INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again – beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/3583

73-31,476

JONES, Rupel Ballinger, 1930-
THE EFFECTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE ON ELEMENTARY PUPIL ATTITUDES.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1973
Education, administration

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE EFFECTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE ON ELEMENTARY PUPIL ATTITUDES

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

RUPEL BALLINGER JONES

Norman, Oklahoma

1973

THE EFFECTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE ON ELEMENTARY PUPIL ATTITUDES

APPROVED BY

Jack F. Parker

Mary Clare Petty

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

DEDICATED TO:

SARA, HELEN, AND J.

Who never lost the faith!

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere gratitude and appreciation to those who have contributed to the development and completion of this study.

The writer is especially indebted to Dr. Jack Parker, chairman of the committee, for his careful guidance and supervision. Thanks and appreciation are expressed to Dr. John D. Pulliam, Dr. Mary Clare Petty, and Dr. Gene Pingleton for their interest and their kind and contributive assistance.

To my wife, Sara, whose understanding support, and love helped me over the rough spots, goes my undying gratitude. To Lisa and Roy, my love; and I cannot begin to thank Helen for everything.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iv

LIST OF TABLES vii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Background of the Study 1
Hierarchy of Authority 2
Rules and Regulations 5
Impersonalization 7
Need for the Study 9
Statement of the Problem 10
Definition of Terms 11
Hypotheses 12
Selection of Participants 12
Design and Methodology 13
Limitations of the Study 14
Organization of the Study 14

II. REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE 15

Bureaucracy 15
Hierarchy of Authority 17
Impersonalization 19
Rules and Regulations 22
Alienation 25
Powerlessness 28
Isolation 29
Self-Estrangement 29
Empirical Studies of Organization and Alienation 30
Summary 33

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

Chapter		Page
III.	RESEARCH DESIGN	34
	Introduction	34
	Sampling	34
	Instrumentation	35
	Administration of the Instruments	39
	Scoring and Processing of Data	40
	Statistical Design	41
IV.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS	43
	Introduction	43
	Statistical Test	44
	Levels of Bureaucracy	44
	Student Alienation	47
	Supplementary Data Concerning Powerlessness	48
	Supplementary Data Concerning Self-Estrangement	50
	Supplementary Data Concerning Isolation	53
V.	FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	55
	Introduction	55
	Findings	57
	Conclusions	58
	Implications and Recommendations	59
BIBLIOGRAPHY		61
APPENDIX A		65
APPENDIX B		69
APPENDIX C		71
APPENDIX D		73
APPENDIX E		75
APPENDIX F		78
APPENDIX G		80
APPENDIX H		82

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Rank Order Listing of Top and Bottom Schools Based on Mean Score of Hierarchy of Authority Dimension of the School Organizational Inventory	45
2.	Rank Order Listing of Top and Bottom Schools Based on Mean Score of Rules and Regulations Dimension of the School Organizational Inventory	45
3.	Rank Order Listing of Top and Bottom Schools Based on Mean Score of Impersonalization Dimension of the School Organizational Inventory	46
4.	Sums and Ranks of Means of Hierarchy of Authority, Rules and Regulations, and Impersonalization	46
5.	Powerlessness Dimension of Student Alienation	48
6.	Powerlessness Dimension of Alienation Male Students	49
7.	Powerlessness Dimension of Alienation Female Students	49
8.	Self-Estrangement Dimension of Student Alienation	50
9.	Self-Estrangement Dimension of Alienation Male Students	51
10.	Self-Estrangement Dimension of Alienation Female Students	52

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table		Page
11.	Isolation Dimension of Student Alienation	53
12.	Isolation Dimension of Alienation Male Students	54
13.	Isolation Dimension of Alienation Female Students	54

THE EFFECTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE ON ELEMENTARY PUPIL ATTITUDES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Organizational theory was one of the present bases to the study of public elementary school administration. To better understand the relationships of participating organizational members was a fundamental goal of organizational theory.

It was recognized that individual organizations and their respective participating members had varying degrees of differences such as alternative actions and goals. Each behaved, interacted, and responded within the environment of its opportunities and confines.

This research dealt with the public elementary school which was regarded as a social system operating within the larger social system of the local community. The public elementary school contained the following elements essential to a functioning social system:

1. administrative hierarchy
2. professional teaching staff
3. student body
4. academic studies
5. equipment and facilities.

The more abstract features of the elementary school were the relationships between:

1. faculty and student body
2. administration and faculty
3. school and community.

Hierarchy of Authority

When an individual joined an organization, he submitted himself to controls by that organization. One way this control was exercised was in the organizational hierarchy of authority. The concept of hierarchy of authority meant that the formal organization prestructured and clearly defined the locus of decision points.[1] The decisions made then flowed from the decision point to the subordinate, prescribing his behavior.

Barnard's theory of organization was essentially a theory of cooperation. He indicated that three criteria must be met in order for a cooperative system to exist. The criteria were: purpose, willingness to serve, and

---

[1]Richard H. Hall, "Interorganizational Structural Variation: Application of the Bureaucratic Model," Administrative Science Quarterly, VII (1962-63), 465.

communication.[1] The individual's willingness to serve was perhaps the most indispensable element of the criteria established by Barnard, for if an individual was not willing to serve or indeed did not serve, the organization was hard-pressed to accomplish its purpose.[2] An individual's willingness to serve brought with it a degree of self-abnegation, the depersonalization of personal action. Willingness to contribute to an organization had a wide range of variation in its intensity among individuals. Willingness to serve was a subjective evaluation of a consideration of efforts (burdens) an individual contributed to an organization and the benefits he received from the organization. An imbalance of the benefits-burdens ratio occurred when the individual was not a part of the decision-making process.[3]

As the organizational hierarchy controlled the behavior of the individual, he developed 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.[4]

---

[1]Chester I. Barnard, The Function of the Executive (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Press, 1938), p. 82

[2]Ibid. [3]Ibid., pp. 84-86.

[4]Dwight G. Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," American Psychological Review, XXVI (October, 1961), 325.

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.[1]

In a more recent writing, Clark suggested that powerlessness was a measure between the power man believed he had and what he believed he should have. He stated: "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."[2]

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 reinforcements he seeks."[3] To the extent that the organizational hierarchy made decisions controlling the behavior of the participant, he was expected to feel "powerless."

---

[1]Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, XXIV (1959), 784.

[2]Ibid.

[3]John P. Clark, "Measuring Alienation Within a Social System," American Sociological Review, XXIV (December, 1959), 754.

Rules and Regulations

It has been posited that the rational decision-making process determined the rules and regulations which were designed to control the behavior of organization members. Rules and regulations specified the desired behaviors of organizational members and specified the extent to which the members had to follow organizationally-defined procedures.

In the classroom, that which was to be learned and the means by which the learning was to be accomplished were institutional "givens." Course content and teaching methodology were stipulated in advance by authorities who were external to the actual group that was to do the learning. In many school situations, there was an explicit or implicit "curriculum of instruction" which specified desired outcomes and kinds of procedures to which teachers and pupils were expected to adhere.[1]

When decisions were made in a formal organizational setting, there were two things to be considered. These were the end to be accomplished and the means to be used. The acts of formal organizations were those of persons dominated by organizational rather than personal ends. The decision was the deliberate adoption of means to ends which was the

---

[1]Jacob W. Getzels and Herbert A. Thelen, "The Classroom Groups as a Unique Social System," The Dynamics of Instructional Groups, Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 53-82.

essence of formal organizations. The determination of organizational purposes or objectives and the more general decisions involved in the process were distributed through the hierarchy in the formal organization and were not concentrated to individuals except to a minor degree.[1]

Closely related to the concept of rules and regulations being rationally determined by those external to the classroom situation was Riesman's discussion of other-direction, which fell within the self-estrangement meaning of alienation. He alluded to the loss of intrinsic meaning of alienation when he spoke of what was at stake when the child learned, "that nothing in his character, no possession he owns, no inheritance of name or talent, no work he had done, was valued for itself, but only for its effect on others . . ."[2]

Seeman defined the self-estrangement dimension of alienation as the degree of dependence of a given behavior upon anticipated future rewards which lay outside the activity itself.[3] He suggested that it was difficult to specify what the alienation is from. The author pointed out that, "to be self-alienated meant to be something less than one might ideally have been if the circumstances in society were otherwise . . . to be given to appearances, conformist."[4]

---

[1]Barnard, The Function of the Executive, pp. 185-87.

[2]Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," p. 790.

[3]Ibid. [4]Ibid.

The worker who worked merely for his salary; the wife who cooked simply to get it over with; the other-directed type who acted only for its effect on others--all of these were instances of self-estrangement.

As the constraints of the formal organization increased on an individual student, the opportunities for self-estrangement increased.

Impersonalization

The dimension of impersonalization of bureaucracy as conceived by Weber dealt with the universalistic relationship. The exclusion of personal consideration was a prerequisite for impartiality as well as for organizational rationality. The impersonal treatment of affairs which were at times of great personal significance to the individual gave rise to the charges of "arrogance," "hautiness," and "not really caring about the individual" being made against organizational representatives.[1]

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

---

[1]Robert Merton, "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality," Complex Organizations, ed. by Amitai Etzioni (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1962), p. 53.

Emotional considerations were secondary to functional considerations. The rights and obligations were determined on the basis of impersonal rather than personal, affective factors. A particularistic interpersonal relationship occurred when the nature of interaction between the participants in the relationship was determined by what the individuals meant to each other personally, rather than by the offices or positions they occupied in an organization. The particularistic relationship was concerned more with the who; whereas, the universalistic relationship was concerned more with the what.[1]

The isolation dimension of alienation was most common in descriptions of the intellectual role. It referred to the detachment of the intellectual from popular cultural standards. This dimension did not refer to a lack of social adjustment on the part of the individual. It did not refer to a lack of warmth, security, or intensity of an individual's social contacts. This dimension of alienation attempted to focus on the individual's expectations or values; indeed it might have been usefully considered in terms of reward values. Seeman defined this dimension as follows: "Assign(ing) low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society."[2]

---

[1]Jacob W. Getzels, "Psycho-Sociological Framework for the Study of Educational Administration," Harvard Educational Review, XXII (1952), 236-39.

[2]Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," p. 789.

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

> 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.[1]

If an individual perceived that the goals and means of an organization were entwined in a spirit of formalistic impersonality--where the official relationship of the organization was governed largely by universalistic rather than particularistic considerations--he was likely to feel an increase of isolation to which Seeman referred. To the extent that the organizational impersonality caused an individual to operate outside of the existing social structure in an attempt to bring about a greatly modified social structure, he could be expected to feel a sense of isolation.

Need for the Study

Weber believed that bureaucracy was the most efficient form of administrative organization. His rationale for this position included: experts with much experience were best qualified to make technically correct decisions. Weber also stated that disciplined performance governed by abstract rules

---

[1]Merton, Complex Organizations, p. 56.

and coordinated by a hierarchy of authority fostered a rationale and consistent pursuit of organizational objectives.[1]

Other writers were convinced that the most efficient form of administrative organization was dysfunctional in some relationships with organizational members. If this were true in the public elementary school, then alternative administrative structures needed to be developed. For example, if relationships between certain characteristics of bureaucracy and certain characteristics of student alienation did exist, then the elementary school needed to develop alternative administrative structures in order to promote student learning. Since the principal objective of the elementary school was student learning, the organizational structure needed to facilitate this end if the stated goal of the school was to be reached in the most effective manner.

Therefore, the need for this study was to attempt to determine whether selected characteristics of bureaucracy affected certain characteristics of student alienation which impeded student learning.

Statement of the Problem

Organizational members constantly functioned within organizational constraints and these members developed personal attitudes and behaviors relative to these constraints.

---

[1]Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations (San Francisco, California: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962), p. 33.

The problem investigated in this study was to determine if selected bureaucratic characteristics of public elementary schools were related to selected characteristics of elementary student alienation.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this investigation, bureaucracy was defined by the following characteristics: hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, and impersonalization.

> Hierarchy of Authority: The extent to which the locus of decision making was prestructured by the organization.[1]
>
> Rules and Regulations: The degree to which the behavior of organizational members was subject to organizational control and the extent to which organizational members followed organizationally defined procedures.[2]
>
> Impersonalization: The extent to which both organizational members and outsiders were treated without regard to individual qualities.[3]

For the purpose of this research, alienation described the following characteristics: powerlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement.

> Powerlessness: "The expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior could not determine the occurrence of the outcomes or the reinforcements he seeks."[4]

---

[1]Richard Hall, "Some Organizational Considerations in the Professional-Organizational Relationship," Administrative Science Quarterly, XII (December, 1967), 465.

[2]Ibid. [3]Ibid.

[4]Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," p. 784.

Isolation: "Assigning low reward value to goals or beliefs that were typically highly valued in a given society."[1]

Self-estrangement: "The degree of dependence of the given behavior upon anticipated future rewards."[2]

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were derived and tested in order to investigate the problem of the study:

Ho_1 Students in schools classified as relatively high in hierarchy of authority will not feel significantly more powerless than students in schools classified as relatively low in hierarchy of authority.

Ho_2 Students in schools classified as relatively high in rules and regulations will not feel significantly more self-estranged than students in schools classified as relatively low in rules and regulations.

Ho_3 Students in schools classified as relatively high in impersonalization will not feel significantly more isolation than students in schools classified as relatively low in impersonalization.

Selection of Participants

In order to test the hypotheses, teachers in seven Title I elementary schools and students in two of these

---

[1] Ibid., p. 789. [2] Ibid., p. 790.

schools in the State of Oklahoma were asked to respond to the appropriate instruments. The School Organizational Inventory was given to the teachers to identify the highest and lowest bureaucratic schools. Student responses to the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire were then used to test each hypothesis.

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

Student responses were obtained by randomly selecting fifty sixth-grade members of the highest bureaucratic school and fifty sixth-grade members of the lowest bureaucratic school.

Design and Methodology

This study was a survey-type study. The statistical tool selected for use in evaluation was the *t* test. Since there were two independent samples and the populations were normal, this was the appropriate statistic.

Each teacher in the study was given the School Organizational Inventory. Then the school with the highest bureaucratic characteristics and the school with the lowest bureaucratic characteristics were determined from these scores. There was a significant difference in two schools as determined by a *t* test of the school which was highest and the school which was lowest in bureaucratic structure. This difference was significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Fifty students were randomly selected from the schools with the highest bureaucratic structure and the lowest bureaucratic structure. The students then responded to the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire. The students' scores from each school were compared to determine the difference between the two groups of students. Supplementary comparisons between the males and between the females were also made.

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 were generalized only to the setting of this investigation. This study was concerned only with the organizational structure of the school and the student attitudes toward it.

Organization of the Study

The report of this study was organized as follows:

1. Chapter I: Introduction
2. Chapter II: Review of Selected Literature
3. Chapter III: Methodology
4. Chapter IV: Presentation and Analysis of Data
5. Chapter V: Findings, Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

Bureaucracy

This research centered on the classical theory of bureaucracy adopted by the eminent German scholar, Max Weber, whose perceptive and incisive theoretical analysis of the principles of bureaucracy was a significant general statement on formal organizations. His writings on the concept of bureaucracy had a strong influence on subsequent thinking and research in the field of formal organizations.

From Weber's work, three bureaucratic characteristics pertinent to this study were identified. The characteristics were:

1. hierarchy of authority,
2. rules and regulations, and
3. impersonalization.[1]

Concerning these characteristics, Blau and Scott wrote:

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

---

[1]Peter M. Blau, Bureaucracy in Modern Society (New York: Random House, 1965), pp. 28-31.

> 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.[1]

One kind of authority exercised by persons in the hierarchy was identified as legal authority. In writing about legal authority, Weber pointed out that obedience was not owed to anyone personally but to enacted rules and regulations which specified to whom and to what rule people owed obedience.[2]

Weber further said that in the pure type bureaucracy, the person in command was the "superior" within a functionally defined "competency" or "jurisdiction," and his right to govern was legitimated by enactment. He suggested that the typical official proceded without regard to person (impersonalization), following rational rules with strict formality (rules and regulations). Where rules failed, he adhered to "functional" considerations of expediency. The author also stated that dutiful obedience was channeled through a hierarchy of offices (hierarchy of authority) which subordinated lower to higher offices.[3]

---

[1]Blau and Scott, Formal Organizations, p. 33.

[2]Max Weber, "Three Types of Legitimate Rule," Complex Organizations, ed. by Amitai Etzioni (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1962), p. 27.

[3]Ibid.

Hierarchy of Authority

One of the organizational characteristics of bureaucracy identified by Weber concerned the way in which the offices (and officers) were arranged. He said that in a bureaucracy, the organization of the offices followed the principle of hierarchy; that is, each lower office was under the control and supervision of a higher one.[1] This hierarchy specified the locus of decision making that was prestructured by the organization.[2]

> Every official in this administrative hierarchy is accountable to his superior for his subordinate's 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.[3]

Supporting Weber's identification of the hierarchial arrangement of offices, Thompson stated that ultimately someone was designated as the "boss." This meant that this person had a right to veto or affirm the organizationally directed proposals of his subordinates, subject to no appeal. The

---

[1]Max Weber, Essays in Sociology, trans. by Gerth and Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 196.

[2]Hall, "Interorganizational Structural Variation," pp. 295-308.

[3]Blau, Bureaucracy in Modern Society, p. 29.

superior's rights included a near-absolute power over the organizational ambitions and careers of subordinates.[1]

Not only did the superior have the right to tell the subordinate what to do, but the superior had the right to deference from his subordinate, the right to be treated with extra care and respect.[2] The significance in this lay in the fact that it was one way in that the superior had the right to be somewhat insensitive as to subordinates' personal needs. The ranking of roles with regard to the amount of deference due them was referred to as the "status system."

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

> 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.[3]

Abbott said that the hierarchical definition of roles was a major deterrent to meaningful innovation in the organization. He saw the deterrent to innovation as a major dysfunctional consequence of structuring the schools bureaucratically. He suggested that although roles in general were

---

[1]Victor A. Thompson, "Hierarchy, Specialization, and Organizational Conflict," Administrative Science Quarterly, V (1961), 485.

[2]Ibid., p. 486.

[3]Victor A. Thompson, Modern Organizations (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1961), p. 75.

defined in terms of both rights and obligations, there was a tendency in bureaucracies to emphasize rights when referring to superordinate roles and to emphasize obligations when referring to subordinate roles.[1]

Although hierarchy was identified and studied extensively in other kinds of organizations, the term was seldom used in the language of the educational writings. Yet the practices to which it referred were commonly prevalent. The typical organization chart of a school was intended specifically to clarify lines of authority and channels of communication. Abbott wrote:

> Even in the absence of such a chart, 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.[2]

Impersonalization

A second characteristic of bureaucracy identified by Weber concerned the affective basis upon which an organizational officer made decisions. Weber said that in a bureaucracy, "the ideal official conducts his office . . . in a

---

[1]Max G. Abbott, "Hierarchical Impediments to Innovation in Educational Organizations," Change Perspectives in Educational Administration (Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University, 1965), p. 47.

[2]Ibid.

spirit of formalistic impersonality . . . without hatred or passion, and hence without affection or enthusiasm."[1]

> 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 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 the others. Impersonal detachment engenders equitable treatment of all persons and thus fosters democracy in administration.[2]

Anderson pointed out that despite attempts within organizations to structure and impersonalize relationships so that individual personalities had little or no effect on the accomplishment of organizational goals, "no organization can be completely rational."[3] He identified three reasons for this being true. First, he suggested that the organization must involve individuals who possessed diverse experiences,

---

[1]Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, trans. by Henderson and Parsons (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), p. 331.

[2]Blau, Bureaucracy in Modern Society, p. 30.

[3]James G. Anderson, "Bureaucratic Rules: Bearers of Organizational Authority," Educational Administration Quarterly, (Winter, 1966), 7-33.

training, and attitudes which they brought to the organization, and these individuals interacted outside of the formally assigned roles that they played in the organization. Secondly, Anderson suggested that the formal and informal structure of the organization were affected by pressure from the environment in which the institution existed. Thirdly, Anderson cited the historical perspective with which persons both within and without the organization regarded the goals of the organization and the methods used to accomplish these goals had a decided effect upon the organization.[1]

Although impersonality engendered equitable treatment for all, it also engendered orientations toward the official and the organization which were 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.[2]

The above writer pointed out that in the school, the tendency to adhere to impersonalization developed counter to the philosophy of recognizing individual differences. He

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid.

suggested that stereotyped behavior which was not adaptable to individual problems was resorted to in grading, parent-teacher conferences, and working with students.[1]

The lack of adaptability of the school to individual differences caused adaptive responses on the part of the students. Carlson identified some of these as "situational retirement," "rebellious adjustment," "side-payment adaptation," and "drop-out adaptation."[2] Each of these responses were caused by a perception on the part of the student that the school was not meeting his individual needs. As Carlson said, these adaptations involved some rejection of both the school and what the school had to offer.[3] Impersonal treatment by the organizational representative could have fostered such a perception.

Rules and Regulations

A third organizational characteristic of bureaucracy identified by Weber concerned the specificity with which the organization controlled its participants. Rules and regulations were developed to provide guidelines and procedures

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Richard O. Carlson, "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences: The Public School and Its Clients," Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, ed. by Daniel E. Griffiths, Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 261-76.

[3] Ibid.

that facilitated the operation of the formal organization. Operations were governed, "by a consistent system of abstract rules---(and) consisted of the application of these rules to particular cases."[1]

Blau stated:

> 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 legal issues. Bureaucratic duties range in complexity from one of these extremes to the other.[2]

Ideally, rules and regulations were designed to foster behavior which was the most rational toward the attainment of organizational goals. However, in some instances, the rules could have inhibited goal attainment. As Merton observed:

> 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.

---

[1]Weber, Social and Economic Organization, p. 330.

[2]Blau, Bureaucracy in Modern Society, pp. 29-30.

> 4. Thus, the very elements which conduce toward efficiency in general produce inefficiency in specific instances.[1]

That some organizational participants did in fact adhere to the rules and regulations despite the conditions was commonly understood. In fact, this recognition was so common that the special name "bureaucrat" was attached to persons so identified. Merton saw 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.[2]

The tendency of organizational officials to enforce adherence to rules and regulations may also have had implications for the orientation of the subordinates. As Parsons 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 . . .[3]

Organizational theorists recognized this and have stated that the organization needed to adapt to be effective. Anderson said that in order for an institution to be effective, there had to be a balance between acquiescence to authority against individual initiative. He suggested that strict adherence to organizational rules had to be tempered

---

[1]Merton, "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality," p. 53.

[2]Ibid., p. 55. [3]Ibid., p. 68.

with the exercise of discretion by the member of the organization in performing his function. He pointed out that one of the major critical problems of a bureaucracy was to maintain an orientation that lay mid-way between a rigid adherence to formal rules and the unlimited exercise of discretion in order that the organization retained the flexibility necessary to deal with individual problems and to accomplish the organizational goals.[1]

Alienation

Etzioni emphasized that the involvement of participants in the organization was affected by the legitimacy of a directive as well as by the degree to which it frustrated the subordinate's need dispositions. He further suggested that alienation produced not only by the illegitimate exercise of power, but also by power which frustrated the participant's needs, wishes, and desires. Commitment, on the other hand, generated not merely by directives which were considered legitimate, but also by those which were in line with internalized needs of the participant.[2]

According to Seeman, alienation was a concept which pervaded the literature of sociology and held a prominent

---

[1]Anderson, "Bureaucratic Rules: Bearers of Organizational Authority," p. 13.

[2]Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations (New York: The Free Press, 1961), pp. 15-16.

place in the work of contemporary sociologists. He contended that alienation was a central theme in the works of such men in sociology as Marx, Weber, and Durkheim,[1] Dean credited much of the development of the original concept of alienation to Hegel, Marx, and Weber.[2]

Alienation was 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 was reported. Pearlin suggested that the lack of investigation of alienation was due to the difficulty of identifying that from which people are alienated.[3]

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."[4] Continuing, Nettler pointed out that Hegel first suggested the term "alienation" in describing the situation in which man became detached from the world of nature,

---

[1]Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," p. 783.

[2]Dwight G. Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," American Sociological Review, XXVI (October, 1961), 325.

[3]Paul C. Pearlin, "Alienation from Work: A Study of Nursing Personnel," American Sociological Review, XXVII (June, 1962), 325.

[4]Gwynn Nettler, "A Measure of Alienation," American Sociological Review, XXII (December, 1957), 670.

including his own nature.[1] 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.[2]

The concept of alienation was deeply rooted in sociological tradition and it recently enjoyed extensive popularity in the work of contemporary behavioral scientists. Dean credited Seeman with bringing order out of chaos with his classification of dimensions of alienation.[3]

Using the writings of other eminent sociologists, Seeman identified five dimensions of alienation. They were: 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 sociological thought;

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid.

[3] Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," p. 754.

and to make the traditional interest in alienation more amenable to sharp empirical statement."[1]

Powerlessness

Powerlessness was 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."[2]

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 management. Weber extended this concept beyond the industrial sphere by associating it with all bureaucratic organizations where the worker was subject to the directives of another. Seeman said that powerlessness was perhaps the most common understanding of the term "alienation" in sociological literature.[3]

Seeman was explicit to point out that this conception of powerlessness was a distinctly social-psychological view. He stated that his construction of powerlessness clearly departed from the Marxian tradition by removing the critical polemic element in the idea of alienation. He believed that powerlessness was purely the individual's expectancy for some control of events. Powerlessness thus defined was clearly

---

[1]Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," p. 783.

[2]Ibid., [3]Ibid.

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 expectations for control and his desire for control.[1] However, Seeman did 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.[2]

Isolation

The isolation dimension of alienation was defined as, "assign(ing) low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in a given society."[3] Seeman pointed out that this usage did not refer to isolation as a lack of "social adjustment"--of warmth, security, or intensity of an individual's detachment from popular cultural standards. It closely approximated one of the adaptations Merton identified that an individual had made to a situation in which goals and means were not well coordinated. This adaptation led men outside the environing social structure to seek to bring about a greatly modified social structure. It presupposed alienation from reigning goals and standards.[4]

Self-Estrangement

This dimension was defined as the degree of dependence of the given behavior upon anticipated future rewards that lay

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid., p. 785. [3] Ibid., p. 789. [4] Ibid.

outside the activity itself. It referred to an assessment by the individual that his activity was not intrinsically meaningful.[1]

Seeman gave Fromm and Mills much credit for the development of this concept of alienation. Seeman suggested that this form of alienation was displayed by those who sought reward outside of the activity in which they were participating. In this view, what was called self-estrangement referred essentially to the inability of the individual to find self-rewarding activities that engage him.[2]

Empirical Studies of Organization and Alienation

In a study that closely paralleled 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 sub-scales from D. A. MacKay's School Organizational Inventory were used to obtain a measure of the organizational structure of schools as perceived by

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid., p. 790.

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 perceived a high degree of centralization of authority and rule structure in the school organization, they tended to feel more alienated from their work and fellow workers. It was further concluded that those who perceived less formal structure in terms of centralization of authority and specification of rules were less alienated from work and fellow workers.

Adams felt that the evidence provided by his study led support to the contention that a teacher's sense of involvement and power to affect conditions over his work were directly related to his perception of the organizational structure of the school.[1]

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

---

[1]Charles F. Adams, "The Relationship of Teacher Alienation to the Organizational Structures of Schools" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York, 1968), p. 35.

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 was a scale designed to measure the degree of student alienation. This instrument provided 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 differed significantly in type of bureaucratic structure. Five schools which were identified as representing pure types were also found. A consistency in significant 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 suggested that two definitional problems existed in the five-dimensional measure of alienation. The author suggested that both powerlessness and meaninglessness involved predictions of behavioral outcomes and this

might have caused inconsistencies in other research even though it did not produce problems in his research. He also pointed out that there was 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.[1]

Summary

Chapter II was a review of the selected literature concerning bureaucracy and alienation as it pertained to this study. The three characteristics of bureaucracy employed in this research which were discussed were: hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, and impersonalization. The three dimensions of alienation alluded to were: powerlessness, self-estrangement, and isolation. Also, specified were the instruments used to obtain the data which were: The School Organizational Inventory to measure the level of bureaucracy in a school and The Pupil Attitude Questionnaire to measure the degree of student alienation.

---

[1]Henry Kolesar, "An Empirical Study of Client Alienation in the Bureaucratic Organization" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1967), p. 82.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

This chapter described the research design. Specifically, the sampling techniques, the instrumentation, and the method of administering the instruments were described. The chapter concluded with a description of the statistical procedures used to analyze the data. The problem investigated in this study was whether selected bureaucratic characteristics of public elementary schools were related to selected characteristics of elementary student alienation.

Sampling

In order to test the hypotheses, teachers in seven Title I elementary schools and students in two of these schools in the State of Oklahoma were asked to respond to the appropriate instruments. The School Organizational Inventory was used to identify the highest and lowest bureaucratic schools. Student responses to the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire were then used to test each hypothesis.

Student responses were obtained by randomly selecting fifty sixth-grade members of the highest bureaucratic school and fifty sixth-grade members of the lowest bureaucratic school.

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

One hundred and five teachers responded to items of the School Organizational Inventory.[1] One hundred students responded to items of the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire.[2]

Instrumentation

The instrument used to measure the level of bureaucracy in each of the elementary 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]

---

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

[2]Kolesar, "An Empirical Study of Client Alienation in the Bureaucratic Organization," pp. 63-67.

[3]Hall, "Interorganizational Structural Variation:," pp. 295-308.

[4]Norman 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, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1963), p. 20.

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, and (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 judgements 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.

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 consistency using correlation 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 correlation 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, Punch[1] 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 said that professionalization and bureaucratization were two distinct and separate elements of organizational life. He stated that only the four subscales of Hierarchy of Authority, Procedural Specifications, Rules for Members,

---

[1]Keith Francis Punch, "Bureaucratic Structure in Schools and Its Relationship to Leader Behavior: An Empirical Study" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1967), pp. 192-97.

and Impersonality were measures of bureaucratization. For this reason, only the thirty-three items making up these 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 measured in each of the schools in the sample of this study.

To each of the thirty-three statements, five response categories were provided. The responses given by each teacher indicated his/her degree of agreement or disagreement with the statement. The instrument was included in Appendix A.

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

The instrument consisted of thirty-four statements. To each statement, five response categories were provided. The response given by the student indicated the degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement. The thirty-four items provided a basis of measurement for three dimensions of alienation which were: powerlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement. These were the dimensions developed by Seeman and used by Kolesar in the examination of alienation among elementary 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 elementary school. The number of items was reduced to 145 through analysis of the items for discriminative ability. Pearson r correlations were 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 three dimensions of alienation. A combination of thirty-four items were randomly selected from this ninety-eight factor matrix. Kolesar reported coefficients of stability for the dimensions of powerlessness, self-estrangement, and isolation of 0.73, 0.74, and 0.66 respectively, and 0.79 for the combined scores. The instrument was included in Appendix E of this study.

Administration of the Instruments

The school administrator of each of the selected schools was contacted by the researcher and the proposed project was explained to him. When the school officials granted permission to the researcher to use the teachers

and pupils, appointments were then scheduled so that the instruments could be administered to the faculty and the students of the schools involved. A follow-up call was then given to each school 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 explain and answer questions that the teachers had. The following week the researcher used a student roll to randomly select fifty students from the two schools to participate in the study. The students selected were those from the school with the highest level of bureaucratic structure and those from the school with the lowest bureaucratic structure. The students selected then responded to the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire. School officials were helpful in that a room was 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 scored by the researcher. 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.

Mean scores were computed for each of the subscales and a total bureaucracy score was computed for each of the schools. The rank order listing of the top and bottom schools based on the mean scores of the School Organizational Inventory on each of the dimensions of hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, and impersonalization were shown in Tables 1 through IV.

Statistical Design

The t test for two independent samples was used in this study. The assumptions for the t test called for independent samples, distributions of the variables in the populations to be normal, and homogeneity of variance in the samples. Certain variables were controlled in this investigation in order to have a normal population; these included socioeconomic status of the students, achievement level of the students, and age and grade level of the students. To control these variables only Title I schools were included; the achievement level of the students (measured by the California Achievement Test) had to have an average in the normal range, and only eleven- and twelve-year-old sixth graders were included in the student sample.

The .05 level of confidence was used to denote significance.[1] A *t* of 1.64 was required for significance as a one-tailed test was employed. The writer felt the direction of the difference between students' means was of specific interest in this study.

---

[1]George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), p. 139.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

Before the hypotheses were tested, all the teachers (105) in the seven Title I schools responded to the School Organizational Inventory. The purpose of this activity by these teachers was to determine the level of bureaucracy in the schools as each teacher respectively perceived it to be. A substantial margin of statistical difference in the levels of bureaucratic structure based on hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, and impersonalization between two of the seven schools was necessary in order to continue the study for testing the sixth-grade students' levels of alienation in the high and low schools. There was a wide range in scores between the highest and lowest schools in the bureaucratic structure as shown in Tables 1 through 4.

Three major hypotheses were used to test the students' levels of alienation in the study. Each of the hypotheses included sub-hypotheses pertaining to the sex of the students. Data pertinent to these hypotheses are found in Tables 5 through 13.

Statistical Test

The *t* test for independent samples was used to test all major and sub-hypotheses. According to Ferguson, the writer accepted hypotheses which were supported at the .05 level of significance. "The .05 level was originally chosen---and has persisted with researchers---because it is considered a reasonably good gamble. It is neither too high nor too low for most social scientific research. The .05 and .01 levels have been widely advocated."[1]

Levels of Bureaucracy

Table 1 contains data indicating mean scores of the various schools on hierarchy of authority. Table 2 contains data indicating mean scores of the various schools on rules and regulations. Table 3 contains data indicating mean scores of the various schools on impersonalization. Table 4 contains the sums and ranks of means of hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, and impersonalization.

---

[1]George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), p. 139.

TABLE 1

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

School	Mean Score Hierarchy of Authority
1	40.912
4	39.375
7	37.182
2	33.679
6	32.718
5	30.602
3	29.064

TABLE 2

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

School	Mean Score Rules and Regulations
1	47.065
7	46.125
2	44.098
5	39.976
6	37.931
4	35.750
3	34.006

TABLE 3

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

School	Mean Score Impersonalization
1	29.850
7	28.921
6	27.792
4	26.001
5	23.492
2	23.102
3	20.417

TABLE 4

SUMS AND RANKS OF MEANS OF HIERARCHY OF AUTHORITY, RULES AND REGULATIONS, AND IMPERSONALIZATION

School	Sums
1	117.827
7	112.228
4	101.126
2	100.879
6	98.441
5	94.070
3	83.487

There was definitely a significant difference in levels of bureaucracy between schools (1) and (3). The *t* value between the highest mean sum (117.827) and the lowest mean sum (83.487) was as follows: $t = 5.3541$

$df = 26$

$p < .001$

Anything higher than 3.707 is significant beyond the .001 level. This statistically significant difference in bureaucratic levels between schools (1) and (3) provided the necessary samples of the pupil population to be tested on alienation. School (1) was the high level of bureaucracy while school (3) was the low.

Student Alienation

Hypothesis One dealt with the effect of hierarchy of authority on feelings of powerlessness in students. Hypothesis Two dealt with the effect of rules and regulations on feelings of self-estrangement in students. Hypothesis Three dealt with the effect of impersonalization on feelings of isolation in students.

Ho_1 Students in schools classified as relatively high in hierarchy of authority will not feel significantly more powerless than students in schools classified as relatively low in hierarchy of authority.

Table 5 contains data relevant to the testing of Ho_1. The calculated *t* value for the analysis was 1.498. A *t* value of 1.645 was needed for significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted.

TABLE 5

POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF STUDENT ALIENATION

School	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Powerlessness Score	t
High in Hierarchy of Authority	50	8.172	33.84	1.498
Low in Hierarchy of Authority	50	9.013	34.45	
		$p > .05$		

Supplementary Data Concerning Powerlessness

Sex: Table 6 contains data concerning the statistical analysis of male participants on the issue of the powerlessness dimension of alienation. 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 0.527. There was no significant difference, which was consistent with the acceptance of the hypothesis.

Table 7 contains data concerning the statistical analysis of female participants on the issue of the powerlessness dimension of alienation. 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 1.479. There was no significant difference, which was consistent with the acceptance of the hypothesis.

TABLE 6

POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
MALE STUDENTS

School	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Powerlessness Score	t
High in Hierarchy of Authority	23	8.9872	35.63	0.527
Low in Hierarchy of Authority	21	7.9021	36.38	
		$p > .05$		

TABLE 7

POWERLESSNESS DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
FEMALE STUDENTS

School	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Powerlessness Score	t
High in Hierarchy of Authority	27	8.1692	31.06	1.479
Low in Hierarchy of Authority	29	10.0892	32.94	
		$p > .05$		

Ho_2 Students in schools classified as relatively high in rules and regulations will not feel significantly more self-estranged than students in schools classified as relatively low in rules and regulations.

Table 8 contains data relevant to the testing of Ho_2. The calculated t value for the analysis was 1.095. A t value of 1.645 was needed for significance at the 0.05 level. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted.

TABLE 8

SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF STUDENT ALIENATION

School	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self-estrangement Score	t
High in Rules and Regulations	50	6.0051	35.17	1.095
Low in Rules and Regulations	50	7.0119	34.39	
		$p > .05$		

Supplementary Data Concerning Self-Estrangement

Sex: Table 9 contains data concerning the statistical analysis of male participants on the issue of the powerlessness dimension of alienation. 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 0.129.

There was no significant difference, which was consistent with the acceptance of the hypothesis.

TABLE 9

SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
MALE STUDENTS

School	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self-estrangement Score	t
High in Rules and Regulations	23	6.2981	36.12	0.129
Low in Rules and Regulations	21	6.2798	36.43	
		$p > .05$		

Table 10 contains data concerning the statistical analysis of female participants on the issue of the self-estrangement dimension of alienation. 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 1.8826. There was a significant difference, which was not consistent with the acceptance of the hypothesis.

TABLE 10

SELF-ESTRANGEMENT DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
FEMALE STUDENTS

School	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Self-estrangement Score	t
High in Rules and Regulations	27	6.2281	33.71	1.8826
Low in Rules and Regulations	29	7.0910	32.00	
		$p < .05$*		

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

Ho_3 Students in schools classified as relatively high in impersonalization will not feel significantly more isolation than students in schools classified as relatively low in impersonalization.

Table 11 contains data relevant to the the testing of Ho_3. The calculated t value for the analysis was 1.701. A t value of 1.645 was needed for significance at the 0.05 level. The hypothesis could not be rejected, however, because the difference in the means was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

TABLE 11

ISOLATION DIMENSION OF STUDENT ALIENATION

School	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	t
High in Impersonalization	50	3.5798	33.40	
Low in Impersonalization	50	3.4891	24.03	1.701
		$p < .05$*		

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

Supplementary Data Concerning Isolation

Sex: Table 12 contains data concerning the statistical analysis of male participants of the issue of the isolation dimension of alienation. 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 2.3947. There was a significant difference. However, the hypothesis could not be rejected because the difference in means was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

TABLE 12

ISOLATION DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
MALE STUDENTS

School	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	t
High in Impersonalization	33	3.6989	22.62	2.3947
Low in Impersonalization	21	3.5772	23.95	
		$p < .05$*		

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

Table 13 contains data concerning the statistical analysis of female participants on the issue of the isolation dimension of alienation in schools classified as high and low in impersonalization. The value of the calculated t for females was 0.1031. There was no significant difference, and the hypothesis was accepted

TABLE 13

ISOLATION DIMENSION OF ALIENATION
FEMALE STUDENTS

School	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean Isolation Score	t
High in Impersonalization	27	3.3644	24.07	0.1031
Low in Impersonalization	29	3.1979	24.12	
		$p > .05$		

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine selected structural characteristics of the elementary 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 certain elementary schools related to selected characteristics of student alienation?

Three major hypotheses were used to test the students' levels of alienation. Each of these hypotheses included sub-hypotheses pertaining to the sex of the students.

The participants in the study were selected on the basis of the socioeconomic status of the students in the schools and on the level of achievement of the students. To control the independent variables, students who fell in the

normal range of achievement and teachers who were in attendance at the Title I schools made up the populations. Teachers in these schools were used as a means for obtaining data on the bureaucratic characteristics of the schools. The student participants included fifty students randomly selected from the school classified as relatively high in specific bureaucratic characteristics and 50 students from the school classified as relatively low in specific bureaucratic characteristics. Forty-four male students and fifty-six female students were included in the sample.

Teacher responses to the School Organizational Inventory were used to identify the highest and the lowest bureaucratic schools. Student responses to the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire were then used to test each hypothesis.

Data from the teacher participants were collected by giving the School Organizational Inventory to 105 of the 108 teachers in the Title I schools. After scoring the teachers' responses, the categories of bureaucratic characteristics of hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, and impersonalization were determined for each school. The schools were then classified as to the school with the highest bureaucratic characteristics and the school with the lowest bureaucratic characteristics.

Students were randomly selected from the school with the highest level of bureaucratic structure and the school with the lowest bureaucratic structure. These students

responded to the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire. Student responses were scored and categorized for the three dimensions of alienation--powerlessness, self-estrangement, and isolation. This categorization also included male and female selections of the three dimensions of the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire.

A t test was used to test the three major hypotheses and the sub-hypotheses pertaining to sex. The .05 level of confidence was employed to indicate significance.

Findings

1. Ho_1 indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the students' feelings of powerlessness in schools classified as relatively high in hierarchy of authority and schools classified as relatively low in hierarchy of authority. The testing of this hypothesis resulted in its acceptance in the null. Testing of the sub-hypotheses regarding differences in alienation due to sex of the students indicated that sex was not a factor.

2. Ho_2 indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the students' feelings of self-estrangement in schools classified as relatively high in rules and regulations and schools classified as relatively low in rules and regulations. The testing of this hypothesis resulted in its acceptance in the null.

Where sub-hypothesis two pertaining to sex did reveal some difference, all the male students followed the above

pattern of findings. The opposite was true for females, who felt more self-estranged in the high bureaucratic school.

3. Ho_3 indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in the students' feelings of isolation in schools classified as relatively high in impersonalization and schools classified as relatively low in impersonalization. However, the testing of this hypothesis resulted in its acceptance in the null, as the difference was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

Conclusions

The findings of this study supported the following conclusions:

1. Feelings of alienation on the part of elementary pupils were not significantly affected by the level of bureaucracy present in the school.

2. The level of bureaucracy did affect the feelings of self-estrangement among female students. As the levels of bureaucracy increased, females had greater feelings of self-estrangement.

3. Where bureaucracy did alienate students, it was in the opposite direction from that expected, which indicated that a high level of bureaucratic characteristics frequently appeared to reduce student alienation.

Implications and Recommendations

1. The results of this study seem to contradict much of the contemporary literature concerning bureaucracy and alienation as well as a number of other empirical studies. Although these contrasting results could well indicate defects in the research design, there may be other explanations such as the following:

a. It may be that the process by which characteristics of bureaucracy are legitimated are a part of the early experiences of children in the American culture and are so influential on their attitudes toward bureaucracy that reducing the more obvious indications of organizational structure actually increases feelings of alienation, at least temporarily.

b. The bureaucratic characteristics as measured in this study may reflect conditions wherein there was 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 organizational members know what is expected of them, they may feel they are better able to comply with organizational expectations and therefore feel less alienated.

c. Perhaps these results stem from differences of perceptions of organizational structure between teachers and pupils.

2. Additional research to explore the validity of the results of the study and/or these observations relating to the study might be conducted. Such research might involve:

a. Possible differences in the perceived levels of bureaucracy and alienation by individuals occupying different levels in the hierarchy.

b. The degree to which affective factors relating to individuals at different decision points in the hierarchy may determine the way they view the organization.

c. The degree to which length of time in school may affect feelings of alienation as they relate to bureaucratic characteristics.

d. Whether or not factors pertaining to the circumstances and conditions in which rules and regulations are formulated affect feelings of alienation that might result from them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

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.

_____, and Scott, W. Richard. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962.

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

Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.

Merton, Robert. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality." Complex Organizations. Edited by Amitai Etzioni. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1962.

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

Weber, Max. "Three Types of Legitimate Rule." Complex Organizations. Edited by Amitai Etzioni. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1962.

_____. Essays in Sociology. Translated by Gerth and Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.

_____. The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations. Translated by Henderson and Parsons, New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Periodicals

Abbott, Max G. "Hierarchical Impediments to Innovation in Educational Organizations." Change Perspectives in Educational Administration. Auburn, Alabama: 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." Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. Edited by Daniel E. Griffiths. Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964, pp. 261-76.

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, Jacob W. "A Psycho-Sociological Framework for the Study of Educational Administration." Harvard Educational Review, XXII (1952), pp. 236-39.

_____, and Thelen, Herbert A. "The Classroom Groups as a Unique Social System." The Dynamics of Instructional Groups." Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964, pp. 53-82.

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

_____. "Some Organizational Considerations in the Professional-Organizational Relationship." Administrative Science Quarterly, XII (December, 1967), p. 465.

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

Perlin, Paul C. "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. V (1961), p. 485.

Unpublished Materials

Adams, Charles F. "The Relationship of Teacher Alienation to the Organizational Structures of School." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York, 1968.

Kolesar, Henry. "An Empirical Study of Client Alienation in the Bureaucratic Organization." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1967.

MacKay, D. A. "An Empirical Study of Bureaucratic Dimensions and Their Relationships to the Characteristics of School Organization." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964.

Punch, Keith Francis. "Bureaucratic Structure in Schools and Its Relationship to Leader Behavior: An Empirical Study." Unpublished Ph.D. 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 Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1963.

APPENDIX A

SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY

SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY

(Please do not sign your name to this questionnaire.)

Directions: In this series of statements, you are asked to indicate how well each 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's organizational structure.

The five possible choices are:

Always True	(AT)
Often True	(OFT)
Occasionally True . . .	(OCT)
Seldom True	(ST)
Never True	(NT)

---

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

2. The rules which state 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.

APPENDIX B

SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY ANSWER SHEET

SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY ANSWER SHEET

(Please do not sign your name to this questionnaire.)

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

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 C

CATEGORICAL BREAKDOWN OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY

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 and Regulations

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

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

PUPIL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

(Please do not write your name on this questionnaire.)

Directions: Read each of the following statements carefully. Then circle the letters or letter on the answer sheet which most nearly reflect your opinion of the statement being made.

EXAMPLE: (A.) All sixth-grade students are dumb.

1. It is always best to do right no matter how much effort it takes.
2. There is nothing a student can do about the way a school is run.
3. All of our school activities are planned by somebody else.
4. It doesn't do any good to complain to teachers about school; they don't really care.
5. If I put up with a rotten deal now, it will pay off later on.
6. Students should not be required to study very much.
7. In this school the students are almost forced to do things which are not right.
8. In this school the students are often asked their opinions about how the school ought to be run.
9. I think my teachers will give me the same marks on my report cards no matter how well I really do.
10. I plan to complete my high school education.
11. These days a student doesn't really know whom he can count on.
12. I often worry about what my teachers think of me.
13. Students should do their best even in classes they don't like.
14. The main reason I study is so I can get good grades.

15. In my courses, I often read and study ahead of the rest of the class.

16. The principal of this school is interested in every student here.

17. When a student has done something wrong, the principal and teachers always listen to the student's side of the story before they decide what they are going to do.

18. The teachers in this school will not listen to students' complaints about unfair rules.

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

20. It's better to stay in school than to drop out and go to work.

21. In this school there are several ways we can protect ourselves if we disagree with the principal or teachers.

22. I'm more interested in doing a good job on an assignment than the grade I get on it.

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

24. In this school the teachers are the rulers and the students are the slaves.

25. I wouldn't do homework at all if it wasn't required by the teachers.

26. I like to do extra assignments just for fun.

27. It is very important to try to impress your teachers.

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

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

30. The principal of this school always listens to your complaints.

31. Students' ideas about how the school should be run are often adopted in this school.

32. I find it easy to please my teachers.

33. I plan to go to college.

34. Students in this school are allowed to help plan their own class schedule.

APPENDIX F

PUPIL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE ANSWER SHEET

PUPIL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE ANSWER SHEET

(Please do not put your name on this answer sheet.)

Biographical Data: Age: yrs.___ mos.___ Sex: Male Female

Strongly Agree	SA
Agree	A
Undecided	U
Disagree	D
Strongly Disagree . . .	SD

(A.) (EXAMPLE) SA A U D (SD)

1.	SA	A	U	D	SD	18.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2.	SA	A	U	D	SD	19.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3.	SA	A	U	D	SD	20.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4.	SA	A	U	D	SD	21.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5.	SA	A	U	D	SD	22.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6.	SA	A	U	D	SD	23.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7.	SA	A	U	D	SD	24.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8.	SA	A	U	D	SD	25.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9.	SA	A	U	D	SD	26.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10.	SA	A	U	D	SD	27.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11.	SA	A	U	D	SD	28.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12.	SA	A	U	D	SD	29.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13.	SA	A	U	D	SD	30.	SA	A	U	D	SD
14.	SA	A	U	D	SD	31.	SA	A	U	D	SD
15.	SA	A	U	D	SD	32.	SA	A	U	D	SD
16.	SA	A	U	D	SD	33.	SA	A	U	D	SD
17.	SA	A	U	D	SD	34.	SA	A	U	D	SD

APPENDIX G

CATEGORICAL BREAKDOWN OF PUPIL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

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:

2, 3, 4, 8, 16, 17, 18, 21, 24, 30, 31, and 34

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

6, 7, 9, 11, 15, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, and 32

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

1, 5, 10, 12, 13, 14, 27, 28, 29, and 33

APPENDIX H

KEY TO SCORING PUPIL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

KEY TO SCORING PUPIL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

The Pupil Attitude Questionnaire is divided into two groups. Group I includes items: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, and 29.

The scoring for this group is:

SA = 5, A = 4, U = 3, D = 2, and SD = 1.

Group II includes items: 1, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34.

The scoring for this group is:

SA = 1, A = 2, U = 3, D = 4, and SD = 5.