or impartial application of these rules has become increasingly institutionalized.⁵²

Goodman, also, has addressed himself to this issue under the guise of centralization. It is Goodman's contention that under a "... centralized enterprise, the function to be performed is the goal of the organization rather than of persons."⁵³ The people are personnel and "... under such conditions people must end up in total anomie, with no meaningful relation to the environment and society."⁵⁴

In sum, there is a feeling of discontent with the interpersonal relationships arising out of capitalism, industrialism, centralism, urbanism, bureaucracy, and a host of other labels. Moreover, these types of social organization are facilitators of alienation and anomie. But, more importantly, alienation and anomie are functions of the role relationships, ensuing from contemporary society, and when these roles, in which live human beings participate, are delimited by organizational definition, a logical consequence has to be alienation and/or anomie.

One recent and crucial empirical study has, in effect, tried to locate alienation and anomie antecedents in bureaucracy types.⁵⁵

A "bureaucracy type" measure was produced by a short form of Likert-type items originally constructed by Hall, who used Weber's analysis, to empirically assess five bureaucracy characteristics: hierarchy of authority, specialization, impersonality, system of rules, and procedures.⁵⁶ The alienation dimensions to be tested were powerlessness, normlessness, social isolation, general alienation, anomia, and self-estrangement as previously cited by Dean and Srole with the exception of the self-estrangement items that were constructed by Bonjean and Grimes. Occupational position was another variable because there has been some indication that salaried or white collar occupations are also subject to the alienative processes.⁵⁷

The samples were randomly drawn from three occupational sectors including 120 hourly paid workers, 108 salaried managers, and 104 independent businessmen; and interviews were conducted to assess bureaucracy perceptions and alienation. Findings indicate:

- (1) Hourly paid workers impute extraordinary degrees of power and control to those occupying key positions in bureaucratic organizations and respond with feelings

of powerlessness, normlessness, self-estrangement, anomia and general alienation.

- (2) Among managers there are no significant relationships between bureaucratic characteristics and alienation.
- (3) Impersonality is more closely related to alienation than other organizational characteristics among businessmen.⁵⁸

Bonjean and Grimes felt their data do not support the generalization that a direct relationship between bureaucratization and alienation exists. But, as has already been stated, the relationship does hold with the hourly paid respondents. What can be extracted here is further substantiation for the role stasis concept. That is, the workers possessed less individual freedom on their jobs, which is a result of the organizational definitions surrounding their jobs and, consequently, resulted in significantly higher alienation and anomia scores.

FOOTNOTES

¹William A. Faunce, Problems of an Industrial Society (New York, 1968), p. 84.

²Ibid.

³Robert A. Nisbet, The Sociological Tradition, (New York, 1966), pp. 265-266.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., p. 266.

⁶Robert A. Nisbet, The Social Bond (New York, 1970), p. 264.

⁷Irving Louis Horowitz, Professing Sociology, (Chicago, 1968), p. 102.

⁸Ephraim H. Mizruchi, The Substance of Sociology, ed. Ephraim H. Mizruchi (New York, 1967), p. 550.

⁹Faunce, p. 85.

¹⁰H. Marcuse, Reason and Revolution, (Fair Lawn, N. J., 1941), p. 275.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Erich Fromm, Marx's Concept of Man, (New York, 1966), p. 44.

¹³Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation", American Sociological Review, 24 (December, 1959), pp. 783-791.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 784.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 785.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 786.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 788.

¹⁹Gwynn Nettler, "A Measure of Alienation", American Sociological Review, 22 (December, 1957), p. 672.

- ²⁰C. Wright Mills, White Collar, (New York, 1951), pp. 184, 188.
- ²¹Eric Hoffer, The True Believer, (New York, 1950).
- ²²Eric Fromm, The Sane Society, (New York, 1955).
- ²³Seeman, p. 789.
- ²⁴Dwight Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement", American Sociological Review, 26 (October, 1961), p. 754.
- ²⁵Ibid.
- ²⁶J. L. Simmons, "Some Intercorrelations Among 'Alienation' Measures", Social Forces, 44 (March, 1966), p. 371.
- ²⁷Dean, p. 753.
- ²⁸Horowitz, p. 103.
- ²⁹Ibid., pp. 103-104.
- ³⁰Nisbet, (1970), p. 275.
- ³¹Emile Durkheim, Suicide: A Study in Sociology, tr. George Simpson (Glencoe, Ill., 1951), p. 253.
- ³²Nisbet, (1966), p. 301.
- ³³Ibid., p. 94.
- ³⁴Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, (Glencoe, Ill., 1949), p. 164.
- ³⁵Leo Srole, "Social Integration and Certain Correlaries: An Exploratory Study", American Sociological Review, 21 (December, 1956), pp. 709-716.
- ³⁶Ibid., pp. 710-711.
- ³⁷Elmer L. Struening and Arthur H. Richardson, "A Factor Analytic Exploration of the Alienation, Anomia and Authoritarian Domain", American Sociological Review, 30 (October, 1965), pp. 768-778.
- ³⁸E. H. Mizruchi, "Social Structure and Anomie in a Small City", American Sociological Review, 25 (October, 1960), pp. 645-654.
- ³⁹Wendell Bell, "Anomie, Social Isolation, and the Class Structure", Sociometry, 20 (June, 1957), pp. 105-116.
- ⁴⁰Wendell Bell and Dorothy Meier, "Anomie and the Achievement of Life Goals", American Sociological Review, 24 (April, 1959), pp. 189-202.

⁴¹Alan Roberts and Milton Rokeach, "Anomie, Authoritarianism and Prejudice: A Replication", American Journal of Sociology, 61 (January, 1956), pp. 355-358.

⁴²Simmons, p. 371.

⁴³Nisbet, (1970), p. 274.

⁴⁴Ibid.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 275.

⁴⁶The author acknowledges a reification in this section. Due to conceptual difficulty it cannot be avoided.

⁴⁷Irving M. Zeitlin, Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory, (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1968), p. 84.

⁴⁸Ibid.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 85.

⁵⁰Karl Marx, Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, (Mowcow, 1961), p. 70.

⁵¹Zeitlin, p. 87.

⁵²Robert Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, (Chicago, 1964), p. 9.

⁵³Paul Goodman, People or Personnel, (New York, 1963), p. 3.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 14.

⁵⁵Charles M. Bonjean and Michael D. Grimes, "Bureaucracy and Alienation: A Dimensional Approach", Social Forces, 48 (March, 1970), pp. 365-372.

⁵⁶Richard H. Hall, "The Concept of Bureaucracy: An Empirical Assessment", American Journal of Sociology, 69 (July, 1963), pp. 32-34.

⁵⁷Eric Josephson and Mary Josephson, Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society, (New York, 1962).

⁵⁸Bonjean and Grimes, p. 372.

CHAPTER III

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Operational Definition

Role stasis, operationally, does not differ significantly from its theoretical counterpart. Moreover, certain dimensions of the concept can be extracted to product greater clarity. The more important dimensions are:

1. role routinization,
2. actor perception of the role indicates a lack of strong organizational expectation for individual initiative,
3. creativity within the role boundaries are at a minimum, and
4. spontaneity is suppressed by formal role definition.

These dimensions, along with others, make up an operational model for the concept. Further clarification will be shown in the description of the sample.

Sample Selection

Secretarial personnel were used primarily for two reasons. First, there is a considerable lack of data in the sociological literature pertaining to females; secondly, the secretarial role is viewed in a supportive relationship within complex organizations. Secretarial importance within the context of organizational efficiency appears to be disproportionate to both monetary and psychic rewards bestowed upon

the role. Mills outlines three broad levels within a female office hierarchy. The first is the private secretary, an administrative assistant. Where office policy warrants, she may have both stenographers and typists working for her. Concerning her superior, she is, in short, "... justifiably called his office wife."¹ The second rung in the hierarchy are the stenographers whose duties entail typing and dictation. The typists occupy the third level. Their work is mostly straight copying matter, and hence, their most important role requisites are speed and accuracy at the keyboard.² In short, Mills states "... the prized white-collar spot for women is becoming more and more the job of a factory-like operative."³

The new office is rationalized: machines are used, employees become machine attendants; the work, as in the factory, is collective, not individualized; it is standardized for interchangeable, quickly replaceable clerks; it is specialized to the point of automatization. The employee group is transformed into a uniform mass in a soundless place, and the day itself is regulated by an impersonal time schedule. Seeing the big stretch of office space with rows of identical desks, one is reminded of Herman Melville's description of a nineteenth-century factory: 'At rows of blank-looking counters sat rows of blank-looking girls, with blank, white folders in their blank hands, all blankly folding blank paper.'⁴

Although the organization from which this study's sample was drawn did not appear to be as grim as Mills' description; there was a very formal, very businesslike, and austere atmosphere.

The sample was drawn from a large bank in a southwestern, metropolitan city. The original research design intended to randomly sample from the three secretarial levels previously mentioned. Due to a perceived organizational disruption, the data herein were gathered from the administrative assistants level only. Even though research design was compromised, it should be noted that this particular organizational

role is a better test of the role stasis concept due to supposedly more individual freedom involved. That is, while discussing the plausibility of this study with the bank officials, it was emphasized that this role required not only high level secretarial skills, but some spontaneous decision making capacities.

For purposes of this study, the role stasis concept and the secretarial position were defined as having the following characteristics:

1. Ultimately, there is a narrow organizational definition of the secretarial role.
2. The role is highly routine.
3. Automation and other technological improvements have been introduced and utilized; however, there has been no discernible broadening of role responsibilities, which eventuates in a further role delimitation.
4. Although there is a formal organizational expectation for individual initiative, it is not perceived or rewarded.
5. Due to standardization, the possibility of role creativeness is minimal.
6. Decision making powers concerning work matters are perceived as slim.
7. Office policy constricts norms concerning immediate office arrangement, dress codes, and general behavior.

Succinctly, the secretarial position is one of routine tasks (typing, filing, dictation, etc.) where the organizational definition of that role supercedes individual spontaneity, initiative, creativity, decision making capacities, norm formation, and in actuality, is a constriction

of self. Thus, by both theoretical and operational dimensions of role stasis, the secretarial role has been fixed or rigidified by organizational definition. Furthermore, by organizational definition of the role there appears to be inherently in that definition all five of the previously cited dimensions of alienation and anomia.

A population of 43 female administrative assistants were identified through job prerequisites and organizational charting. Questionnaires were distributed to the population, and 27 were returned. Also, questionnaire distribution was timed so that ensuing vacation periods did not alter the organizational climate, thus, controlling a biasing factor.

Instrument Selection and Description

The instrument used was comprised of seventeen biographical and general information questions, including age, marital status, number of dependents, income, and educational background items. Eleven of the 17 items were questions dealing with role responsibilities, primary reasons for working, years employed as full-time secretary, years with present organization, and acceptability of working conditions.

The second part of the instrument was comprised of 54 alienation, anomia, and role stasis items. (See Appendix A for complete instrument.)

The alienation items were obtained from two sources. Seven self-estrangement questions were obtained from Bonjean and Grimes.⁵ (See Appendix B.) The second source of alienation questions were the result of a factor analysis of Dean's,⁶ Srole's,⁷ and Neal and Rettig's,⁸ scales.⁹

The factor analysis defined 25 alienation items, but only nine were selected for use. (See Appendix C.) Since Srole's new, nine item anomia scale was also incorporated in this study, an overlapping redundancy became apparent.¹⁰ (See Appendix D.) However, the nine items that were selected did tap the five variants of alienation as distinguished by Seeman.¹¹ It should be noted that the present study is only concerned with a composite alienation index and, therefore, will not be analyzing specific dimensions. The general alienation/anomia section was made up of seven self-estrangement items, nine alienation items and nine anomia items. (See Question 1 through 25, Appendix A.)

Another exploratory dimension of this study was to examine the consequences of modifying the existing alienation and anomia scale items to a specific setting. Most alienation and anomia scales require the respondent to project his feelings from a "world view" perspective, as exemplified in the general alienation and anomia items. Hence, the nine general alienation and nine general anomia items were modified to reflect a job situational referent in the last half of the instrument. (See Appendices C and D.) For example, "You sometimes can't help wondering whether anything is worthwhile anymore" (Srole, anomia-general) was modified to "I often wonder if this job is worthwhile" (Srole, anomia-specific). An example of an alienation modification is, "People's ideas change so fast that I wonder if we'll ever have anything to depend on" (alienation-general) is modified to, "Company ideas and policies change so fast that I often wonder if I can depend on anything" (alienation-specific). The self-estrangement items were not modified because their structure did not warrant a change and a fatigue factor was becoming evident.

The questionnaire included 11 role stasis items which were designed to: (1) compliment the operational dimensions of the concept, and (2) discern the perceived amount of role stasis involved within a job context. (See Appendix E.)

The finished instrument then was completely randomized. A coin was flipped to decide whether the general scales or specific modified scales were to appear first. A table of random numbers was then used to assign the scale positions and individual statement positions.

Variable Description

This study is primarily concerned with six dependent variables: alienation and anomia-general, alienation and anomia-specific, total alienation/anomia-general, and total alienation/anomia-specific. In this thesis, if role stasis is an antecedent of alienation and anomia, alienation and anomia are dependent upon the amount of perceived role stasis. A check on this assumption has been built into the design. While role stasis ultimately is the independent variable, specific alienation and anomia, or the modified items may also be considered as independent variables when assessing the amount of general alienation and anomia. More clearly stated, general alienation and anomia are dependent upon specific alienation and anomia, which is, in turn, dependent upon role stasis.

Other contributing factors to be examined are:

1. age contingency,
2. amount of total role experience,
3. length of employment within the sampled organization,
4. educational background,

5. marital status,
6. number of dependents, and
7. income.

Furthermore, descriptive data concerning office responsibilities, reasons for working, both bank and departmental acceptability, and perceived immediate changes to be made were collected.

Hypothesis

The specific hypothesis of this thesis were grouped into two categories. The first group of hypothesis predict relationships between the role stasis scale, the alienation and anomia-general scales and the modified alienation and anomia-specific scales, and both the general and specific total alienation/anomia scales. These relationships were hypothesized as follows:

- H₁: Role stasis is positively correlated with alienation-general.
- H₂: Role stasis is positively correlated with anomia-general.
- H₃: Role stasis is positively correlated with alienation-specific.
- H₄: Role stasis is positively correlated with anomia-specific.
- H₅: Role stasis is positively correlated with total alienation/
anomia-general.
- H₆: Role stasis is positively correlated with total alienation/
anomia-specific.

The relationships occurring from the scale modifications were hypothesized as follows:

- H₇: Alienation-specific is positively correlated with alienation-general.
- H₈: Anomia-specific is positively correlated with anomia-general.

H₉: Alienation/anomia-specific is positively correlated with alienation/anomia-general.

In the second group, six hypothesis were stated in the null form because role stasis theory relegates them to be nonsignificant variables.

H₁₀: Age has no significant effect on alienation or anomia measures.

H₁₁: Total secretarial role experience has no significant effect on alienation or anomia measures.

H₁₂: Number of prior secretarial positions have no significant effect on alienation or anomia measures.

H₁₃: Secretarial role experience within the sampled organization has no significant effect on alienation or anomia measures.

H₁₄: Educational background has no significant effect on alienation or anomia measures.

H₁₅: Income has no significant effect on alienation or anomia measures.

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

The questionnaires have been coded and keypunched on IBM cards. Computer programs were written for two of the statistical treatments, (see Appendix F), and the author calculated the remaining tests.

The statistical treatment of the data was classified as having both parametric and nonparametric qualities. Correlation Coefficient was selected as the primary statistical test, while, Chi Square was used on certain nonparametric data. Phi was used to determine the amount of

association for all significant Chi Squares. The criteria required to reject the hypothesis was set at the .05 level of significance.

FOOTNOTES

¹C. Wright Mills, White Collar, (New York, 1951), p. 207.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 209.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Charles M. Bonjean and Michael D. Grimes, "Bureaucracy and Alienation: A Dimensional Approach", Social Forces, 48 (March, 1970), pp. 365-372.

⁶Dwight Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement", American Sociological Review, 26 (October, 1961), pp. 753-759.

⁷Leo Srole, "Social Integration and Certain Correlaries: An Exploratory Study", American Sociological Review, 32 (December, 1956), pp. 418-420.

⁸Arthur Neal and Solomon Rettig, "Dimensions of Alienation Among Manual and Non-Manual Workers", American Sociological Review, 28 (August, 1963), pp. 599-608.

⁹Miriam Kangus, "Alienation and Involvement", (Unpub. MA thesis, University of Kansas, 1968), p. 15.

¹⁰This scale was obtained through Dr. Richard Dodder, Oklahoma State University, Department of Sociology, who received it through correspondence with its designer, Srole.

¹¹Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation", American Sociological Review, 24 (December, 1959), pp. 783-791.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Descriptive

Three open-ended questions were included in the instrument in order to ascertain a more personal feeling for the data, in that data are somewhat sparse concerning working females in general, and specifically, secretarial employees. The first of the three dealt with the respondents perception of her formal job title. The reasoning behind this type of item was that organizational emphasis was placed on the title "administrative assistant" over "secretary" in that an "administrative assistant" connotated a hierarchical designation over and above "secretary." Hence, the question was designed to tap positional awareness. The findings indicate that awareness is not present, insofar as the sample did comprise 62 per cent of the administrative assistant population.

The second open-ended question was included to discern the primary role responsibilities. Moreover, the stereotypical conception of the secretarial role is one of primarily skills -- typing, filing, dictation, etc. However, organizational emphasis was directed in such a manner as to define the administrative assistant level as not only having a high skill competency, but also some decision making capacities. Furthermore, organizational emphasis was placed on personality and grooming as prerequisites for the role. Although the general

responses indicated skill responsibilities, there was some mention of decision making within an assistant's capacity. When this question is compared with the formal title question, the individual perception of role responsibilities and individual role definitions indicated inconsistencies between organizational and actor assessments of the role.

The third open-ended item was concerned with the primary reasons for employment. As expected, the standard income, associations, and the desire to work were indicated with a strong mention of the income factor.

In conclusion, these items indicate that: (1) there is a degree of organizational and actor discrepancy circumscribing the role, and (2) where the standard "working reasons" responses are equally present, there is a greater frequency of income being the motivation for employment.

Role Stasis, Anomie, and Alienation¹

The primary objective of this study was the exploration of anomie and alienation antecedents. Theoretically, it was proposed that a causality might lie within a particular role complex. For example, Dean states that alienation might not be a personality "trait," but a situational-relevant variable.² It was hypothesized that not only was the situation relevant, as in this study of job role, but the organizational definition of that role can actually be self constricting, consequently, correlating with alienation and anomie.

The second objective of the study entailed a methodological exercise and at the same time posited an internal check on the role stasis

concept. The methodological problem was one of modifying two existing alienation and anomia instruments to a situational-relevant variable. In this case, the situation involved the work role. The instruments were reduced from a general "world view" perspective to a specific situational perspective. Thus, each general item, with the exception of the self-estrangement items, had a specific counterpart.

Another facet of the modifying procedure was to theoretically provide a check for the role stasis findings. Moreover, if alienation and anomie are situational and role stasis is an antecedent of general alienation and anomie, then role stasis and specific alienation and anomia should also correlate, or the first nine hypotheses should not be rejected.

Table I indicates that the correlations for this aspect of the study were in the hypothesized direction.

TABLE I
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN ROLE STASIS, ALIENATION AND ANOMIA-GENERAL, AND ALIENATION AND ANOMIA-SPECIFIC SCALES (n = 27)

Scales	Anomia- General	Role Stasis	Anomia- Specific	Alienation Specific	Total A/A-G	Total A/A-S
Alienation-General	.860	.503	.596	.727	-----	.742
Anomia-General	-----	.471	.643	.654	-----	.724
Role Stasis	-----	-----	.669	.564	.508	.686
Anomia-Specific	-----	-----	-----	.604	.634	-----
Alienation-Specific	-----	-----	-----	-----	.725	-----
Total A/A General	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	.760

.374 Needed for .05 Significance Level
.478 Needed for .01 Significance Level

It is of notable interest that not only do all of the measures correlate, but also the correlations are significant at the .01 level, with the exception of role stasis to anomia-general. Caution should be used in interpretations of these findings in that the scales used may only be conceptually independent of one another. However, there is still some degree of substantiation for the proposed model. The theoretical and operational boundaries of the role stasis concept are still in an exploratory stage, and naturally, are susceptible for further delineation or expansion.

As stated in Chapter III, some of the more standard variables were also investigated, such as age, marital status, occupational experience, education, etc.; but conceptually, they were relegated to the role stasis concept and hence hypothesized as being nonsignificant factors. That is, these more standard sociological variables were conceptually not primary antecedents of alienation or anomie. While purposely stated in the null form, the findings indicate the hypothesis were in the predicted direction and were not rejected. Table II shows that none of the scales, with the exception of one, (see Table II) correlate with: age ($\bar{x} = 40$), years of total secretarial experience ($\bar{x} = 15.44$), years of secretarial experience within sampled organization ($\bar{x} = 7.14$), number of prior secretarial positions ($\bar{x} = 3.00$), and number of departments worked within sampled organization ($\bar{x} = 3.14$).

Another variable considered was educational background. Instead of obtaining the number of years, it was theorized that possibly a dichotomy of educational orientations may prove more valuable. The instruments were coded between a business orientation, or secretarial skills, as opposed to a non-business orientation. Theoretically, business

oriented individuals, through their educational training, would be more aware of their expectations to include the constrictive role boundaries; and hence, a decrease in the amount of role stasis, alienation, and anomia was expected. Whereas the non-business oriented individuals not acquiring the same socialization would display higher role stasis, alienation, and anomia scores. However, in theory the role stasis concept would relegate the educational factor to at least an intervening one.

TABLE II

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF ALIENATION, ANOMIA, AND ROLE STASIS SCALES WITH AGE, TOTAL SECRETARIAL EXPERIENCE, SPECIFIC ORGANIZATIONAL EXPERIENCE, NUMBER OF PRIOR POSITIONS, AND NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DEPARTMENTS WITHIN SAMPLED ORGANIZATION (n = 27)

	Age	Total Experience	Specific Organizational Experience	Number of Prior Positions	Number of Departments
Alienation-General	.195	.202	.292	-.046	.284
Anomia-General	.129	.365	.335	.125	.250
Role Stasis	.029	-.083	.208	-.143	.153
Anomia-Specific	.067	.200	.048	-.004	-.145
Alienation-Specific	.080	.181	.330	.064	.455*

*.05 Significance

As hypothesized, Table III indicates there are no significant differences between alienation, anomia, and role stasis measures.

TABLE III
 EDUCATIONAL ORIENTATIONS AND ALIENATION, ANOMIA,
 AND ROLE STASIS MEASURES (n = 27)

Orientation	Measure		Fisher's Exact
	Anomia-General		
	High	Low	
Non-Business	2	3	
Business	10	12	.6102
	Alienation-General		
	High	Low	
Non-Business	2	3	
Business	9	13	.8092
	Total Alienation/Anomia-General		
	High	Low	
Non-Business	3	2	
Business	12	10	.6102
	Role Stasis		
	High	Low	
Non-Business	3	2	
Business	8	14	.5248
	Anomia-Specific		
	High	Low	
Non-Business	3	3	
Business	10	12	.7684

TABLE III (Continued)

Orientation	Measure		Fisher's Exact
	Alienation-Specific		
	High	Low	
Non-Business	4	1	
Business	8	14	
			.1691
	Total Alienation/Anomia-Specific		
	High	Low	
Non-Business	4	1	
Business	9	13	
			.1359

The last variable to be reported is marital status. The sample consisted of one widow, one single, six divorced, and nineteen married females. These were also dichotomized in categories of married and non-married and tested with each of the measures. The Chi Square test along with the Yates correction factor and Phi were used to denote significant differences and strength of association. (See Table IV.)

As shown, only two of the measures indicate any significant differences, and the related association is only moderate. Caution is advised here due to the sample size, but of notable interest is that direction is constant.

Income, both personal and family, was another variable to be considered; however, the intervals were found to be meaningless, and thus, were not reported.

TABLE IV
 MARITAL STATUS AND ALIENATION, ANOMIA, AND ROLE
 STASIS MEASURES (n = 27)

Marital Status	Scale		χ^2	d.f.	P.	ϕ
Anomia-General						
	High	Low				
Non-Married	6	2				
Married	6	13	2.87	1	N.S.	
Alienation-General						
	High	Low				
Non-Married	7	1				
Married	5	14	6.47	1	.01	.479
Total Alienation/Anomia-General						
	High	Low				
Non-Married	7	1				
Married	7	12	4.08	1	.05	.387
Role Stasis						
	High	Low				
Non-Married	4	4				
Married	7	12	.05	1	N.S.	
Anomia-Specific						
	High	Low				
Non-Married	6	2				
Married	7	12	2.04	1	N.S.	
Alienation-Specific						
	High	Low				
Non-Married	5	3				
Married	7	12	.60	1	N.S.	

TABLE IV (Continued)

Marital Status	Scale		χ^2	d.f.	P.	ϕ
	High	Low				
	Total Alienation/Anomia-Specific					
Non-Married	6	2				
Married	7	12	2.04	1	N.S.	

Limitations and Discussion

The most obvious limitation of the study is sample size, and generalizations could hardly be posited. However, two counter-balancing arguments may be noted to give credence to the findings. First, the means and medians were similar, thus indicating an approximate normality. Secondly, the sample, although not drawn from the entire organization, was obtained from the secretarial level that theoretically should show lower correlations. Table II indicated one correlation to be significant out of twenty-five possible correlations, and is expected due to chance variation at the .05 level.

Two correlations were indicated in Table IV, marital status to alienation-general and marital status to total alienation/anomia general, to be significant at the .01 and .05 levels respectively, but only with a moderate strength of association. Although this type of relationship is expected, caution should be emphasized on the basis of a loading in the non-married category. The six divorced respondents, out of a total of eight, were felt to be biasing this particular statistic.

Possibly the most important limitation is the matter of independence between the "general" scale forms. Table I indicates the highest correlation is between the alienation-general and the anomia-general scales (.860). This high a correlation is more than moderately indicative of a lack of operational independence. Possibly the two scales may be approximating the same phenomenon, but these two scales should not by any means preclude the theoretical distinctions of Marx and Durkheim.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Although not important for this study, statistical reporting each scale's mean and standard deviation can be found in Appendix G.

² Dwight Dean, "Alienation: Its Meanings and Measurement", American Sociological Review, 26 (October, 1961), p. 757.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

On the whole, the findings do indicate that the role stasis concept is an idea that does warrant further research and development. Whether that research is done on the empirical or the theoretical levels, there seems to be implications inherent in the concept that could yield new perspectives on alienation, anomie, social organization, and social disorganization.

The evidence presented above implies that role stasis is at least one antecedent of the alienation and anomie phenomena. Also, other implications may be drawn from this study. Since empirical evidence is supportive of the role stasis and alienation/anomie relationship, it would seem to follow that social organization does have the capacity for dehumanization via policies of compartmentalization, segmentalization, bureaucracy, or more aptly stated, over-organization.

The consequences of this capacity may be evidenced in forms of personal disturbances which not only impede self-fulfillment and human attainment, but also social disturbances which impede organizational effectiveness. That is, organizations have the precarious power of delimiting and constricting personnel to a state of automatism under the guise of efficiency and output. Consequently, if the personnel within the organization are not able to function as whole human beings, it

follows that the organization, while in final analysis is simply a total of its personnel, is not functioning at its potential either.

The question does arise as to how important is the worker role? Dubin, states that alienation from work and its ramifications are not all that important because the work role is no longer the "central life-interest" as it once may have been.¹ Moreover, Blauner suggests:

The absence of opportunities to develop inner potential, to express idiosyncratic abilities, and to assume responsibility and decision-making functions, may not be a source of serious discontent to most workers today. ... It is the hope of many that the opportunities for self-expression and creativity denied by modern technology and bureaucracy can be found again in freely chosen pursuits of leisure time.²

The problem with the leisure argument, although quite a plausible one, is that there is a considerable amount of expressionistic evidence suggesting that "... the quality of one's worklife affects the quality of one's leisure, family relations, and basic self-feelings."³

Moreover, if the worker views his work as simply a job or just a means of sustaining a life style, the alienation and anomie phenomena do not seem to be a viable manifestation. On the other hand, if that same worker views his occupation as an important life expression, and is delimited by organizational arrangement, job description, automation, and other impersonal functionaries without any forms of organizational recognition as a responsible human being, then a logical consequence is manifested in both personal and social disturbances, namely alienation and anomie.

FOOTNOTES

¹Robert Dubin, "Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the Central Life Interest of Industrial Workers", Social Problems, III (1956), pp. 131-142.

²Robert Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, (Chicago, 1964), p. 183.

³Ibid., p. 184.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bell, Wendell. "Anomie, Social Isolation, and the Class Structure." Sociometry, 20 (June, 1957), 105-116.
- Bell, Wendell, and Dorothy Meier. "Anomia and the Achievement of Life Goals." American Sociological Review, 24 (April, 1959), 189-202.
- Blauner, Robert A. Alienation and Freedom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Bonjean, Charles M., and Michael D. Grimes. "Bureaucracy and Alienation: A Dimensional Approach." Social Forces, 48 (March, 1970), 365-372.
- Dean, Dwight. "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement." American Sociological Review, 26 (October, 1961), 753-759.
- Dubin, Robert. "Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the Central Life Interest of Industrial Workers." Social Problems, III (1956), 131-142.
- Durkheim, Emile. tr. George Simpson, Suicide: A Study in Sociology. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951.
- Faunce, William A. Problems of Industrial Society. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.
- Fromm, Eric. The Sane Society. New York: Rinehart and Co., 1955.
- Fromm, Eric. Marx's Concept of Man. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1966.
- Goodman, Paul. People or Personnel. New York: Random House, 1963.
- Hall, Richard A. "The Concept of Bureaucracy: An Empirical Assessment." American Journal of Sociology, 69 (July, 1963), 32-34.
- Hoffer, Eric. The True Believer. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Horowitz, Irving Lois. Professing Sociology. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1968.
- Josephson, Eric and Mary. eds., Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1962.

- Kangus, Miriam. "Alienation and Involvement." (unpub. M.A. Thesis, University of Kansas, 1968).
- Marcuse, Herbert. Reason and Revolution. Fair Lawn, N. J.: Oxford University Press, 1941.
- Marx, Karl. Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1961.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949.
- Mills, C. Wright. White Collar. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Mizruchi, E. H. "Social Structure and Anomie in a Small City." American Sociological Review, 25 (October, 1960), 645-654.
- Mizruchi, E. H. ed. The Substance of Sociology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.
- Neal, Arthur, and Solomon Rettig. "Dimensions of Alienation Among Manual and Non-Manual Workers." American Sociological Review, 28 (August, 1963), 599-608.
- Nettler, Gwynn. "A Measure of Alienation." American Sociological Review, 22 (December, 1957), 670-677.
- Nisbet, Robert A. The Sociological Tradition. New York: Basic Books, 1966.
- Nisbet, Robert A. The Social Bond. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970.
- Roberts, Alan, and Milton Rokeach. "Anomie, Authoritarianism, Prejudice: A Replication." American Journal of Sociology, 61 (January, 1956), 355-358.
- Seeman, Melvin. "On the Meaning of Alienation." American Sociological Review, 24 (December, 1959), 783-791.
- Simmons, J. L. "Some Intercorrelations Among 'Alienation' Measures." Social Forces, 44 (March, 1966), 370-372.
- Srole, Leo. "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study." American Sociological Review, 21 (December, 1956), 709-716.
- Struening, Elmer L., and Arthur H. Richardson. "A Factor Analytic Exploration of the Alienation, Anomie, and Authoritarian Domain." American Sociological Review, 30 (October, 1965), 768-778.
- Zeitlin, Irving M. Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

- A. Age _____
- B. Approximately how many years have you been employed as a full time secretary? _____
- C. How many years have you been a full time secretary in this bank? _____
- D. How many secretarial positions have you had prior to working here? _____
- E. How many different departments have you worked within during your employment here? _____
- F. My formal job title is: _____
- G. My primary office responsibilities are: _____

- H. The primary reasons why I am working are: _____

- I. Educational background:
 High school only without any business courses - Yes _____ No _____
 High school with some business courses - Yes _____ No _____
 Business college courses - Yes _____ No _____ (If yes, approx. how many? _____)
 University or College without any business courses - Yes _____ No _____
 University or College with some business courses - Yes _____ No _____
 University or College degree(s) - Yes _____ No _____ (If yes, what major and degree(s)? _____)
- J. Present marital status:
 Single _____
 Married _____
 Separated _____
 Divorced _____
 Widowed _____
- K. Number of children and other dependents who count on you for support
 Children _____ Others _____
- L. My last promotion or raise was within the last _____ months.
- M. My last months take-home check was:
 Less than \$200 _____
 251-300 _____
 351-450 _____
 451-550 _____
 551-650 _____
 651-750 _____
 751-850 _____
 851-950 _____
 More than 951 _____

N. If married, our last months combined wages were:

- Does not apply _____
- Less than \$300 _____
- 301 - 450 _____
- 451 - 600 _____
- 601 - 750 _____
- 751 - 900 _____
- 901 - 1050 _____
- 1051 - 1200 _____
- More than 1200 _____

O. The department I work in is:

- Extremely pleasant _____
- Acceptable _____
- Almost Unacceptable _____
- Unacceptable _____
- Tyrannical _____
- Other (specify) _____

P. The company on the whole is:

- Extremely pleasant _____
- Acceptable _____
- Almost Unacceptable _____
- Unacceptable _____
- Tyrannical _____
- Other (specify) _____

Q. If I could make any immediate changes in either office, department, or company policies they would be:

Below are some statements regarding public issues, with which some people agree and some people disagree. Please give your own opinion about these statements whether you agree or disagree with them as they stand.

Please check the appropriate letter as follows:

- A - Agree Strongly with the statement
- a - agree with the statement
- U - Undecided about the statement
- d - disagree with the statement
- D - Disagree Strongly with the statement

1. Sometimes I get restless because I can't express my real feelings when talking and doing things with others.
A a U d D
2. I have found that more often than not the rules in our world go against human nature.
A a U d D
3. When I am around other people, I try to keep in mind that saying what you really feel often gets you in trouble.
A a U d D
4. I have found that in order to get along in this world usually you have to put on an act instead of being able to be your real self.
A a U d D
5. I have found that just being your natural self won't get you very far in this world.
A a U d D
6. I frequently have to do things to please others that I would rather not do.
A a U d D
7. What others think I should do is usually not what I would really like to do.
A a U d D
8. You sometimes can't help wondering whether anything is worthwhile anymore.
A a U d D
9. There's little use writing to public officials because often they aren't interested in the problems of the average man.
A a U d D
10. Most people don't really care what happens to the next fellow.
A a U d D
11. These days a person doesn't really know who he can count on.
A a U d D

12. Nowadays a person must live for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.
A a U d D
13. In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse.
A a U d D
14. It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.
A a U d D
15. To make money, there are no right and wrong ways anymore, only easy ways and hard ways.
A a U d D
16. Next to health, money is the most important thing in life.
A a U d D
17. It is only wishful thinking to believe that one can really influence what happens in society at large.
A a U d D
18. People's ideas change so fast that I wonder if we'll ever have anything to depend on.
A a U d D
19. I often wonder what the meaning of life really is.
A a U d D
20. Those running our government must hush up many things that go on behind the scenes, if they wish to stay in office.
A a U d D
21. We are just so many cogs in the machinery of life.
A a U d D
22. Having "pull" is more important than ability in getting a government job.
A a U d D
23. Sometimes I have the feeling that people are using me.
A a U d D
24. There are few dependable ties between people anymore.
A a U d D
25. This world is run by a few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
A a U d D

The next set of statements have been reported by secretaries concerning their particular jobs and various company policies. Again you are asked to agree or disagree with the statements as they stand in the same manner.

26. I am expected to follow office procedure at all times.
A a U d D
27. Since I began working here I have not been able to change the routines that I was expected to fit into.
A a U d D
28. Because of company policy I feel I cannot be myself.
A a U d D
29. My job is such that individual initiative is not rewarded by promotions or financial raises.
A a U d D
30. Ultimately, my job is the same old routine, day-in and day-out.
A a U d D
31. Even though the typewriters and other office equipment are sufficient, I never get to work on anything new and exciting.
A a U d D
32. My work is not at all stimulating to me personally.
A a U d D
33. If given a chance I could make some changes that would really benefit the company.
A a U d D
34. Sometimes I think a robot could do my job.
A a U d D
35. I am never asked my opinion concerning new office furniture, decorations, or arrangements.
A a U d D
36. I am expected to ask others about any decisions to be made concerning my work.
A a U d D
37. Most people at work don't really care what happens to me.
A a U d D
38. The plight of the average secretary is getting worse.
A a U d D
39. To get a promotion or raise, there are no right or wrong ways anymore, only easy ways and hard ways.
A a U d D

40. I cannot count on anyone at work.
A a U d D
41. My supervisors are not really interested in any of my problems.
A a U d D
42. I pretty much work for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.
A a U d D
43. Often I wonder if this job is worthwhile.
A a U d D
44. With the way things look for the future of this company, I would hesitate before advising anyone to apply for a job here.
A a U d D
45. Money is the most important reason why I continue to work.
A a U d D
46. There are few dependable ties between employees anymore.
A a U d D
47. I often feel like a small cog in the company machinery.
A a U d D
48. Sometimes those in supervisory positions must hush up some things in order to keep their jobs.
A a U d D
49. Company ideas and policies change so fast I often wonder if I can depend on anything.
A a U d D
50. Sometimes I have the feeling that people in the company are using me.
A a U d D
51. It is only wishful thinking to believe that I can really influence what happens in this company.
A a U d D
52. I often wonder what the importance of this job really is.
A a U d D
53. This company is run by a few people in key places and there is not much secretaries can do to implement any changes.
A a U d D
54. Having "pull" is more important that ability in getting a raise or promotion.
A a U d D

Sincere thanks is extended for your cooperation in answering this questionnaire. Any comments that you may have will be appreciated below.

APPENDIX B

SELF-ESTRANGEMENT ITEMS

SELF-ESTRANGEMENT ITEMS
(numbered as they appeared on questionnaire)

1. Sometimes I get restless because I can't express my real feelings when talking and doing things with others.
2. I have found that more often than not the rules in our world go against human nature.
3. When I am around other people, I try to keep in mind that saying what you really feel often gets you in trouble.
4. I have found that in order to get along in this world usually you have to put on an act instead of being able to be your real self.
5. I have found that just being your natural self won't get you very far in this world.
6. I frequently have to do things to please others that I would rather not do.
7. What others think I should do is usually not what I would really like to do.

APPENDIX C

ALIENATION-GENERAL ITEMS AND ALIENATION-SPECIFIC ITEMS

ALIENATION-GENERAL ITEMS AND ALIENATION-SPECIFIC ITEMS
(numbered as they appeared on questionnaire)

17. It is only wishful thinking to believe that one can really influence what happens in society at large.
 18. People's ideas change so fast that I wonder if we'll ever have anything to depend on.
 19. I often wonder what the meaning of life really is.
 20. Those running our government must hush up many things that go on behind the scenes, if they wish to stay in office.
 21. We are just so many cogs in the machinery of life.
 22. Having "pull" is more important than ability in getting a government job.
 23. Sometimes I have the feeling that people are using me.
 24. There are few dependable ties between people anymore.
 25. This world is run by a few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
- - - - -
46. There are few dependable ties between employees anymore.
 47. I often feel like a small cog in the company machinery.
 48. Sometimes those in supervisory positions must hush up some things in order to keep their jobs.
 49. Company ideas and policies change so fast I often wonder if I can depend on anything.
 50. Sometimes I have the feeling that people in the company are using me.
 51. It is only wishful thinking to believe that I can really influence what happens in this company.
 52. I often wonder what the importance of this job really is.
 53. This company is run by a few people in key places and there is not much secretaries can do to implement and change.
 54. Having "pull" is more important than ability in getting a raise or promotion.

APPENDIX D

ANOMIA--GENERAL AND ANOMIA--SPECIFIC ITEMS

ANOMIA--GENERAL AND ANOMIA--SPECIFIC ITEMS
(numbered as they appeared on questionnaire)

8. You sometimes can't help wondering whether anything is worthwhile anymore.
 9. There's little use writing to public officials because often they aren't interested in the problems of the average man.
 10. Most people don't really care what happens to the next fellow.
 11. These days a person doesn't really know who he can count on.
 12. Nowadays a person must live for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.
 13. In spite of what some people say the lot of the average man is getting worse.
 14. It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.
 15. To make money, there are no right and wrong ways anymore, only easy ways and hard ways.
 16. Next to health, money is the most important thing in life.
- - - - -
37. Most people at work don't really care what happens to me.
 38. The plight of the average secretary is getting worse.
 39. To get a promotion or raise, there are no right or wrong ways anymore, only easy ways and hard ways.
 40. I cannot count on anyone at work.
 41. My supervisors are not really interested in any of my problems.
 42. I pretty much work for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.
 43. Often I wonder if this job is worthwhile.
 44. With the way things look for the future of this company, I would hesitate before advising anyone to apply for a job here.
 45. Money is the most important reason why I continue to work.

APPENDIX E

ROLE STASIS ITEMS

ROLE STASIS ITEMS
(numbered as they appeared on questionnaire)

26. I am expected to follow office procedure at all times.
27. Since I have been working here I have not been able to change the routines that I was expected to fit into.
28. Because of company policy I feel I cannot be myself.
29. My job is such that individual initiative is not rewarded by promotions or financial raises.
30. Ultimately, my job is the same old routine, day-in and day-out.
31. Even though the typewriters and other office equipment are sufficient, I never get to work on anything new and exciting.
32. My work is not at all stimulating to me personally.
33. If given a chance I would make some changes that would really benefit the company.
34. Sometimes I feel a robot could do my job.
35. I am never asked my opinion concerning new office furniture, decorations, or arrangements.
36. I am expected to ask others about any decisions to be made concerning my work.

APPENDIX F

CORRELATION COEFFICIENT PROGRAM

CORRELATION COEFFICIENT PROGRAM

```

DIMENSION X(54),D(11,10),A(10)
DO2 I=1,11
DO2 J=1,10
2 D(I,J)=0
CT=0
9 READ(5,10,END=20) (A(I),I=6,10),X
10 FORMAT(3F2.0,2F1.0,7X,54F1.0)
DO12 I=1,5
12 A(I)=0
DO14 I=1,9
A(1)=A(1)+X(I+16)
A(2)=A(2)+X(I+ 7)
A(3)=A(3)+X(I+25)
A(4)=A(4)+X(I+36)
A(5)=A(5)+X(I+45)
IF(I.GT.7) GOTO14
A(I)=A(I)+X(I)
14 CONTINUE
A(3)=A(3)+X(35)+X(36)
DO16 I=1,10
D(11,I)=D(11,I)+A(I)
DO16 J=1,10
16 D(I,J)=D(I,J)+A(I)*A(J)
CT=CT+1.
GOTO9
20 CONTINUE
DO22 I=1,10
DO21 J=1,10
IF(I.EQ.J)GOTO21
UP=D(I,J)-D(11,I)*D(11,J)/CT
DN=((D(I,I)-D(11,I)**2/CT)*(D(J,J)-D(11,J)**2/CT))**.5
D(I,J)=UP/DN
21 CONTINUE
22 D(I,I)=1.0
WRITE(6,25)CT
25 FORMAT('1',' ROMEIS ROLE STASIS STUDY. CORRELATIONS',
1//' N=',F4.0//)
WRITE(6,27)(I,I=1,10)
27 FORMAT(19,9I7)
DO30 I=1,10
30 WRITE(6,32)I,(D(I,J),J=1,10)
32 FORMAT(14,10F7.3)
35 STOP
END

```

APPENDIX G

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ALIENATION/ANOMIA

MEASURES (n = 27)

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ALIENATION/ANOMIA
MEASURES (n = 27)

Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation
Anomia-General	8.96	4.34
Alienation-General	21.93	7.02
Total Alienation/Anomia General	30.88	8.25
Role Stasis	13.07	5.46
Anomia-Specific	7.04	3.61
Alienation-Specific	10.81	4.71
Total Alienation/Anomia Specific	17.85	5.94

VITA

James Charles Romeis

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: ROLE STASIS: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY IN ALIENATION AND ANOMIE
AMONG FEMALE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Tulsa, Oklahoma, February 14, 1946, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Jim Romeis. Married October 10, 1966 to Dana L. Horner.

Education: Graduated from Memorial High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1964; received the Bachelor of Science degree in Sociology from Oklahoma State University, in May, 1969; completed the requirements for the Master of Science degree, with a major in Sociology, July, 1970.

Organizations: Southwestern Social Science Association

Professional Experience: Statistical laboratory assistant, 1969; National Science Foundation research assistant, 1970; teaching assistant, 1970; co-authored publication with Dr. F. Gene Acuff, "Reference Group Theory: An Overlooked Dimension in Social Gerontology," to appear in the 1970 Proceedings of the Southwestern Social Science Association.