

Copyright by
CARL RAY ANDERSON
1970

SELECTED BUREAUCRATIC CHARACTERISTICS
AND STUDENT ALIENATION IN THE
PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL

By

CARL RAY ANDERSON

Bachelor of Music Education
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas
1957

Master of Arts
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas
1966

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, 1970

Thesis
1970 D
A5452
cop. 2

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
OCT 28 1970

SELECTED BUREAUCRATIC CHARACTERISTICS
AND STUDENT ALIENATION IN THE
PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL

Thesis Approved:

Richard P. Jungers
Thesis Adviser

James B. Appleberry
Wm. D. Frazier

Earl J. Ferguson

D. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

763541

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. Richard Jungers, who served as chairman of his advisory committee; to Dr. James Appleberry, a special expression of appreciation and indebtedness is acknowledged for his assistance throughout the study; to Dr. William Frazier, and Dr. Earl Ferguson, appreciation is also expressed.

Appreciation is also expressed to the school officials, teachers, and students who gave of their time and effort to help with the study.

To the writer's family, Martha, Sheryl, and Steven, a deep feeling of appreciation is expressed for the time, patience, and understanding extended throughout the work of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
The Problem	2
Definition of Terms	2
Assumptions	4
Limitations of the Study	4
Significance of the Study	5
II. REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE, RATIONALE, AND HYPOTHESES	6
Introduction	6
Bureaucracy	6
Hierarchy of Authority	8
Impersonalization	10
Rules and Regulations	13
Alienation	15
Empirical Studies of Organization and Alienation	20
Rationale and Hypotheses	23
III. RESEARCH DESIGN	31.
Introduction	31
Sampling	31
Instrumentation	32
Administration of the Instruments	36
Scoring and Processing of Data	37
Statistical Treatment of Data	41
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	42
Introduction	42
Hypothesis One	42
Sex	44
Grade Level in School	46
Minority Group	48
Academic Consideration	50
Hypothesis Two	52
Sex	53
Grade Level in School	54
Minority Group	57

Chapter	Page
Academic Consideration	59
Hypothesis Three	61
Sex	62
Grade Level in School	64
Minority Group	66
Academic Consideration	68
V. SUMMARY	70
Findings	70
Hypothesis One	70
Hypothesis Two	72
Hypothesis Three	73
Implications	74
Recommendations for Further Study	77
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	78
APPENDIX A - SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY	81
APPENDIX B - SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY RESPONSE SHEET	84
APPENDIX C - CATEGORICAL BREAKDOWN OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY	85
APPENDIX D - KEY TO SCORING SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY	86
APPENDIX E - PUPIL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE	87
APPENDIX F - PUPIL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE SHEET	91
APPENDIX G - CATEGORICAL BREAKDOWN OF PUPIL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE	93
APPENDIX H - KEY TO SCORING PUPIL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE	94

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Rank Order Listing of Top and Bottom Quartile Based on Mean Score of Hierarchy of Authority Dimension of the School Organizational Inventory	38
II. Rank Order Listing of Top and Bottom Quartile Based on Mean Score of Rules and Regulations Dimension of the School Organizational Inventory	39
III. Rank Order Listing of Top and Bottom Quartile Based on Mean Score of Impersonalization Dimension of the School Organizational Inventory	40
IV. Powerlessness Dimension of Student Alienation	43
V. Powerlessness Dimension of Alienation Male Students	44
VI. Powerlessness Dimension of Alienation Female Students	45
VII. Powerlessness Dimension of Alienation Sophomores	46
VIII. Powerlessness Dimension of Student Alienation Seniors	47
IX. Powerlessness Dimension of Alienation Minority Group	48
X. Powerlessness Dimension of Alienation Non-Minority	49
XI. Powerlessness Dimension of Alienation Academically Oriented Course of Study	50
XII. Powerlessness Dimension of Alienation Non-Academically Oriented Course of Study	51
XIII. Self-Estrangement Dimension of Student Alienation	52

Table	Page
XIV. Self-Estrangement Dimension of Alienation Male Students	53
XV. Self-Estrangement Dimension of Alienation Female Students	54
XVI. Self-Estrangement Dimension of Alienation Sophomores	55
XVII. Self-Estrangement Dimension of Alienation Seniors	56
XVIII. Self-Estrangement Dimension of Alienation Minority Group	57
XIX. Self-Estrangement Dimension of Alienation Non-Minority Group	58
XX. Self-Estrangement Dimension of Alienation Academically Oriented Course of Study	59
XXI. Self-Estrangement Dimension of Alienation Non-Academically Oriented Course of Study	60
XXII. Isolation Dimension of Student Alienation	61
XXIII. Isolation Dimension of Alienation Male Students	62
XXIV. Isolation Dimension of Alienation Female Students	63
XXV. Isolation Dimension of Alienation Sophomores	64
XXVI. Isolation Dimension of Alienation Seniors	65
XXVII. Isolation Dimension of Alienation Minority Group	66
XXVIII. Isolation Dimension of Alienation Non-Minority Group	67
XXIX. Isolation Dimension of Alienation Academically Oriented Course of Study	68
XXX. Isolation Dimension of Alienation Non-Academically Oriented Course of Study	69

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

One of the current approaches to the study of school administration is to base the study on organizational theory. A basic objective of organizational theory is to attempt to explain the relationships which occur among members of groups of people who participate in the activities of an organization.

To be sure, each organization and each participant within an organization is different to varying degrees. Each has goals, both stated and not stated. Each is faced with alternative actions. Each will act, interact, and react within the milieu of its opportunities and limitations.

This study dealt with the public high school. The public high school can be viewed as a social system which operates within the larger social system of the community. It has stated purposes and possesses concrete elements which include an administrative hierarchy, a professional teaching staff, students, courses of study, facilities, and equipment. Somewhat more intangible elements possessed by the high school include the relationships between the school and the community, between administration and staff, and between staff and students.

The Problem

As organizational participants engage in daily activity, they must operate within the constraints imposed by that organization. The participants develop personal orientations to these constraints and to the kind of interaction these constraints impose. The problem investigated in this study was whether selected organizational constraints were related to selected orientations of participants. More particularly, were selected bureaucratic characteristics of the school related to selected characteristics of student alienation.

Definition of Terms

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.¹

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.²

Impersonality. The extent to which both organizational members and outsiders are treated without regard to individual

¹Richard Hall, "Some Organizational Considerations in the Professional-Organizational Relationship", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 12, December, 1967, p. 465.

²Ibid., p. 465.

qualities.³

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."⁴

Isolation. is "assigning low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in a given society."⁵

Self-Estrangement. is "the degree of dependence of the given behavior upon anticipated future rewards."⁶

Supplementary Data Terms:

Academically Oriented Course of Study. 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. This would be a course of study that consisted of more than half of the courses in

³Ibid., p. 465.

⁴Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation", American Sociological Review, XXIV, Dec. 1959, p. 784.

⁵Ibid., p. 789.

⁶Ibid., p. 790.

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

It was assumed that the responses by the teachers to items of the School Organizational Inventory were representative of their perceptions of what was actually present in the school. It was further assumed that the student responses to items of the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire were also representative of their attitudes toward each item.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to the analysis of the relationships of the selected bureaucratic characteristics and selected dimensions of student alienation. Findings of this study can be generalized only to the setting of this investigation. This study was concerned only with the

organizational structure of the school and student attitudes toward it. Size of the school, community environment, home environment, and other such variables were not considered.

Significance of the Study

According to Weber, bureaucracy is the most efficient form of administrative organization. His rationale for this position include such things as: experts with much experience are best qualified to make technically correct decisions. Another reason given by Weber is that disciplined performance governed by abstract rules and coordinated by an hierarchy of authority fosters a rationale and consistent pursuit of organizational objectives.⁷

Some writers have said that the most efficient form of administrative organization may be dysfunctional in some relationships with organizational participants. If this is indeed true in the public school, then alternative administrative structures might need to be developed. For example, if relationships between certain characteristics of bureaucracy and certain characteristics of student alienation do indeed exist, then the school may need to develop alternative administrative structures in order to promote student learning. Since the primary objective of the school is pupil learning, the organizational structure should facilitate this end if indeed the stated goal of the school is to be reached in the most effective manner.

⁷Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations, Chandler Publishing Co., San Francisco, 1962, p. 33.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE, RATIONALE AND HYPOTHESES

Introduction

The literature relative to the concepts used in the study is abundant. The first part of this chapter is a review of those concepts which have meaning to the research. The chapter concludes with the rationale supporting each hypothesis followed by the statement of the hypothesis tested.

Review of Selected Literature

Bureaucracy

Several organization theorists have developed propositions designed to clarify the nature and characteristics of formal organizations. This study will focus on one of these, the classical theory of bureaucracy espoused by the eminent German scholar, Max Weber.

It would be difficult to dispute that Weber's perceptive and incisive theoretical analysis of the principles of bureaucracy are a significant general statement on formal organizations. His writings on the concept of bureaucracy have had a profound influence on subsequent thinking and research in the field of formal organizations.

From Weber's work, five characteristics of bureaucracy have been

identified. The characteristics are:

- (1) hierarchy of authority
- (2) rules and regulations
- (3) impersonalization
- (4) career status
- (5) specialization¹

Concerning these characteristics, Blau and Scott write:

In Weber's view, these organizing principles maximize rational decision-making and administrative efficiency. Bureaucracy, 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.²

One kind of authority exercised by persons in the hierarchy has been identified as legal authority. In writing about legal authority, Weber points out that obedience is not owed to anyone personally but to enacted rules and regulations which specify to whom and to what rule people owe obedience.³

Weber further says that in the pure type bureaucracy, the person in command is the "superior" within a functionally defined "competency" or "jurisdiction", and his right to govern is legitimated by enactment. He suggests that the typical official proceeds without regard to person

¹Peter M. Blau, Bureaucracy in Modern Society, Random House, New York, 1965, pp. 28-31.

²Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations, Chandler Publishing Company, San Francisco, Calif., 1962, p. 33.

³Max Weber, "Three Types of Legitimate Rule", Complex Organizations, Amitai Etzioni, editor, Hall, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1962, p. 27.

(impersonalization), following rational rules with strict formality (rules and regulations). Where rules fail, he adheres to "functional" considerations of expediency. The author also states that dutiful obedience is channeled through a hierarchy of offices (hierarchy of authority) which subordinates lower to higher offices.⁴

Hierarchy of Authority. One of the organizational characteristics of bureaucracy identified by Weber concerns the way in which the offices (and officers) are arranged. He says that in a bureaucracy, the organization of offices follows the principal of hierarchy: that is, each lower office is under the control and supervision of a higher one.⁵ This hierarchy specifies the locus of decision making that has been pre-structured by the organization.⁶

Every official in this administrative hierarchy is accountable to his superior for his subordinates' decision and actions as well as his own. To be able to discharge his responsibility for the work of his subordinates, he has authority over them, which means that he has the right to issue directives and they have the duty to obey them. This authority is strictly circumscribed and confined to those directives that are relevant for official operations.⁷

Supporting Weber's identification of the hierarchical arrangement of offices, Thompson has stated that ultimately, someone is designed as the "boss". This means that this person has a right to veto or affirm the organizationally directed proposals of his subordinates,

⁴Ibid., p. 27.

⁵Max Weber, Essays in Sociology, translated by Gerth and Mills, Oxford University Press, 1946, p. 196.

⁶Hall, p. 465.

⁷Blau, p. 29.

subject to no appeal. The superior's rights include a near-absolute power over the organizational ambitions and careers of subordinates.⁸

Not only does the superior have the right to tell the subordinate what to do, but the superior has the right to deference from his subordinate, the right to be treated with extra care and respect.⁹ The significance in this lies in the fact that it is one way in that the superior has the right to be somewhat insensitive as to subordinates' personal needs. The ranking of roles with regard to the amount of deference due them is referred to as the "status system".

The superordinate in the hierarchy is also assumed to have superior technical competence to all his subordinates. Thompson says:

It is assumed that the superior, at any point in the hierarchy is able to tell his subordinates what to do, and to guide them in doing it. That is, it is assumed that he is more capable in all of his unit's activities than any of his subordinates who perform them.¹⁰

Abbott has said that the hierarchical definition of roles has been a major deterrent to meaningful innovation in the organization. He sees the deterrent to innovation as a major dysfunctional consequence of structuring the schools bureaucratically. He suggests that although roles in general are defined in terms of both rights and obligations, there is a tendency in bureaucracies to emphasize rights when referring to superordinate roles and to emphasize obligations

⁸Victor A. Thompson, "Hierarchy, Specialization and Organizational Conflict", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 5, 1961, p. 485.

⁹Thompson, p. 486.

¹⁰Victor A. Thompson, Modern Organizations, Alfred A. Knopf and Company, 1961, p. 75.

when referring to subordinate roles.¹¹

Although hierarchy has been identified and studied extensively in other kinds of organizations, the term is seldom used in the language of the educational writings. Yet the practices to which it refers are commonly prevalent. The typical organization chart of a school is intended specifically to clarify lines of authority and channels of communication. "Even in the absence of such a chart", writes Abbott, "School employees have a clear conception of the nature of the hierarchy in their school systems". Rigid adherence to hierarchical principles has been stressed to the point that failure to adhere to recognized lines of authority is viewed, "as the epitome of immoral organizational behavior".¹²

Impersonalization. A second characteristic of bureaucracy identified by Weber concerns the affective basis upon which an organizational officer makes decisions. Weber says that in a bureaucracy, "the ideal official conducts his office...in a spirit of formalistic impersonality...without hatred or passion, and hence without affection or enthusiasm".¹³

For rational standards to govern operations without interference from personal considerations, a detached approach must prevail within the organization and especially toward clients. If an official develops strong feelings about some subordinates or clients, he can hardly help letting

¹¹Max G. Abbott, "Hierarchical Impediments to Innovation in Educational Organizations", Change Perspectives in Educational Administration, Auburn Univ., Auburn, Ala., 1965, p. 47.

¹²Abbott, p. 47.

¹³Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, translated by Henderson and Parsons, Oxford University Press, New York, 1947, p. 331.

those feelings influence his official decisions. As a result, and often without being aware of it himself, he might be particularly lenient in evaluating the work of one of his subordinates or might discriminate against some clients and in favor of others. The exclusion of personal considerations from official business is a prerequisite for impartiality as well as for efficiency. The very factors that make a government bureaucrat unpopular with his clients, an aloof attitude and a lack of genuine concern with their problems, actually benefit these clients. Disinterestedness and lack of personal interest go together. The official who does not maintain social distance and becomes personally interested in the cases of his clients tends to be partial in his treatment of them, favoring those he likes over others. Impersonal detachment engenders equitable treatment of all persons and thus fosters democracy in administration.¹⁴

Anderson points out that despite attempts within organizations to structure and impersonalize relationships so that individual personalities will have little or no effect on the accomplishment of organizational goals, "no organization can be completely rational".¹⁵

He identifies three reasons for this being true. First, he suggests that the organization must involve individuals who possess diverse experiences, training, and attitudes which they bring to the organization and these individuals interact outside of the formally assigned roles that they play in the organization. Secondly, Anderson suggests that the formal and informal structure of the organization are affected by pressure from the environment in which the institution exists. Thirdly, Anderson cites the historical perspective with which persons both within and without the organization regard the goals of

¹⁴Blau, p. 30.

¹⁵James G. Anderson, "Bureaucratic Rules: Bearers of Organizational Authority", Educational Administration Quarterly,

the organization and the methods used to accomplish these goals will have a decided effect upon the organization.¹⁶

Although impersonality may engender equitable treatment for all, it may also engender orientations toward the official and the organization which can be dysfunctional for organizational goal attainment.

In an attempt to minimize personal relations, abstract rules for classes are developed. The individual merits are ignored and categories are developed into which each problem or individual is placed. Also since persons outside of the organization represent an uncontrollable element which may prove inimical to the organization, rules are designed to represent categories so that similar cases may be treated alike in a predetermined manner. In this way the official can call upon the authority and prestige of the organization which reside in the rules to justify his actions with respect to clients... This in turn leads to conflict between the official who views a case as fitting particular stereotyped model and the client who wants personal consideration of his circumstances.¹⁷

The above writer points out that in the school, the tendency to adhere to impersonalization may develop counter to the philosophy of recognizing individual differences. He suggests that stereotyped behavior which is not adaptable to individual problems is resorted to in grading, parent-teacher conferences, and working with students.¹⁸

The lack of adaptability of the school to individual differences has caused adaptive responses on the part of the students. Carlson has identified some of these as "situational retirement", "rebellious ad-

¹⁶Ibid., p. 12.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 12.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 22

justment", "side-payment adaptation", and "drop-out adaptation".¹⁹

Each of these responses are caused by a perception on the part of the student that the school is not meeting his individual needs. As Carlson says, these adaptations involve some rejection of both the school and what the school has to offer.²⁰ Impersonal treatment by the organizational representative may foster such a perception.

Rules and Regulations. A third organizational characteristic of bureaucracy identified by Weber concerns the specificity with which the organization controls its participants. Rules and Regulations are developed to provide guidelines and procedures that will facilitate the operation of the formal organization. Operations are governed, "by a consistent system of abstract rules--- (and) consist of the application of these rules to particular cases".²¹

Blau states:

This system of standards is designed to assure uniformity in the performance of every task, regardless of the number of persons engaged in it, and the coordination of different tasks. Hence explicit rules and regulations define the responsibility of each member of the organization and the relationships between them. This does not imply that bureaucratic duties are necessarily simple and routine. It must be remembered that strict adherence to general standards in deciding specific cases characterizes not only the job of the file clerk but also that of the Supreme Court Justice. For the former, it may involve merely filing alphabetically; for the latter, it involves interpreting the law of the land in order to settle the most complicated

¹⁹Richard O. Carlson, "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences: The Public School and Its Clients", Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, edited by Daniel E. Griffiths, Chicago: Sixty-third Yearbook of NSSE, 1964, pp. 261-276.

²⁰Ibid., p. 272.

²¹Weber, p. 330.

legal issues. Bureaucratic duties range in complexity from one of these extremes to the other.²²

Ideally, rules and regulations are designed to foster behavior which is the most rational toward the attainment of organizational goals. However, in some instances, the rules may in fact inhibit goal attainment. As Merton observes:

1. An affective 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.²³

That some organizational participants do in fact adhere to the rules and regulations despite the conditions is commonly understood. In fact, this recognition is so common that the special name "bureaucrat" has been attached to persons so identified. Merton sees the bureaucrat as possessing a strong tendency toward conformance, strictly adhering to regulations, being timid, conservative, and technical, and with sentiments displaced from goals to means.²⁴

The tendency of organizational officials to enforce adherence to rules and regulations may also have implications for the orienta-

²²Blau, pp. 29-30.

²³Robert Merton, "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality", Complex Organizations, Amitai Etzioni, editor, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1962, p. 53.

²⁴Ibid., p. 55.

tion of the subordinates. As Parsons has observed:

...a system of rational-legal authority can only operate through imposing and enforcing rules and regulations with relative efficiency, seriously frustrating limits on many important human interests, interests which either operate, independently of particular institutions, in any society, or are generated by the strains inherent in the particular structure itself...²⁵

Organizational theorists have recognized this and have stated that the organization must adapt to be effective. Anderson says that in order for an institution to be effective, there must be a balance between acquiescence to authority against individual initiative. He suggests that strict adherence to organizational rules must be tempered with the exercise of discretion by the member of the organization in performing his function. He points out that one of the major critical problems of a bureaucracy is to maintain an orientation that lies midway between a rigid adherence to formal rules and the unlimited exercise of discretion in order that the organization may retain the flexibility necessary to deal with individual problems and to accomplish the organizational goals.²⁶

Alienation

Etzioni emphasizes that the involvement of participants in the organization is affected by the legitimacy of a directive as well as by the degree to which it frustrates the subordinate's need dispositions. He further suggests that alienation will be produced not only by the illegitimate exercise of power, but also by power which

²⁵Ibid., p. 68.

²⁶Anderson, p. 13.

frustrates the participant's needs, wishes and desires. Commitment, on the other hand, will be generated not merely by directives which are considered legitimate, but also by those which are in line with internalized needs of the participant.²⁷

According to Seeman, alienation is a concept which pervades the literature of sociology and holds a prominent place in the work of contemporary sociologists. He contends that alienation is a central theme in the works of such men in sociology as Marx, Weber, and Durkheim.²⁸ Dean credits much of the development of the original concept of alienation to Hegel, Marx, and Weber.²⁹

Alienation is considered by a number of theorists to be one of the more prominent and crucial conditions in modern society. However, despite the importance of the concept, little empirical research has been reported. Pearlin suggests that the lack of investigation of alienation may be due to the difficulty of identifying that from which people are alienated.³⁰

Nettler said, "The idea of 'alienation' has a long history but a recent vogue and, as with any other concept refurbished for scholarly purposes, its adopters are using it variously".³¹

²⁷ Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, The Free Press, New York, 1961, pp. 15-16.

²⁸ Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation", American Sociological Review, XXIV December, 1959, p. 783.

²⁹ Dwight G. Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement", American Sociological Review, XXVI October, 1961, p. 325.

³⁰ Pearlin, "Alienation from Work: A Study of Nursing Personnel", American Sociological Review, XXVII June, 1962, p. 325.

³¹ Gwynn Nettler, "A Measure of Alienation", American Sociological Review, XXII December, 1957, p. 670.

Continuing, Nettler points out that Hegel first suggested the term alienation in describing the situation in which man becomes detached from the world of nature, including his own nature.³² For example, as man engaged in increasingly complex cooperative projects, he had to work with situations which were unnatural in that they did not spring from nature. They were a product of his cooperation. Marx identified the separation from "natural" activities in the work environment and identified the resulting worker's orientation as "alienation" brought about by labor specialization. Whereas Marx used alienation in the industrial sphere, Durkheim used the term "alienation" to describe the separation of the individual from direction emanating from within himself.³³

The concept of alienation is deeply rooted in sociological tradition and it has recently enjoyed extensive popularity in the work of contemporary behavioral scientists. Dean credits Seeman with bringing order out of chaos with his classification of dimensions of alienation.³⁴

Using the writings of other eminent sociologists, Seeman has identified five dimensions of alienation. They are: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement. His purposes in attempting to identify the dimensions of alienation were: "to make more organized sense of one of the great traditions in

³²Ibid., p. 670.

³³Ibid., p. 670.

³⁴Dean, p. 754.

sociological thought; and to make the traditional interest in alienation more amenable to sharp empirical statement".³⁵

Powerlessness: Powerlessness is 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".³⁶

This dimension of alienation originated in the Marxian view of the worker's condition in a capitalist society where he viewed the worker as downtrodden, subject to manipulation of the management. Weber extended this concept beyond the industrial sphere by associating it with all bureaucratic organizations where the worker is subject to the directives of another. Seeman says that powerlessness is perhaps the most common understanding of the term "alienation" in sociological literature.³⁷

Seeman is explicit to point out that this conception of powerlessness is a distinctly social-psychological view. He states that his construction of powerlessness clearly departs from the Marxian tradition by removing the critical polemic element in the idea of alienation. He believes that powerlessness is purely the individual's expectancy for some control of events. Powerlessness thus defined is clearly distinguished from an observer judging an individual to be powerless from objective interpretations of powerlessness against some ethical standard, and the individual's sense of discrepancy between his

³⁵Seeman, p. 783.

³⁶Ibid., p. 784.

³⁷Ibid., p. 784.

expectations for control and his desire for control.³⁸ However, Seeman does limit the application of powerlessness to the depiction of man's relation to the social order. He wished to avoid the possibility of identifying powerlessness with personal adjustment.³⁹

Isolation: The isolation dimension of alienation is defined as, "assign(ing) low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in a given society".⁴⁰ Seeman points out that this usage does not refer to isolation as a lack of "social adjustment" - of warmth, security, or intensity of an individual's social contacts. Rather, it refers to the individual's detachment from popular cultural standards. It closely approximates one of the adaptations Merton identifies that an individual may make to a situation in which goals and means are not well coordinated. This adaptation leads men outside the environing social structure to seek to bring about a greatly modified social structure. It presupposes alienation from reigning goals and standards.⁴¹

Self-Estrangement: This dimension is defined as the degree of dependence of the given behavior upon anticipated future rewards that lie outside the activity itself. It refers to an assessment by the individual that his activity is not intrinsically meaningful.⁴²

Seeman gives Fromm and Mills much credit for the development of

³⁸Ibid., p. 784.

³⁹Ibid., p. 785.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 789.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 789.

⁴²Ibid., p. 789.

this concept of alienation. Seeman suggests that this form of alienation is displayed by those who seek reward outside of the activity in which they are participating. In this view, what has been called self-estrangement refers essentially to the inability of the individual to find self-rewarding activities that engage him.⁴³

Empirical Studies of Organization and Alienation

In a study that would closely parallel this investigation, Adams determined the extent selected factors of the school's organizational structure as perceived by teachers, were related to a teacher's sense of alienation. In his study, Adams assumed the school to be structured more or less bureaucratically, and two specific bureaucratic characteristics, centralization of authority and rule structure, were identified as those likely to have a direct bearing on a teacher's sense of alienation from work.

Data for Adams' study were collected from 490 teachers in an Eastern state. Two subscales from D. A. MacKay's, School Organizational Inventory were used to obtain a measure of the organizational structure of schools as perceived by teachers. A scale developed by Dwight Dean, "Scale For Measuring Alienation" was reworded to measure the teacher's sense of alienation from work and fellow workers.

The conclusions from the study were that when teachers perceive a high degree of centralization of authority and rule structure in the school organization they tend to feel more alienated from their work and fellow workers. It was further concluded that those who perceive

⁴³Ibid., p. 790.

less formal structure in terms of centralization of authority and specification of rules are less alienated from work and fellow workers.

Adams felt that the evidence provided by his study leads support to the contention that a teacher's sense of involvement and power to affect conditions over his work are directly related to his perception of the organizational structure of the school.⁴⁴⁴

In an attempt to test hypotheses which predicted the degree of alienation of students in different types of bureaucratic high schools, Kolesar administered the School Organizational Inventory to more than four hundred teachers in twenty Alberta high schools. Based on the teacher responses to items in the Inventory, Kolesar identified four types of bureaucratic schools. The four types identified were monocratic, punishment-centered, collegial or representative, and mock.

As a part of the study, Kolesar developed the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire. This is a scale designed to measure the degree of student alienation. This instrument provides scores on five dimensions of alienation: powerlessness, normlessness, meaninglessness, self-estrangement, and isolation as well as a total score for alienation. This instrument was administered to more than seventeen hundred students in twelve of the original sample of twenty high schools.

It was found that schools differ significantly in type of bureaucratic structure. Five schools which were identified as representing pure types were also found. A consistency in significant

⁴⁴⁴Charles F. Adams, "The Relationship of Teacher Alienation to the Organizational Structures of Schools", (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), State University of New York, 1968.

differences in the degree of student alienation on the powerlessness dimension and on total scores of student alienation were reported.

Kolesar found that student powerlessness and total alienation scores were significantly higher in punishment centered schools. He found the same to be true in schools in which the authority dimension of bureaucracy was emphasized as opposed to schools in which it was de-emphasized.

The researcher suggests that two definitional problems exist in the five dimensional measure of alienation. The author suggested that both powerlessness and meaninglessness involve predictions of behavioral outcomes and this might cause inconsistencies in other research even though it did not produce problems in his research. He also pointed out that there is a close relationship of isolation and normlessness, and rejection of school norms would likely result in school rule breaking. He suggested that further examination of this relationship by future researchers might prove helpful.⁴⁵

Baird,⁴⁶ in his study of student alienation, tested hypotheses related to a planned school desegregation environment. The population for his study was comprised of students attending four secondary schools in a large southwestern city.

The alienation level of the subjects was measured by the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire developed by Kolesar. This instrument provided

⁴⁵Henry Kolesar, "An Empirical Study of Client Alienation in the Bureaucratic Organization", unpublished dissertation, University of Alberta, 1967. (Ph.D.)

⁴⁶John L. Baird, "An Exploration of Alienation of Secondary School Students Participating in Planned Desegregation", unpublished dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1969. (Ph.D.)

for the measurement of five dimensions of alienation which included powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, self-estrangement, and isolation. The summation of these scores provided a composite alienation score.

The methodology called for the Kolesar instrument to be administered to randomly selected samples of students in four project schools in a sociotemporal context which was dynamic. Some of the variables considered were sex, grade level, transfer or non-transfer status, core or peripheral residence, and core or peripheral school.

Baird reported that students attending core schools had alienation levels which were significantly higher than students who attended peripheral schools both before and after desegregation. He found that core residence transfer students did not have different alienation scores than peripheral residence transfer students and that core residence transfer students did not have alienation scores high or different from peripheral residence transfer students.

Baird also reported that junior high school students were found to have significantly higher levels of alienation in the dimensions of normlessness and isolation after desegregation. He found adequate evidence to support one hypothesis which predicted that male students would have alienation scores higher than female students.⁴⁷

Rationale and Hypotheses

When an individual joins an organization, he submits himself to controls by that organization. One way this control is exercised is in

⁴⁷Ibid.

the organizational hierarchy of authority. The concept of hierarchy of authority means that the formal organization has prestructured and clearly defined the locus of decision points.⁴⁸ The decisions made then flow from the decision point to the subordinate, prescribing his behavior.

Barnard's theory of organization is essentially a theory of cooperation. He indicates that three criteria must be met in order for a cooperative system to exist. The criteria are: purpose, willingness to serve, and communication.⁴⁹ The individual's willingness to serve is perhaps the most indispensable element of the criteria established by Barnard, for if an individual is not willing to serve or indeed does not serve, the organization will be hard pressed to accomplish its purpose.⁵⁰ An individual's willingness to serve brings with it a degree of self-abnegation, the depersonalization of personal action. Willingness to contribute to an organization has a wide range of variation in its intensity among individuals. Willingness to serve is a subjective evaluation of a consideration of efforts (burdens) an individual contributes to an organization and the benefits he receives from the organization. An imbalance of the benefits-burdens ratio may occur when the individual is not a part of the decision-making process.⁵¹

As the organizational hierarchy controls the behavior of the

⁴⁸Hall, p. 465.

⁴⁹Chester I. Barnard, The Function of the Executive, Harvard Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1938, p. 82.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 82.

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 84-86.

individual, he develops certain feelings or orientations to the organization. Marx and Hegel recognized the orientation of the worker to the organization when they described the worker as being separated from effective control of his destiny. They suggested that the worker was alienated to the extent that the prerogative and means of decision were expropriated by the hierarchy.⁵²

Marx and Hegel placed emphasis on the wage worker being separated from the means of production and thus he felt alienated from the organization. Weber extended this notion beyond the industrial sphere by describing the sense of powerlessness that individuals felt in the organization. He suggested that the modern soldier was separated from the means of violence; the scientist from the means of inquiry; and the civil servant from the means of administration.⁵³

In more recent writing, Clark suggests that powerlessness is a measure between the power man believes he has and what he believes he should have. He states, "It is necessary for man to consider himself deserving of a role in the social situation before he can experience feelings of alienation within it".⁵⁴

The sense of powerlessness was one of the characteristics of the broader concept of alienation defined by Seeman. He defined powerlessness as, "the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of outcomes, or reinforce-

⁵²Dean, p. 754.

⁵³Seeman, p. 783.

⁵⁴John P. Clark, "Measuring Alienation Within a Social System", American Sociological Review, XXIV, Dec., 1959, p. 754.

ments he seeks".⁵⁵ To the extent that the organizational hierarchy makes decisions controlling the behavior of the participant, he may be expected to feel "powerless". To test this statement in the public schools, the following hypothesis was formulated.

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.

It has been posited that the rational decision-making process determines the rules and regulations which are designed to control the behavior of organizational members. Rules and regulations specify the desired behaviors of organizational members and specify the extent to which the members must follow organizationally defined procedures.

In the classroom that which is to be learned and the means by which the learning is to be accomplished are institutional "givens". Course content and teaching methodology are stipulated in advance by authorities who are external to the actual group that is to do the learning. In many school situations, there will be an explicit or implicit "curriculum of instruction" which will specify desired outcomes and kinds of procedures to which teachers and pupils are expected to adhere.⁵⁶

When decisions are made in a formal organizational setting, there are two things to be considered, these are the end to be accomplished

⁵⁵Seeman, p. 783.

⁵⁶Jacob W. Getzels and Herbert A. Thelen, "The Classroom Groups as a Unique Social System",

and the means to be used. The acts of formal organizations are those of persons dominated by organizational rather than personal ends. The decision is the deliberate adoption of means to ends which is the essence of formal organizations. The determination of organizational purposes or objectives and the more general decisions involved in the process are distributed through the hierarchy in the formal organization and are not concentrated to individuals except to a minor degree.⁵⁷

Closely related to the concept of rules and regulations being rationally determined by those external to the classroom situation is Riesman's discussion of other-direction which falls within the self-estrangement meaning of alienation. He alludes to the loss of intrinsic meaning of alienation when he speaks of what is at stake when the child learns, "that nothing in his character, no possession he owns, no inheritance of name or talent, no work he has done, is valued for itself, but only for its effect on others..."⁵⁸

Seeman defines the self-estrangement dimension of alienation as the degree of dependence of a given behavior upon anticipated future rewards which lie outside the activity itself.⁵⁹ He suggests that it is difficult to specify what the alienation is from. The author points out that, "to be self-alienated means to be something less than one might ideally be if the circumstances in society were otherwise...to be given to appearances, conformist".⁶⁰ The worker who works merely

⁵⁷Barnard, pp. 185-187.

⁵⁸Seeman, p. 790.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 790

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 790.

for his salary, the wife who cooks simply to get it over with, the other directed type who acts only for its effect on others---all of these are instances of self-estrangement.

As the constraints of the formal organization increase on an individual student, the opportunities for self-estrangement may be increased. To test this statement in public schools, the following hypothesis was formulated.

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 dimension of impersonalization of bureaucracy as conceived by Weber deals with the universalistic relationship. The exclusion of personal consideration is a prerequisite for impartiality as well as for organizational rationality. The impersonal treatment of affairs which are at times of great personal significance to the individual gives rise to the charges of "arrogance", "haughtiness", and "not really caring about the individual" being made against organizational representatives.⁶¹

Getzels utilizes the terms universalism and particularism to describe dimensions of interpersonal relationships. An interpersonal relationship is said to be universalistic when the nature of the interaction between the participants in the relationship is determined by the offices or positions they occupy within a given institution.

⁶¹Merton, p. 53.

Emotional considerations are secondary to functional considerations. The rights and obligations are determined on the basis of impersonal rather than personal, affective factors. A particularistic interpersonal relationship occurs when the nature of interaction between the participants in the relationship is determined by what the individuals mean to each other personally rather than by the offices or positions they occupy in an organization. The particularistic relationship is concerned more with the who; whereas the universalistic relationship is concerned more with the what.⁶²

The isolation dimension of alienation is most common in descriptions of the intellectual role. It refers to the detachment of the intellectual from popular cultural standards. This dimension does not refer to a lack of social adjustment on the part of the individual. It does not refer to a lack of warmth, security, or intensity of an individual's social contacts. This dimension of alienation attempts to focus on the individual's expectations or values, indeed, it may be usefully considered in terms of reward values. Seeman defines this dimension as follows: "assign(ing) low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society".⁶³

Seeman says that his definition of isolation approximates the adjustment pattern identified by Merton which individuals make to a situation in which goals and means are not well coordinated. Merton states:

⁶²J. W. Getzels, "Psycho-Sociological Framework for the Study of Educational Administration", Harvard Educational Review, XXII, 1952, pp. 236-239.

⁶³Seeman, p. 789.

This adaptation (rebellion) leads men outside the environing social structure to envisage and seek to bring into being a new, that is to say, a greatly modified, social structure. It presupposes alienation from reigning goals and standards.⁶⁴

If an individual perceives that the goals and means of an organization are entwined in a spirit of formalistic impersonality; where the official relationship of the organization is governed largely by universalistic rather than particularistic considerations, he is likely to feel an increase of isolation to which Seeman referred. To the extent that the organizational impersonality causes an individual to operate outside of the existing social structure in an attempt to bring about a greatly modified social structure, he may be expected to feel a sense of isolation. To test this statement in the public schools, the following hypothesis was formulated.

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.

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 789.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

This chapter will describe the research design. Specifically, the sampling techniques, the instrumentation, and the method of administering the instruments are described in this chapter. The chapter concludes with a description of the statistical procedures used to analyze the data.

Sampling

In order to test the hypotheses, teachers and students in twenty public high schools in the state of Kansas were asked to respond to the appropriate instruments. The public high schools were selected by a stratified-random process. The School Organizational Inventory was used to identify the schools in the top and bottom quarters. Student responses to the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire were then used to test each hypothesis.

All public high schools in the state of Kansas were stratified into classifications based upon the number of secondary teachers in the school. Schools with thirty or more teachers were classified as large, and schools with twenty-nine or fewer teachers were classified as small. Sixty-six schools were classified as large and four hundred ninety-five were classified as small. Ten schools were then randomly

selected from each classification.

Student responses were obtained by randomly selecting twenty members of the sophomore class and twenty members of the senior class. Where the membership of the respective classes did not total twenty, all members of that particular class responded.

Every teacher in each of the high schools participated in the study except those teachers who were absent from the building at the time of the administration of the instrument.

Four hundred eighty-seven teachers responded to items of the School Organizational Inventory.¹ Seven hundred eighty-seven students responded to items of the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire.²

Instrumentation

The instrument used to measure the level of bureaucratization in each of the high schools was the School Organizational Inventory. This instrument was developed by Hall,³ adapted for use in the schools by MacKay, and modified by Robinson.⁴

¹D. 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.

²Henry Kolesar, "An Empirical Study of Client Alienation in the Bureaucratic Organization", (unpublished dissertation) The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1967. (Ph.D.)

³Richard H. Hall, "Interorganizational Structural Variation: Application of the Bureaucratic Model", Administrative Science Quarterly, VII, 1962-63, pp. 295-308.

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

The instrument developed by Hall was designed to measure bureaucracy in commercial and governmental organizations. Six subscales were developed to measure the dimensions of bureaucracy. The scores on the six subscales were then summed to provide a total bureaucratization score for a particular organization. The six subscales were:

(1) Hierarchy of Authority, (2) Specialization, (3) Rules for Members, (4) Procedural Specifications, (5) Impersonality, (6) Technical Competence.

Hall's pilot instrument consisted of 146 items. In its final form, the Likert-type scale consisted of sixty-two short descriptive statements. Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficient for scales ranged between .80 and .90. Hall validated the instrument by selecting organizations which were judged to be either high or low in one or more of the six dimensions by independent observers. He found a significant relationship between the bureaucratization scores and the judgments of the observers.

By adapting terminology to the educational setting, MacKay modified the Hall instrument for use in schools. He did not, however, make any major changes in concepts which had been developed. As MacKay refined the instrument, he found that the dimensions of Specialization and Technical Competence correlated negatively with the other four dimensions. He concluded that the dimensions of Specialization and Technical Competence were measuring something different in bureaucracy than were the other four dimensions.

Later, Robinson rewrote some of the items in an effort to achieve greater clarity. At that time, the original sixty-two items were reduced to forty-eight. The scales were tested for internal consist-

ency using correlational methods and the items were tested for discriminating power. Robinson concluded that his refinements added to the discriminating power of the items and increased the correlational value between each subscale item and total subscale scores.

Robinson confirmed and refined MacKay's conclusion when he found that Specialization and Technical Competence were significantly and positively related. He also found that Hierarchy of Authority, Rules for Members, Procedural Specifications, and Impersonality were positively and significantly related. There was a significant and negative correlation between the first two and the last four dimensions.

In a study conducted later, Punch⁵ confirmed Robinson's findings. Punch concluded that Specialization and Technical Competence were a rough measure of professionalization and that the other four dimensions measured bureaucratization. Punch stated that professionalization and bureaucratization are two distinct and separate elements of organizational life. He stated that only the four subscales of Hierarchy of Authority, Procedural Specifications, Rules for Members, and Impersonality were measures of bureaucratization. For this reason, only the thirty-three items making up these four dimensions, the "authority dimension of bureaucracy" as Kolesar referred to it, were used in this study.

For the purpose of this research, the rules and regulations and procedural specification subscales of the School Organizational Inventory were combined to form the rules and regulations dimension

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

measured in each of the schools in the sample of this study.

To each of the thirty-three statements, five response categories are provided. The responses given by each teacher indicate his degree of agreement or disagreement with the statement. The instrument is included in Appendix A.

The instrument used to measure the level of student alienation in each of the high schools was the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire. This instrument was developed by Kolesar specifically for the measurement of alienation among secondary school students.

The instrument consists of sixty statements. To each statement, five response categories are provided. The response given by the student indicated the degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement. The sixty items provide a basis of measurement for five dimensions of alienation. These dimensions are: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement. These are the dimensions developed by Seeman and used by Kolesar in the examination of alienation among secondary school students.

Kolesar constructed and refined the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire. There were 167 items in the original bank of questions. A panel of judges evaluated the items. A pilot instrument of 164 items was developed through rewording, deletion of, and addition to the original items. This pilot instrument was then administered to a sample of 163 students in a large urban high school. The number of items was reduced to 145 through analysis of the items for their discriminative ability. Pearson r correlations calculated for each item with each other item and with the subscale total. The correlation coefficients with a .01 level of reliability excluded an additional twenty items from the

instrument. Of the remaining 125 items, ninety-eight were isolated by factor analysis and were categorized into the five dimensions of alienation. A combination of sixty items were randomly selected from this ninety-eight factor matrix. Kolesar reported coefficients of stability for the dimensions of powerlessness, self-estrangement, normlessness, meaninglessness, and isolation of 0.73, 0.74, 0.71, 0.63, and 0.66 respectively, and 0.79 for the combined scores. The instrument is included in Appendix E.

Administration of the Instruments

The chief school administrator and building principal of each of the selected schools were telephoned by the researcher and the proposed project was explained. When the school officials granted permission to the researcher to use the teachers and pupils, appointments were scheduled so that the instruments could be administered to the faculty and students of the schools. A follow-up letter was then sent to each of the schools to confirm the appointment.

The researcher visited each school personally. A faculty meeting was held either before the school day began or at the end of the school day. It was at these meetings that the teachers responded to the School Organizational Inventory. This technique of data collection proved to be very desirable in that it enabled the researcher to meet with, explain, and answer questions that the faculty had. While still in the school, the researcher used a student roll to which identification numbers were assigned to each student. Using a table of random numbers, the students were selected who then responded to the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire. School officials were helpful in that a room

was generally assigned where the students could work. The researcher was available to answer questions and collect the completed instruments as the students finished.

Scoring and Processing of Data

Responses to the thirty-three statements of the School Organizational Inventory were punched into data cards and scoring was done by computer. The score for each dimension of bureaucracy was determined by summing the scores of the statements on each dimension. Scoring followed the specifications of MacKay and Robinson. Information from the personal information section of the response sheet was coded and also punched on the cards.

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. The rank order listing of the top and bottom quartiles based on the mean scores of the School Organizational Inventory on each of the dimensions of hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, and impersonalization are shown in Tables I through III.

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
	7	33.800
	16	33.375
(Top Quarter)	17	32.182
	8	31.679
	5	29.195
	Median Score of Sample	27.438
	19	25.636
	11	25.300
(Bottom Quarter)	2	24.760
	3	23.174
	12	23.083

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
	7	53.050
	8	51.143
(Top Quarter)	16	46.125
	5	45.976
	20	45.429
	Median Score of Sample	44.098
	4	39.931
	9	39.219
(Bottom Quarter)	3	38.609
	12	37.750
	11	35.300

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
	7	25.850
	16	24.841
(Top Quarter)	19	24.636
	8	23.929
	13	23.824
	Median Score of Sample	22.667
	3	21.565
	9	21.561
(Bottom Quarter)	17	21.500
	15	21.483
	4	21.438

Responses to the sixty statements of the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire were punched into data cards and were scored by the computer. The score for each dimension of alienation was arrived at by taking the summation of scores of the statements on each dimension. Scoring followed the specifications established by Kolesar. A detailed description can be found for the scoring of this instrument in Appendix H of this report.

Statistical Treatment of Data

Each of the hypotheses under investigation were tested using the parametric t test. The t tests were calculated using the programmed t test from the Oklahoma State University computer center.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

OF THE DATA

Introduction

In this chapter the presentation and analysis of the data will be reported as they relate to each of the hypotheses examined. Adhering to common practice, the writer accepted hypotheses which were supported at the .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 1.522. With 398 degrees of freedom, a t value of 1.645 was needed for significance at the 0.05 level. Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported. Data relevant to this hypothesis are summarized in Table IV.

TABLE IV
POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF STUDENT ALIENATION

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power- lessness Score	t
Top Quarter	200	8.9373	34.45	1.522
Bottom Quarter	200	9.5367	35.86	
P > .05				

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 0.570 with 176 degrees of freedom. There was no significant difference. The data related to this test are summarized in Table V.

TABLE V
POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
MALE STUDENTS

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power- lessness Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	88	9.1544	36.38	0.570
Bottom Quarter	90	8.4934	37.13	
p > .05				

A t test was used to determine if there was a significant difference between female 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 females was 1.490 with 220 degrees of freedom. There was no significant difference. The data related to this test are summarized in Table VI.

TABLE VI
POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
FEMALE STUDENTS

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power- lessness Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	112	8.4613	32.94	1.490
Bottom Quarter	110	10.1946	34.82	
p > .05				

Grade Level in School: A t test was used to ascertain if there was a significant difference between sophomore 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 0.418 with 206 degrees of freedom, there was no significant difference. The data related to this test are summarized in Table VII.

TABLE VII
POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
SOPHOMORES

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power- lessness Score	t —
Top Quarter	103	9.5035	35.33	0.418
Bottom Quarter	105	9.3431	34.78	
p > .05				

A t test was used to determine if there was a significant difference 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 2.733 with 190 degrees of freedom. There was a significant difference. The data related to this test are summarized in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII
POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF STUDENT ALIENATION
SENIORS

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power lessness Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	97	8.1911	33.52	2.733
Bottom Quarter	95	9.6063	37.05	
p < .005 *				

* Even though the statistic calculation indicated a significant difference between 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 on the powerlessness dimension of alienation in schools that were classified as high and low in hierarchy of authority. The t value for students who considered themselves as being in a minority group was 0.965. With 77 degrees of freedom, the means were not significantly different. Data germane to this test are presented in Table IX.

TABLE IX
POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
MINORITY GROUP

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power- lessness Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	42	9.5400	35.81	0.965
Bottom Quarter	37	8.7769	33.78	
p > .05				

To determine if significance existed between students who did not consider themselves as being in a minority group of a particular school on the powerlessness 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 2.263. With 318 degrees of freedom, the means were significantly different. Data related to this test are presented in Table X.

TABLE X
POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
NON-MINORITY

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power- lessness Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	158	8.7347	34.09	2.263
Bottom Quarter	162	9.6024	36.42	
p < .025 *				

* Even though the statistic calculation indicated a significant difference between 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 2.153 with 268 degrees of freedom. There was a significant difference. The data related to this test are summarized in Table XI.

TABLE XI

POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
ACADEMICALLY ORIENTED COURSE OF STUDY

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power- lessness Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	139	8.8807	33.48	2.153
Bottom Quarter	131	9.5656	35.91	
p < .025 *				

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

A \underline{t} test was calculated to determine if there was a significant difference between those students who were enrolled in a non-academically 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 \underline{t} for those students enrolled in a non-academically oriented course of study was 0.550 with 128 degrees of freedom, there was no significant difference. Data related to this test are summarized in Table XII.

TABLE XII
POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF ALIENATION NON-ACADEMICALLY
ORIENTED COURSE OF STUDY

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Power- lessness Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	61	8.6704	36.66	0.550
Bottom Quarter	69	9.4809	35.77	
p > .05				

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 1.110. With 393 degrees of freedom, a t value of 1.645 was needed for significance at the 0.05 level. Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported. Data used in testing this hypothesis are summarized in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII
SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF STUDENT ALIENATION

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self- estrangement Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	195	6.4040	35.95	1.110
Bottom Quarter	200	7.3684	35.17	
p > .05				

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 0.137 with 183 degrees of freedom, there was no significant difference. Data related to this test are summarized in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV

SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
MALE STUDENTS

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self- estrangement Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	89	6.3687	36.44	0.137
Bottom Quarter	96	7.3068	36.76	
p > .05				

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 1.826 with 207 degrees of freedom. There was a significant difference. Data relevant to this test are summarized in Table XV.

TABLE XV
SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
FEMALE STUDENTS

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self- estrangement Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	105	6.3182	35.42	1.826
Bottom Quarter	104	7.1180	33.71	
p < .05 *				

* The statistic calculation indicated a significant difference between the means in the direction of prediction.

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 classified as high and low on the rules and regulations dimension of bureaucracy. The value of the calculated t for sophomores was 0.748 with 184 degrees of freedom, there was no significant difference. Data germane to this test are summarized in Table XVI.

TABLE XVI
SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
SOPHOMORES

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self- estrangement Score	t —
Top Quarter	92	6.8110	36.37	0.748
Bottom Quarter	94	7.5491	35.62	
p > .05				

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 0.708. With 206 degrees of freedom, there was no significant difference. Data relative to this test are summarized in Table XVII.

TABLE XVII
SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
SENIORS

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self- estrangement Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	102	5.7756	35.35	0.708
Bottom Quarter	106	7.1256	34.67	
p > .05				

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 1.310. With 84 degrees of freedom, there was no significant difference. The data relevant to this test are summarized in Table XVIII.

TABLE XVIII
SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
MINORITY GROUP

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self- estrangement Score	t
Top Quarter	37	6.0767	36.78	1.310
Bottom Quarter	49	6.3807	34.98	
p > .05				

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 0.542. With 306 degrees of freedom, there was no significant difference. Data relative to this test are summarized in Table XIX.

TABLE XIX
SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
NON-MINORITY GROUP

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self- estrangement Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	157	6.4087	35.68	0.542
Bottom Quarter	151	7.6605	35.24	
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 t test was calculated. The calculated t value for students enrolled in an academically oriented course of study was 1.549 with 233 degrees of freedom. There was no significant difference. The data related to this test are summarized in Table XX.

TABLE XX

SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
ACADEMICALLY ORIENTED COURSE OF STUDY

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self- estrangement Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	130	6.5049	35.18	1.549
Bottom Quarter	105	7.8102	33.72	
p > .05				

The 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 t for students enrolled in a non-academically oriented course of study was 0.543. With 157 degrees of freedom, there was no significant difference. Data relevant to this test are summarized in Table XXI.

TABLE XXI

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

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self- estrangement Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	64	5.7989	37.33	0.543
Bottom Quarter	95	6.4794	36.78	
p > .05				

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 1.753. With 390 degrees of freedom, a t value of 1.645 was needed for significance at the 0.05 level. The hypothesis could not be supported, however, because the difference in the means was in the opposite direction from that predicted. Data germane to the stated results are summarized in Table XXII.

TABLE XXII

ISOLATION DIMENSION OF STUDENT ALIENATION

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	192	3.5895	24.03	1.753
Bottom Quarter	200	3.4949	24.66	
p < .05 *				

* Even though the statistic 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 2.476 with 187 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	101	3.7001	23.95	2.476
Bottom Quarter	88	3.6430	25.28	
p < .05 *				

* Even though the statistic 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 0.102. With 201 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	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	91	3.4604	24.12	0.102
Bottom Quarter	112	3.2920	24.17	
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 0.225. With 189 degrees of freedom, there was no significant difference. The data related to this test are summarized in Table XXV.

TABLE XXV
ISOLATION DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
SOPHOMORES

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	100	3.5682	24.74	0.225
Bottom Quarter	90	3.6665	24.86	
p > .05				

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 2.667 with 210 degrees of freedom. There was a significant difference. The data relevant to this test are summarized in Table XXVI.

TABLE XXVI
ISOLATION DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
SENIORS

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	92	3.4511	23.26	2.667
Bottom Quarter	120	3.3689	24.52	
p < .05 *				

* Even though the statistic 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 isolation 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 0.970. With 85 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	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	33	3.5070	23.39	0.970
Bottom Quarter	54	3.0323	24.09	
p > .05				

The same procedure was used to determine if there was a significant 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 \underline{t} for non-minority group members was 1.694 with 302 degrees of freedom. There was a significant difference. The data relevant to this test are summarized in Table XXVIII.

TABLE XXVIII
ISOLATION DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
NON-MINORITY GROUP

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	158	3.6035	24.16	1.694
Bottom Quarter	146	3.6288	24.87	
p < .05 *				

* Even though the statistic 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 a 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 1.875 with 235 degrees of freedom. There was a significant difference. The data related to this test are summarized in Table XXIX.

TABLE XXIX

ISOLATION DIMENSION OF ALIENATION ACADEMICALLY
ORIENTED COURSE OF STUDY

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	118	3.4280	23.83	1.875
Bottom Quarter	119	3.7199	24.71	
p < .05 *				

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

A \underline{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 \underline{t} for students enrolled in a non-academically oriented course of study was 0.429. With 153 degrees of freedom, there was no significant difference. Data related to this test are summarized in Table XXX.

TABLE XXX
ISOLATION DIMENSION OF ALIENATION NON-ACADEMICALLY
ORIENTED COURSE OF STUDY

Group	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	<u>t</u>
Top Quarter	74	3.8112	24.35	0.429
Bottom Quarter	81	3.1339	24.59	
p > .05				

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to examine selected structural characteristics of the high school as an organization, and the student attitudes toward the school. The structural characteristics which this study examined were based on the conceptualization of bureaucracy. The student attitudes examined were based on the concept of alienation. The basic question that was considered was as follows: Are selected bureaucratic characteristics of the school related to selected characteristics of student alienation?

In addition to testing hypotheses related to the basic question of this research, student attitudes were considered in terms of sex, grade level, whether the student was a member of a minority group, and whether the student was pursuing an academically oriented course of study.

Findings

Hypothesis One

1. Hypothesis one stated that students in schools classified as relatively high in hierarchy of authority would feel significantly more powerless than students in schools classified as relatively low in hierarchy of authority. The hypothesis was not supported.

2. Neither males nor females in schools classified as relatively high in hierarchy of authority felt significantly more powerless than those in schools classified as relatively low in hierarchy of authority.

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

4. While there was no significant difference between the sense of powerlessness felt by minority group members in schools classified as relatively high and relatively low in hierarchy of authority, non-minority group members in schools classified as relatively low in hierarchy of authority felt significantly more powerless than non-minority group members in schools classified as relatively high in hierarchy of authority.

5. Students enrolled in an academically oriented course of study in schools classified as relatively low in hierarchy of authority were significantly higher in the sense of powerlessness than students enrolled in an academically oriented course of study in schools classified as relatively high in hierarchy of authority. There was no significant difference in the sense of powerlessness felt by students enrolled in a non-academic course of study between the schools classified as relatively high and relatively low.

Hypothesis Two

1. Hypothesis two stated that students in schools classified as relatively high in rules and regulations would feel significantly more self-estranged than students in schools classified as relatively low in rules and regulations. This hypothesis was not supported.

2. While there was no significant difference between the sense of self-estrangement felt by male students in schools classified as relatively high and relatively low in rules and regulations, female students in schools classified as high on the rules and regulations dimension of bureaucracy were significantly higher on the self-estrangement dimension of alienation than females in schools classified as low on the rules and regulations dimension of bureaucracy.

3. Sophomores in schools classified as high in rules and regulations were higher on the self-estrangement dimension of alienation than sophomores in schools classified as low on the rules and regulations dimension of bureaucracy. There was no significant difference in the sense of self-estrangement felt by seniors in schools classified as relatively high and relatively low in rules and regulations.

4. The minority group students in schools classified as high in rules and regulations were higher on the self-estrangement dimension of alienation than the minority group students in schools classified as low on the rules and regulations dimension of bureaucracy. There was no significant difference in the sense of self-estrangement felt by the non-minority group in schools classified as relatively high and relatively low in rules and regulations.

5. Students enrolled in an academically oriented course of study in schools classified as high in rules and regulations were higher on the self-estrangement dimension of alienation than students enrolled in an academically oriented course of study in schools classified as low on the rules and regulations dimension of authority. There was no significant difference in the sense of self-estrangement felt by students enrolled in a non-academic course of study between schools classified as relatively high and relatively low in rules and regulations.

Hypothesis Three

1. Hypothesis three stated that students in schools classified as relatively high in impersonalization would feel significantly more isolated than students in schools classified as relatively low in impersonalization. Even though the statistic calculation indicated a significant difference between the means, the hypothesis was rejected because the difference was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

2. Male students in schools classified as low on the impersonalization dimension of bureaucracy were significantly higher on the isolation dimension of alienation than seniors in schools classified as high on the impersonalization dimension of bureaucracy. There was no significant difference in the sense of isolation felt by female students in schools classified as relatively high and relatively low in impersonalization.

3. Seniors in schools classified as low on the impersonalization dimension of bureaucracy were significantly higher on the isolation

dimension of alienation than seniors in schools classified as high on the impersonalization dimension of bureaucracy. There was no significant difference in the sense of isolation felt by sophomores in schools classified as relatively high and relatively low in impersonalization.

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

5. Students enrolled in an academically oriented course of study in schools classified as low on the impersonalization dimension of bureaucracy were significantly higher on the isolation dimension of alienation than students enrolled in an academically oriented course of study in schools classified as high on the impersonalization dimension of bureaucracy. There was no significant difference in the sense of isolation felt by students enrolled in a non-academic course of study in schools classified as relatively high and relatively low in impersonalization.

Implications

1. Several writers have stressed the dysfunctional characteristics of bureaucracy. Indeed the rationale which led to the development of the hypotheses tested in this study indicated that selected bureaucratic characteristics might be expected to alienate students in the public schools. Based upon the analysis of the data

presented, the rationale and hypotheses must be rejected. In fact, the data leads to the opposite conclusion. Apparently the selected bureaucratic characteristics do not result in student alienation as measured herein; in fact, they may reduce it. An examination of the means reported in the supplementary analysis tests will show that the means which were significantly different were all in the opposite direction from that which might be expected, except for one. The difference between the means for the data for Hypothesis Three was also significant, but in the opposite direction from that predicted.

The larger question must then be raised, "Is bureaucracy dysfunctional in that it results in alienation of organizational participants?" Data from this study would indicate it is not. Two points may explain these results. First, an increase in the bureaucratic characteristics measured in this study may result in a greater clarification of the locus of decision points, a clarification of behaviors expected of organizational participants, and a perception that the organizational representatives treat all participants equally fair. If the participants know what is expected of them, they may think they are better able to comply with organizational expectation. If the participants do not agree with the expectation, they may know which decision points to approach in order to secure a change. Second, bureaucracy may not result in alienation if the participants as a group legitimate the structure, expectations, or behavior of the organization and its representatives. Perhaps alienation will occur only when the group perceives the structure, expectations, or the behavior of the organizational representatives as non-legitimate.

2. A second implication from the study is that the methodological approach to data collection may need to be modified. It may be that teachers and students do not perceive the organizational structure of the school in the same way. For example, the bureaucratic characteristics may be perceived as quite high by one level in the hierarchy, and quite low by another. Etzioni indicates that the lower participant in an organization is less "in the know" concerning organizational activities because from his position, only segments of the organization and its activities are visible.¹ If this is true, then a study of bureaucratic characteristics and alienation of organizational participants may require measurement of both from the same persons.

3. A third implication from the study deals with the level of impersonalization. The presence of impersonality in formal organizations, especially toward clients, has been identified as being necessary if rational standards are to govern the operations of the organization.² It would appear that the impersonalization characteristic of bureaucracy was the least active in the schools that participated in this investigation. The range of mean scores on the impersonalization dimension of the School Organizational Inventory was only slightly more than four points. (Table III). It seems that the classroom teacher or the organizational representative with whom the student comes in contact most often may not present the formalistic impersonality impression to the student that some writers maintain

¹ Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, The Free Press, New York, 1961, p. 16.

² Peter M. Blau, Bureaucracy in Modern Society, Random House, New York, 1965, p. 30.

is present in the efficient operation of a formal organization.

4. A fourth implication from this study is that only the schools classified as relatively high in rules and regulations had mean scores that were consistently in the direction of the prediction. This may mean that an organization, in its attempt to clarify the behaviors expected of its participants, may not be using all sources available to it before decisions concerning the participants are made.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study may contribute to theory in the area of organizations. It may be of value to personnel who have the responsibility for school organization, curriculum, and activity decisions. Most of all, however, this study will have value if it stimulates further research in the area of school organization patterns and accompanying student attitudes. Some areas that may be considered include the following:

1. Is there a difference in the perceived levels of bureaucracy and alienation of individuals who occupy different levels of the hierarchy?
2. Is the affective consideration displayed by individuals who occupy decision points in the hierarchy a factor in the way lower participants view the organization?
3. Is the length of tenure on the part of a student a factor in his level of alienation?
4. The number of rules and regulations in an organization may be of little consequence. The important factor may be the way the organization develops the expectations of the student or the reason the rules and regulations were developed.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

- Barnard, Chester I. Functions of the Executive, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938.
- Blau, Peter M. Bureaucracy in Modern Society. New York: Random House, 1956.
- Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962.
- Etzioni, Amitai. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: The Free Press, 1961.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Merton, Robert. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality." Complex Organizations. Amitai Etzioni, editor. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.
- Mills, C. Wright. White Collar. New York: Oxford Press, 1951.
- Popham, W. James. Educational Statistics; Use and Interpretation. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- Simon, Julian L. Basic Research Methods in Social Science: The Art of Empirical Investigation. New York, Random House, 1969.
- Thompson, Victor A. Modern Organizations. Alfred A. Knopf and Company, 1961.
- Weber, Max. "Three Types of Legitimate Rule." Complex Organizations. Amitai Etzioni, editor. New York: Hall, Rinehart, and Winston, 1962.
- Weber, Max. Essays in Sociology. Translated by Gerth and Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Translated by Henderson and Parsons, New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

B. Periodicals

- Abbott, Max G. "Hierarchical Impediments to Innovation in Educational Organizations." Change Perspectives in Educational Administration. Auburn, Ala.: Auburn University, 1965, p. 47.
- Anderson, James G. "Bureaucratic Rules: Bearers of Organizational Authority." Educational Administration Quarterly, (Winter, 1966), pp. 7-33.
- Carlson, Richard O. "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences: The Public School and Its Clients,"
- Clark, John P. "Measuring Alienation Within a Social System." American Sociological Review, XXIV (December, 1959), p. 754.
- Dean, Dwight G. "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement." American Sociological Review, XXVI (October, 1961), p. 325.
- Getzels, J. W. "A Psycho-Sociological Framework for the Study of Educational Administration." Harvard Educational Review, XXII, (1952), pp. 236-239.
- Getzels, Jacob W. and Herbert A. Thelen. "The Classroom Groups as a Unique Social System." The Dynamics of Instructional Groups, (NSSE Yearbook), Vol. 59, No. 2, pp. 53-82.
- Hall, Richard H. "Interorganizational Structural Variation: Application of the Bureaucratic Model." Administrative Science Quarterly, VII (1962-63), pp. 295-308.
- Hall, Richard H. "Some Organizational Considerations in the Professional-Organizational Relationship." Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 12, (December, 1967), p. 465.
- Nettler, Gwynn. "A Measure of Alienation." American Sociological Review, XXII (December, 1957), p. 670.
- Pearlin, "Alienation From Work: A Study of Nursing Personnel." American Sociological Review, XXVII (June, 1962), p. 325.
- Seeman, Melvin. "On the Meaning of Alienation." American Sociological Review, XXIV (December, 1959), p. 784.
- Thompson, Victor A. "Hierarchy, Specialization and Organizational Conflict." Administrative Science Quarterly. Vol. 5, (1961), p. 485.

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).
- Baird, John L. "An Exploration of Alienation of Secondary School Students Participating in Planned Desegregation." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1969).
- 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.)

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 of this school always get their orders from higher up.
6. The time for 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. The school has a manual of rules and regulations for teachers to follow.
19. Each staff member is responsible to an administrator to whom the member regularly reports.
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 everything.
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 an answer.
31. No matter how special a pupil's or parent's problem appears to be, a 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 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 | |

APPENDIX B

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
(1 = Bachelor's Degree,
2 = Bachelor's + 16,
3 = Master's,
4 = Master's + 16,
5 = Ed.S.,
6 = Ed.D. or Ph.D.) 3. _____
4. Teaching experience in years
(include this year)
 - a. Total teaching
(1 = 1-5,
2 = 6-10,
3 = 11-15,
4 = 16-20,
5 = over 20) 4a. _____
 - b. In present position
(1 = 1,
2 = 2-3,
3 = 4-6,
4 = 7-10,
5 = over 10) 4b. _____
5. Do you teach in an "academic"
discipline?
(1 = yes,
2 = no) 5. _____

APPENDIX C

CATEGORICAL BREAKDOWN OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY

Key To The Categorical Breakdown of The School Organizational Inventory

Hierarchy of Authority 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

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

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

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

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

Impersonalization 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 SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY

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

AT = 1, OFT = 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.

APPENDIX E

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 can now predict what I can achieve in an occupation after graduation.
7. The school experiences 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 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 intend to keep.
12. In order to get ahead in this school pupils are almost forced to do some things which are not right.
13. Pupils often are 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 is 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"?
(yes = 1, no = 2) 4. _____
5. Are you enrolled in a course of
study where more than half of
your courses are "academic"?
(yes = 1, no = 2) 5. _____

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, 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 scording 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

2
Carl Ray Anderson

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: SELECTED BUREAUCRATIC CHARACTERISTICS AND STUDENT
ALIENATION IN THE PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Kansas City, Kansas, September 6, 1934,
the son of Mr. and Mrs. Raymond A. Anderson.

Education: Attended elementary school in Kansas City, Kansas,
Bremerton, Washington, and Kansas City, Missouri; graduated
from Westport High School, Kansas City, Missouri, in 1953;
received the Bachelor of Music Education degree from the
University of Kansas in 1957; received the Master of Arts
in Education degree from the University of Kansas, with a
major in school administration, in 1966; attended Kansas
State Teachers College, summer and fall, 1968; completed
requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in
July, 1970.

Professional Experience: Teacher of music, English, and social
studies in the Bethel Elementary School, Kansas City,
Kansas, 1959-60; Teacher of music and social studies in the
Arrowhead Junior High School, Kansas City, Kansas, 1960-67;
Principal of Durham Public Schools, Durham, Kansas, 1967-69;
Graduate Assistant in the College of Education, Oklahoma
State University, 1969-70.