INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. 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 material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations 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 through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

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

4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/4730

8018933

RICE, GEORGE KENDELL

LEARNING CLIMATE AND THE SATISFACTION AND ALIENATION OF LAW STUDENTS

The University of Oklahoma PH.D. 1980

University Microfilms International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 18 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4EJ, England

Copyright 1980

by

Rice, George Kendell

All Rights Reserved

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

LEARNING CLIMATE AND THE SATISFACTION AND ALIENATION OF LAW STUDENTS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSPHY

BY

GEORGE KENDELL RICE

Tulsa, Oklahoma

1980

LEARNING CLIMATE AND THE SATISFACTION

AND ALIENATION OF LAW STUDENTS

APPROVED BY

Chairman

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

CONTENTS

		Page
TABLES		iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		vi
CHAPTER		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background and Setting of the Problem	1
	Statement of the Problem	20
	Significance of the Study	27
II.	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH	29
	Learning Climate Theory and Research	29
	Satisfaction Theory and Research	43
	Alienation Theory and Research	60
III.	RESEARCH DESIGN	82
	Restatement of the Problem	82
	Definition of Terms	82
	Research Design and Presentation of Hypotheses	83
	Selection of Subjects	86
	Description of the Instruments	88
	Procedure for Collecting the Data	91
	Statistical Methods	93
IV.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	101
	Learning Climate Perceptions	103
	Overall Satisfaction with the Learning Process	110
	Student Alienation	117
	Summary	128
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	131
APPENDIX		145
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY		177

TABLES

TABLE		Page
1.	The Mann-Whitney U Test Between Law School Groups on the Learning Climate Questionnaire at the Beginning of the School Year	105
2.	The Mann-Whiteney U Test Between Law School Groups on Learning Climate Measets	108
3.	The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test for Twenty-Two First Year Students Comparing Pre-Test and Post-Test Responses on the Learning Climate Questionnaire	109
4.	The Mann-Whitney U Test Between Law School Groups on the Overall Satisfaction Index	111
5.	The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient Between Individual Scores on the Learning Climate Questionnaire Measets and the Overall Satisfaction Index for Each Group	113
6.	The Mann-Whitney U Test Between Law School Groups on the Overall Satisfaction Index	115
7.	The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test for Twenty-Two First Year Students Comparing Pre-Test and Post-Test Responses on the Overall Satisfaction Index	116
8.	The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient Between Individual Scores on the Learning Climate Questionnaire and the University Alienation Scale for Each Law School Group	118
9.	The Mann-Whitney U Test Between Law School Groups on the University Alienation Scale	122
10.	The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test for Twenty-Two First Year Students comparing Pre-Test and Post-Test Responses on the University Alienation Scale	123
11.	The Mann-Whitney U Test Between First, Second and Third Year Law School Groups on the University Alienation Scale	125

TABLES - Continued

TABLE		Page
12.	The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient Between Satisfaction and University Alienation Scale for Groups Completing the First Year of Law School	127
13.	The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient Between the University Alienation Scale and Scholastic Achievement for Groups Completing the First Year of Law School	129
14.	The Mean, Standard Deviation, Median and Range of Scores on the Learning Climate Questionnaire, Satisfaction Index, and University Alienation Scale by Law School Group . .	172

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer would like to acknowledge his appreciation to many individuals who have made the completion of this study a reality.

I would like to express my sincere gratitiude to Dr. Thomas W. Wiggins, Chairman of the doctoral committee, for his inspiration, encouragement, and guidance which were crucial to the development and completion of this work. Grateful appreciation is expressed to the members of the doctoral committee: Dr. Herbert R. Hengst, Dr. Robert E. Ragland, and Dr. Larry K. Michaelsen for their interest, patience and assistance.

The writer would like to acknowledge the assistance given by Jeff Baughman, Systems Analyst, in the use of SPSS for data analysis.

A respectful acknowledgment is expressed to my mother and late father who always had more confidence in my abilities than were perhaps deserved. He would have been very proud of this accomplishment.

A special thanks is due the writer's wife, Carol Ann, for the extra responsibilities assumed and tolerance shown during the completion of this study. Recognition must also be given the writer's daughter, Amy Suzanne, for her creative penciled scatter-plots superimposed upon various worksheet during the early collection of data.

LEARNING CLIMATE AND THE SATISFACTION AND ALIENATION OF LAW STUDENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Setting of the Problem

Organizations differ not only in structure but also in the attitudes and behavior they elicit from their participants. Colleges and universities elicit specific forms of behavior from their students. Some students benefit from and are satisfied with the content and form of education they experience. Other students possessing the academic ability necessary for success are unable to achieve their potential and express antipathy with the institution. Such student reactions to an educational setting may be related to the psychological structures created by the institution.

Widespread discontent with traditional forms of legal education has emerged. University administrators are being challenged by law students to review the way law schools are organized, how they teach and much of what they teach. Quintin Johnstone, Professor of Law at Yale University stated:

> Law school teachers and administrators should genuinely attempt to understand what it is about legal education that students consider

> unsatisfactory, should thoroughly re-evaluate each phase of the educational process, and should make a major effort to come up with significant changes that both they and the students think promising.[1]

Johnstone's initial suggestion to discover the reasons for student vexation has prompted this study. Research on legal education may clarify the consequences of current training practices upon student participants. Therefore, the concern of the present study is to investigate the learning climate of a law school and to measure the relationships between that climate and student satisfaction and alienation. To provide the reader with an adequate background for understanding the theoretical foundation for the investigation, a brief review of the development of the concepts related to the problem will follow.

Behavioral scientists have applied the meterological term climate metaphorically to the study of organizations. Climate refers to the relatively enduring quality of the internal environment of an organization. Climate is experienced by its members, influences their behavior, and can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of attributes of the organization.[2]

Kurt Lewin was one of the first social scientists to express interest in the climate concept. During the 1930's he attempted to describe the essential dynamics that linked human behavior to generalized environmental stimuli.

---

[1]Quintin Johnstone, "Student Discontent and Educational Reform in Law Schools," Journal of Legal Education 23 (1971) :257.

[2]Renato Tagiuri, "The Concept of Organizational Climate," in Organizational Climate: Explorations of a Concept, eds. Renato Tagiuri and George H. Litwin (Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968), p. 27.

Lewin expressed his theoretical understanding of psychological climate as follows:

> To characterize properly the psychological field, one has to take into account such specific items as particular goals, stimuli, needs, social relations, as well as more general characteristics of the field as atmosphere (for instance, the friendly, tense, or hostile atmosphere) or the account of freedom. These characteristics of the field as a whole are as important in psychology as, for instance, the field of gravity for the explanation of events in classical physics. Psychological atmospheres are empirical realities and are scientifically describable facts.[1]

In the 1939 classic paper, "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created 'Social Climates'," Lewin, Lippitt, and White reported their initial attempt to study climate as an emperical reality.[2] The experiment involved the manipulation of three different leader-induced atmospheres: authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire. Results indicated that the experimentally created climates were able to change the observed behavior patterns of group members. In reviewing the observed behavioral changes in the various boys' clubs studied, Lewin and associates concluded:

> It can be reported that in nearly all cases differences in club behavior can be attributed to differences in the induced social climate rather than to constant characteristics of the club personnel.[3]

---

[1]Kurt Lewin, Field Theory in Social Science, ed. Dorwin Cartwright (New York: Harper, 1951), p. 241.

[2]Kurt Lewin, Ronald Lippitt, and Ralph K. White, "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created 'Social Climates'," Journal of Social Psychology 10 (May 1939) :271-299.

[3]Ronald Lippitt and Ralph K. White, "An Experimental Study of Leadership and Group Life," in Readings in Social Psychology, eds. Eleanor E. Maccoby, Theodore M. Newcomb, and Eugene L. Hartley (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958), p. 506.

Kahn and associates contributed to the theoretical development of the climate concept in their interpersonal organization theory. In formation and emphasis, their role-set theory is psychosocial. The major assumption is that the behavior of any organizational performer is a result of the motivational forces derived from the member's role-sets. These role-sets constantly influence the organizational performer by causing him to behave in accordance with the assumed expectations.[1]

The open systems concept developed by Katz and Kahn had philosophical impact on organizational theory development.[2] The distinguishing features of interaction with the environment and feedback loops turned researchers' interests toward the organization as an environmental setting for the study of individual and group behavior. The development of the concept of organizational climate was directly influenced by the discovery that organizations have psychologically meaningful environments.[3]

Two educational psychologists were among the first researchers to assist in the development of the organizational climate concept. In 1958 Pace and Stern made the first systematic and objective attempt to measure the climate of

---

[1]Robert L. Kahn et al., Organizational Stress (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964), p. 35.

[2]Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations 2nd ed. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978).

[3]Roy Payne and Derek S. Pugh, "Organizational Structure and Climate," in Handbook of Industrial-Organizational Psychology, ed. Marvin D. Dunnette (Chicago: McNally, 1975), p. 1126.

colleges and universities.[1] Their research was stimulated by the need-press theory of Murray.[2] Environmental presses were viewed by Murray as counterparts to personality needs. Performance in the environment was viewed as a function of the congruence between need and press.[3]

Pace and Stern developed further the environmental press concept by applying the logic of perceived climate to the study of atmosphere on college and university campuses. By asking students to report on the global college environment, the researchers hoped to gather descriptive information about the environment to be used by prospective students.[4] Also, they intended to improve the prediction of academic performance by studying student-college fit.

Other novel climate research strategies developed in educational settings during the 1960's. In their development of the Environmental Assessment Technique, Astin and Holland assumed that the atmosphere of a college was largely determined by the characteristics of the students, the average

---

[1]C. Robert Pace and George G. Stern, "An Approach to the Measurement of Psychological Characteristics of College Environments," Journal of Educational Psychology 49 (1958) :269-277.

[2]Henry A. Murray, Explorations in Personality (New York: Oxford University Press, 1938).

[3]C. Robert Pace, "College Environments," in Encyclopedia of Educational Research 4th Ed. ed. R. L. Edel (London: MacMillan, 1969), p. 169.

[4]Ibid., p. 280.

[5]Leonard L. Baird, "Focusing on Measures of College Environments," The College Board Review 68 (Winter 1972-73) :4.

intelligence of students, and the size of the institution.[1] In summarizing the results of their research, Astin and Holland concluded that the characteristics of the student body had a considerable influence on the total environment.[2]

Becher and associates used participant observation techniques in their 1961 Kansas Medical School study.[3] The medical student culture was described as a set of student perceptions and responses to commonly perceived environmental pressures.[4]

Astin followed the student behavior approach in his study of classroom environments.[5] Students were asked to describe their own behavior and that of their instructors. The results showed that there were systematic differences in classroom environments among various fields of study.[6]

Thistlethwaite's panel study of 2000 students clearly revealed that a student's desire to seek advanced training was positively related to such

---

[1]Alexander W. Astin and John L. Holland, "The Environmental Assessment Technique: A Way to Measure College Environments," Journal of Educational Psychology 52 (December 1961) :308.

[2]Baird, "Focusing on College Environments," p. 36.

[3]Howard S. Becher et al., Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961).

[4]Pace, "College Environments," p. 171.

[5]Alexander W. Astin, "Classroom Environment in Different Fields of Study," Journal of Education Psychology 56 (October 1965) :275-282.

[6]Ibid., p. 280.

environmental factors as faculty and student press for intellectualism, professors providing positive evaluations of the student's ability, and honors programs. Student perceptions were negatively related to environments in which professors demanded strict compliance with course requirements and in which there was high student press for social conformity, status, and play.[1]

After a review of various research approaches to the measurement of college environments, Pace concluded that not one research methodology was logically or empirically superior to all others.[2] However, Pace stated: "Measures based on the collective perception of students or on observable student behavior appear to be the most direct."[3]

Humanistically-oriented management theorists have stressed the importance of allowing individual differences to be expressed within an organization. Such management strategies were expected to increase levels of worker performance. By emphasizing the importance of individual expression, Argyris, McGregor, and Likert contributed to the development of the organizational climate concept as observed in industrial and business settings.

Argyris attempted to predict how members of an organization would

---

[1]Donald L. Thistlethwaite, "College Press and Student Achievement," Journal of Educational Psychology 50 (October 1959) :183.

[2]Pace, "College Environments," p. 171.

[3]Ibid.

behave given selected procedures and practices.[1] In Gestalt psychological terms, Argyris took a number of environmental cues and formed a composite descriptor. In climate terms, a label was developed which stood for a particular network of procedures and practices.[2]

In the book The Human Side of Enterprise, McGregor developed the concept psychological climate to complete his analysis of effective management.[3] His Theory X and Theory Y climates were predefined specifying the kinds of practices and procedures which hypothetically led people to think of their organization's climate in a particular way.[4] According to McGregor it was the many subtle behavioral manifestations of managerial attitudes that created the psychological climate of the relationship between superior and subordinate.[5]

Theoretical conceptions of the relationship between organizational properties and individual behavior have often emphasized perception of organizational properties as intervening variables. In his book New Patterns

---

[1]Chris Argyris, "Some Problems of Conceptualizing Organizational Climate: A Case Study of a Bank," Administrative Science Quarterly 2 (March 1958) :501-520.

[2]Benjamin Schneider, "Organizational Climates: An Essay," Personnel Psychology 28 (Winter 1975) :467.

[3]Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960).

[4]Schneider, "Organizational Climates," p. 463.

[5]McGregor, Human Enterprise, p. 134

of Management, Likert developed an interaction-influence model and assigned central importance to organizational characteristics as they were perceived by the individual.[1] Causal variables such as structure, objectives, and supervisory practices interact with personality to produce perceptions. It is only through perceptions that the relationship between causal and end-result variables are to be understood.[2] As an intervening variable, climate reflects the internal state and health of the organization.

The first review of the literature on organizational climate research was published by Forehand and Gilmer in 1964.[3] One-hundred and four relevant studies were cited from psychology, sociology, administration, and education. From the research reviewed, Forehand and Gilmer hypothesized that organizational climate affected behavior by defining the stimuli, which confronted the individual, placed constraints upon the freedom of choice, and/or rewarded and punished behavior.[4]

Tagiuri and Litwin explored the emerging concept of organizational

---

[1]Rensis Likert, New Patterns of Management (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961), p. 196.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Garlie A. Forehand and B. von Haller Gilmer, "Environmental Variation in Studies of Organizational Behavior," Psychological Bulletin 62 (December 1964) :361-382.

[4]Ibid., p. 369.

climate from various viewpoints.[1] Tagiuri asserted that climate concepts were needed to explain behavior outside the laboratory in settings where the environment could not be experimentally controlled or where the situation could not be held constant.[2] An environment is interpreted by members of the organization to have a certain quality which affects their attitudes and motivation.

Significant theoretical development of the concept organizational climate evolved out of the work of Litwin and Stringer. In the application of a theory of motivation to climate research, they attempted to discover if different environments demanded or aroused different types of motivation.[3] Litwin and Stringer were able to demonstrate that an experimentally created climate was able to temporarily arouse a particular motive appropriate for its demands and, correspondingly, affect performance and job satisfaction.[4]

Campbell and associates expressed a concern for the relatively few climate dimensions emerging from contemporary research in 1970.[5] In their

---

[1]Renato Tagiuri and George H. Litwin eds. Organizational Climate: Exploration of a Concept (Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968).

[2]Tagiuri, "The Concept of Organizational Climate," p. 11.

[3]George H. Litwin and Robert A. Stringer, Jr. Motivation and Organizational Climate (Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business, Harvard University, 1968), p. 228.

[4]Ibid., p. 144.

[5]John P. Campbell et al., Managerial Behavior Performance and Effectiveness (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970).

review of four organizational studies, Campbell found dimensions common to all four investigations: individual autonomy, structure imposed upon the position, reward orientation, and consideration, warmth and support. Since a great deal of environmental variations were not being uncovered, Campbell proposed that future research attempt to tap as many different dimension of climate as possible.[1]

During the decade of the 1970's Schneider challenged many of the major climate research questions and theoretical deficiencies. Schneider theorized that organizational climate reflected the interaction of personal and organizational characteristics. "Global perceptions of the organization emerge as a result of numerous activities, interactions, reactions, and other daily experiences the person has with the population."[2] By identifying organizational climate as an individual attribute, Schneider provided a bridge between the situation and human behavior.

There has been almost no research reported on the relationship between organizational climate and alienation. Even though the concept of alienation may connote a common meaning to many people, our understanding of the determinants and manifestations of alienation remain limited. Numerous conceptualizations of alienation have been proposed from historical, philosophical,

---

[1] Ibid., p. 394.

[2] Benjamin Schneider and Douglas T. Hall, "Toward Specifying the Concept of Work Climate: A Study of Roman Catholic Diocesan Priests," Journal of Applied Psychology 56 (December 1972) :447.

sociological, and psychological perspectives. Empirical research on alienation has been limited to its static nature which developed from an emphasis on alienation as a personality disposition rather than environmentally related conditions.[1]

A brief historical review of alienation as reflected in the discipline of sociology will follow. The discussion will be limited to the introduction and clarification of the major conceptual dimensions associated with the term. It is hoped that the reader will gain an appreciation for the concept of alienation as a viable research variable.

The concept of alienation was first formulate by Marx in 1844.[2] Alienation was viewed within a specific context - the economy. According to Marx four types of alienation emerged directly from the work situation: (1) alienation from the process of work; (2) alienation from the products of work; (3) alienation of the worker from himself; and (4) alienation of the worker from others.[3] According to Marx man's subjective reaction to an objective societal condition, the Industrial Revolution, was a sense of powerlessness.

---

[1]Daniel Stokols, "Toward a Psychological Theory of Alienation," Psychological Review 85 (January 1975) :42.

[2]Karl Marx, "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts," in Early Writings trans. and ed. T. B. Bottomore (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964).

[3]Ephraim H. Mizruchi, "From Alienation and Anomie," in Alienation: A Casebook, eds. David J. Burrows and Frederick R. Lapides (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1969), p. 99.

Durkheim recognized a condition of the social system in which the rules of the group no longer provided limits to man's impulses.[1] The impact of the Industrial Revolution created strains on man's aspirations and relationships with others. Noting that suicide rates increased both in times of poverty and prosperity, Durkheim introduced the concept of anomie to modern sociology in 1897.[2] Under conditions of relative stability, social mobility is somewhat limited and man strives for limited but genuine goals. However, under unstable conditions, the limits are removed:

> The limits are unknown between the possible and the impossible, what is just and what is unjust, legitimate claims and hopes and those which are immoderate. Consequently there is no restraint upon aspirations. . . . With increased prosperity desire increases.[3]

Following Durkheim's assertion that deregulation of goals was not the only condition of anomie, Merton focused on the deregulation of means.[4] By analyzing the causes of deviant behavior, Merton conceptualized anomie to be a result of the disjunction between socially mandated goals and structurally available means for attaining these goals. Under such conditions anomie, or normlessness, develops to the extent that "the technically most effective procedure, whether culturally legitimate or not, becomes typically preferred to

---

[1] Ibid., p. 100.

[2] Emile Durkheim, Suicide (New York: Free Press, 1951).

[3] Ibid., pp. 252-253.

[4] Mizruchi, "From Alienation and Anomie," p. 100.

institutionally prescribed conduct."[1] Therefore, alientation, defined in terms of the Durkheim-Merton conceptualization, develops when socially unapproved behaviors are perceived as being required to achieve given goals.

A third usage of the term alienation has been applied to the individual who is unclear as to what should be believed in a certain situation. Mannheim argues that as society increasingly organizes its members with reference to the most efficient realization of ends there is a concomitant decline in the peoples' capacity to act in a given situation based on their own insights into the interrelations of events.[2] In Mannheim's depiction of meaninglessness, the individual has low confidence that he can predict the consequences of acting on a given belief.

Nettler measured alienation as a form of isolation or detachment from popular cultural standards.[3] The isolated individual finds little benefit from the goals or beliefs which are highly valued by a society. Nettler's concept of isolalation received recognition and revision through the research of Dean and

---

[1]Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glenco, Illinois: Free Press, 1957), p. 128.

[2]Karl Mannheim, Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1950), p. 302.

[3]Gwynn Nettler, "A Measure of Alienation," American Sociological Review 22 (December 1957) :pp. 670-677.

Middleton.[1]

Another varient of the alienation concept emerged from Fromm's analysis of contemporary social character.[2] Aleination was seen as "a mode of experience in which the person experiences himself as an alien. He has become, one might say, estranged from himself."[3] Therefore, under certain conditions, man experiences self-estrangement.

Perhaps the most significant paper on alienation published during the past quarter-century was written by Seeman.[4] He reviewed the various historical alternative meanings of alienation and concluded that the concept must be approached on a multidimensional basis. Even though Seeman did not propose a set of relationships, he presented an organized view of the uses of the concept and provided an approach tying historical interest to the modern empirical effort. Seeman's five alternative dimensions of alienation were: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement.[5]

---

[1]See Dwight G. Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," American Sociological Review 26 (October 1961) :pp.753-757; Russell Middleton, "Alienation, Race, and Education," American Sociological Review 28 (December 1963) :pp. 973-977.

[2]Erich Fromm, The Sane Society (New York: Harper, 1946).

[3]Ibid., p. 120.

[4]Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review 24 (October 1959) :783-791.

[5]Ibid., p. 790.

There was a virtual absence of research on university student satisfaction prior to the campus disturbances of the 1960's. The only exception was Berdie's 1944 study of relationships between engineering students' curricular satisfaction and such variables as interests, academic performances, occupational level, and masculinity-feminity.[1]

Possible correlates of university student satisfaction have recently received wide attention. A selected number of studies will be cited to illustrate the variety of environmental variables investigated by researchers concerned with student satisfaction. These research examples will provide evidence that the satisfaction dimension of this study is a useful and meaningful student out-put variable.

Wright investigated the integration of graduate students into the graduate school environment and the success of earning graduate degrees.[2] He sought information about such things as students talking to faculty members about personal matters and/or classroom assignments. He found that social adjustment and integration into the department was consistently, and often significantly, related to academic success at the doctoral level.[3]

Field, Holley, and Armenakis administered the Graduate Education

---

[1] Ralph F. Berdie, "Prediction of College Achievement and Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology 28 (June 1944) :239-245.

[2] Charles R. Wright, "Success or Failure in Earning Graduate Degrees," Sociology of Education, 38 (Fall 1964) :73-79.

[3] Ibid., p. 92.

Questionnaire to 62 graduate students in business.[1] They concluded that there was no significant difference between intrinsic and extrinsic factors' ability to predict students' overall satisfaction in graduate school and that a clear dichotomy of intrinsic and extrinsic factors did not exist for that particular sample.[2] Selected factors contributing to graduate student satisfaction were: quality of instruction, opportunity for independent thought, professor-student discussions in courses, and an adequate physical plant of the university.[3]

Gregg investigated graduate student satisfaction resulting from collegial relationships with faculty and the competitive student role relationships.[4] Academic and nonacademic satisfaction were found to vary directly with collegiality of faculty-student relationships. Gregg concluded that collegiality of faculty-student relationships was by far the best predictor of both academic and nonacademic graduate student satisfaction.[5]

Wanous investigated the organizational expectations and perceptions of

---

[1]Hubert S. Feild, William H. Holley, Achilles A. Armenakis, "Graduate Students' Satisfaction with Graduate Education: Intrinsic Versus Extrinsic Factors," The Journal of Experimental Education 43 (Winter 1974) :8-15.

[2]Ibid., p. 13.

[3]Ibid. p. 14.

[4]Wayne E. Gregg, "Several Factors Affecting Graduate Student Satisfaction," Journal of Higher Education 43 (June 1972) :483-498.

[5]Ibid. p. 498.

graduate business students entering three different universities.[1] When a newcomer to an organization experiences an environment quite different from the expected, dissatisfaction may occur.[2] Using satisfaction expectancy theory to explain the behavior of new members of an organization, Wanous correctly hypothesized that the expectations of outsiders would decline as a consequence of entry. Several months of organizational experience were found to be necessary for expectations to be lowered.[3]

Schmidt and Sedlacek gathered data concerning undergraduate student satisfaction at the University of Maryland.[4] Students feeling most dissatisfied were acquainted with no professors while the most satisfied students were acquainted with six or more professors.[5] The results also showed new students anticipated more satisfaction with the university than previously enrolled students. New students expected instructors, faculty, and administrators to show interest in the individual student, that courses would be stimulating and interesting, and that channels for expressing complaints would be readily avail-

---

[1]John P. Wanous, "Organizational Entry: From Naive Expectations to Realistic Beliefs," Journal of Applied Psychology 61 (February 1976) :22-29.

[2]Ibid., p. 22

[3]Ibid., p. 26.

[4]DuMont K. Schmidt and William E. Sedlacek, "Variables Related to University Student Satisfaction," Journal of College Student Personnel 13 (May 1972) :233-238.

[5]Ibid., p. 235.

able. These expectations were apparently not fulfilled as suggested by the results.[1]

Starr and associates found that the less satisfied university students were more likely to terminate attendance at that institution.[2] Students dropping-out for academic reasons were more dissatisfied than non-dropouts on the following variables: compensation, recognition, quality of education, and total satisfaction. The prediction that satisfaction was inversely related to remaining in the university was supported by their findings.[3]

Bowen and Kilmann studied the relationship between learning climate and student satisfaction in graduate and professional schools.[4] For the entire sample population, the researchers found that satisfaction scores were virtually independent of grades and age.[5] For first-year law students, overall satisfaction was significantly correlated with each of the five learning climate dimensions: grading process, task relationships with faculty, social relationships with

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 236-237.

[2] Ann Starr, Ellen L. Betz, and John Menne, "Difference in College Student Satisfaction: Academic Dropouts, Nonacademic Dropouts, and Nondropouts," Journal of Counseling Psychology 19 (July 1972) :321.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Donald D. Bowen and Ralph H. Kilmann, "Developing a Comparative Measure of the Learning Climate in Professional Schools," Journal of Applied Psychology 60 (February 1975) :71-79.

[5] Ibid., p. 75.

faculty, course material presentation, and physical environment. Overall satisfaction was significantly correlated only with task relationships with faculty and course material presentation among advanced law students.[1]

Statement of the Problem

According to recent legal education literature, contemporary law students have voiced complaints about certain law school practices and pedagogical techniques. The first-year law student enters an educational climate that is different from those previously experienced. Many law students have expressed fault with the following: the case study approach, the Socratic method, large impersonal classes, vigorous competition among students, the lack of feedback via periodic grade evaluations, the announcement of class rankings, and the limited opportunity for contact with faculty members.[2] The first-year students' personal adjustment and scholastic achievement may be affected by the learning climate of a law school. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate the learning climate of a law school and to measure the relationship between that climate and student satisfaction and alienation.

The principal problem for research is: What is the relationship between the perceived learning climate of a law school and the satisfaction and aliena-

---

[1] Ibid., p. 77.

[2] See James B. Taylor, "Law School Stress and the Deformation Professionelle," Journal of Legal Education 27 (1975) :251; Joseph H. Cooper, "The Law School Way," Journal of Legal Education 27 (1975) :284; Michael J. Patton, "The Student, the Situation, and Performance During the First Year of Law School," Journal of Legal Education 21 (1968) :48.

tion of law students?

The primary research questions to be investigated may be stated as follows:

> Is there a relationship between perception of the learning climate and the satisfaction of first, second, and third year law students?
>
> Is there a relationship between perception of the learning climate and the alienation of first, second, and third-year law students?

Law schools usually require three years of study for completion. Each new law school class is admitted at the beginning of the academic year. Successful persistant students in each class advance together to the next year of study. Is it possible that the students in each law class develop different objectives, perceive experiences diversely, and react differently to the school at a selected point in time? Theorists claim that the construct organizational climate distinguishes among organizations and should have organization-specific variance.[1] Therefore, climate should be relatively homogeneous within an organization. Recent research results have challenged this basic tenet. Schneider found that different levels of personnel in an insurance company had different views of the organizational climate.[2] Payne and Mansfield discovered that persons higher in the organizational hierarchy tended to perceive their

---

[1] John A. Drexler, Jr., "Organizational Climate: Its Homogeneity Within Organizations," Journal of Applied Psychology 62 (February 1977) :38.

[2] Benjamin Schneider, "Organizational Climate: Individual Preferences and Organizational Realities," Journal of Applied Psychology 56 (June 1972): 212.

organization as less authoritarian, more friendly, and more innovative than lower ranking employees.[1] Johnston studied the differences in perceived quality of the relationship between the individual and the organization as a function of longevity of employment.[2] Data indicated that each generational group perceived a different climate within the organization.[3] In his investigation of 21 diverse industrial business organizations, Drexler found support for the proposition that organizational climate is an attribute of the entire organization.[4] However, subunit effects were also found, but they were much weaker than the organizational effects.[5]

This study allows an opportunity to test the theoretical proposition that climate is an organizational attribute. Also, it provides an occasion to investigate possible student effects as a function of longevity. Therefore, the following secondary research questions are posed for investiagation:

> Is there a difference between first, second, and third year law students on each of the measures of learning climate?

---

[1]Ray L. Payne and Roger Mansfield, "Relationships of Perceptions of Organizational Climate to Organizational Structure, Context, and Hierarchical Position," Administrative Science Quarterly 18 (December 1973) :525.

[2]H. Russell Johnston, "A New Conceptualization of Source of Organizational Climate," Administrative Science Quarterly 21 (March 1976) :95-103.

[3]Ibid., p. 101.

[4]Drexler, "Organizational Climate," p. 42.

[5]Ibid., p. 38.

Is there a difference between first, second, and third year law students on a measure of satisfaction?

Is there a difference between first, second, and third year students on measures of alienation?

The assessment of institutional climate is important because of its relevance to student functioning. One central dimension of the concept organizational climate, according to Forehand, is that the properties of the environment influence behavior.[1] Organizational climate shapes adaptive potentials as well as facilitates or inhibits initiative and coping behavior. The climate in which one functions relates to individual satisfaction, mood, self-esteem and personal growth.[2] Since colleges and universities provide an opportunity to examine such behavioral influences, the concept of organizational climate has important heuristic value.

Olsen posits that a new member of an organization must learn appropriate patterns of interactions and ideas through the process of socialization.[3] What is learned at entry primarily comes about through social reinforcement. A person learns internal social control, Olsen asserts, in three principal ways:

---

[1]Garlie A. Forehand, "On the Interaction of Persons and Organizations," in Organizational Climate: Exploration of a Concept, eds. Renato Tagiuri and George H. Litwin (Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968), p. 66.

[2]Paul M. Insel and Rudolf H. Moos, "Psychological Environments Expanding the Scope of Human Ecology," American Psychologist 29 (March 1974) :186.

[3]Marvin E. Olsen, The Process of Social Organization (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968), p. 121.

internalization, identification, and compliance.[1] Also, the organization exercises overt pressures to induce behavioral conformity among individuals through social manipulation and social sanctioning. Parsons and Platt claim that through the socialization process, the academic community attempts to satisfy current needs of the majority of its student members and to develop and transform the structure of those needs and wishes.[2]

Almost no research has been done which directly addresses the issue of how perceptions change during organizational entry.[3] One methodologically sound study that longitudinally monitored employee expectations was the American Telephone and Telegraph management progress study of newly employed college graduates.[4] The researchers found a tendency for newcomers to hold unrealistically positive expectations about the job and the organization. These expectations declined steadily over seven years of actual experience.[5]

Several studies found that the attractiveness of a new organization may be lower than pre-entry levels even after an elevation due to post choice

---

[1]Ibid., p. 124.

[2]Talcott Parsons and Gerald M. Platt, "Age, Social Structure, and Socialization in Higher Education," Sociology of Education 43 (Winter 1970) :21.

[3]John P. Wanous, "Organizational Entry," p. 22.

[4]Douglas W. Bray, Richard J. Campbell, and Donald L. Grant, Formative Years in Business (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974).

[5]Wanous, "Organizational Entry." p. 23.

dissonance reduction.[1] Reviewing the results of a cross-sectional study of graduate business students entering three different schools, Wanous concluded that entering a new organization did have a profound effect on the cognitive maps of individuals.[2] Some theories of satisfaction claim that when a newcomer to an organization experiences an environment quite different than expected, dissatisfaction may result.[3]

The results of Wanous' study indicated that student expectations significantly declined between the newcomer stage (one month experience) and the insider stage (nine months experience).[4] Results revealed that expectations concerning intrinsic job or organizational characteristics declined significantly with entry but not those referring to extrinsic factors.[5]

The present study provides an opportunity to investiage changes in perceptions and behavioral reactions during the first year of law school. Conclusions drawn from the data will contribute to the literature on behavioral

---

[1]Victor H. Vroom and Edward L. Deci, "The Stability of Post Decisional Dissonance; A Follow-up Study of the Job Attitudes of Business School Graduates," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 6 (1971) :36-39; and John P. Wanous, "An experimental Test of Job Attraction Theory in an Organizational Setting," (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1972).

[2]Wanous, "Organizational Entry," pp. 22-29.

[3]Ibid., p. 22.

[4]Ibid., p. 26.

[5]Ibid., p. 27.

changes during the period of adjustment from newcomer to insider. Additional secondary research questions to be investigated are:

> Is there a change in perception of the learning climate during the first year of law school?
>
> Is there a change in student satisfaction during the first year of law school?
>
> Is there a change in student alienation during the first year of law school?

Stokols proposed a theoretical framework for the study of alienation in small groups.[1] Alienation was described as a sequential-developmental process. It develops as a result of a decline in the quality of one's relationship with a particular context. This perceived deterioration evokes dissatisfaction with the current situation.[2] By assuming that the experience of alienation involves a disillusionment process, Stokols utilized Thibaut and Kelley's comparison level theory as a conceptual base in his operational model of operation.[3]

The present study provides an opportunity to investigate Stokols' assertion that there is a direct relationship between the experience of dissatisfaction and alienation.[4] If some first-year law students develop a sense of dissatisfaction, alienation may also develop for some students toward the end of the first

---

[1]Stokols, "Theory of Alienation," pp. 26-44.

[2]Ibid., p. 27.

[3]John W. Thibaut and Harold H. Kelley, The Social Psychology of Groups (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959).

[4]Stokols, "Theory of Alienation," p. 36.

year of law school. The research question to be investigated is:

> Is there a relationship between satisfaction and alienation among students completing the first year of law school?

In an effort to identify important behavioral correlates of student behavior, it seems important to investigate the relationship between alienation and scholastic achievement among first-year law students. If students develop a sense of powerlessness, meaninglessness and/or social estrangement, their ability to function as a student may be retarded to such an extent that their grades would be lower than less alienated students. Therefore, the following question is posed for investiagtion:

> Is there a relationship between alienation and scholastic achievement among first-year law students?

Significance of the Study

University professors and administrators are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of providing an educational climate that will facilitate student learning, student development, and retention. Before any decisions can be made concerning alterations in the structure, regulations, or teaching methodologies in an educational unit, much information is needed. Even though exploratory in nature, this study is an effort to provide empirical data on selected climate dimensions of a law school. Also it will reveal information about student functioning within that climate.

This study may contribute to the research literature and to the theoretical development of the constructs of organizational climate, student satisfac-

tion, and student alienation. It may also contribute to the understanding of the professional socialization process. And, in an instrumental sense, this study will provide previously unavailable feedback to law school faculty and administrators concerning law student perceptions and experiences.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH

Learning Climate Theory and Research

The concept of organizational climate emerged out of an interest in discovering how an organizational setting limits and influences human behavior. Climate describes the characteristic behavioral processes in a social system at one particular point in time. An individual's personality, needs, abilities, and values effect the perception of the organization thereby influencing the member's behavior.

The climate concept has became that needed conceptual link between the myriad of criterion variables making up a social system and the multifarious determinants of individual behavior. Organizational climate provides educational administrators with a construct which links an organization's procedures and practices with the concerns and needs of individual members. It is hoped that climate research will provide administrators with information about how different procedures and practices stimulate, or fail to stimulate, individual needs, motivation, and behavior.[1]

---

[1] Litwin and Stringer, Organizational Climate, p. 44.

Litwin reviewed the likelihood of integrating climate concepts into some major psychological theories of individual behavior and into some primary sociological and social-psychological theories of organizational behavior.[1] He concluded that theories of individual behavior had not attached much importance to the analysis of climate.[2] Given the nature of most individual behavioral theories, the integration of climate concepts could be accomplished only with great difficulty.

Climate concepts have been easily integrated into theories of organizational behavior. Organizational behavior theories can best be described as systems theories containing a large number of variables. Behavior within organizations can be explained through the complex interrelationships of these variables. Litwin observed that theorists concerned with organizational behavior seemed to be extending their concerns by including individual and group behavior in their analyses.[3]

Schneider found theoretical linkages in climate research with Gestalt psychology and the school of Functionalism associated with McDougall, Dewey, and Cattell.[4] According to Gestalt psychology the perceiver objectively ap-

---

[1]George H. Litwin, "Climate and Behavior Theory," in Organizational Climate: Exploration of a Concept, eds. Renato Tagiuri and George H. Litwin (Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968), p. 35.

[2]Ibid., p. 55.

[3]Ibid., p. 58.

[4]Schneider, "Organizational Climate," p. 448.

prehends order and creates new order through the process of thought integration thereby achieving closure. The closure principle is the process of gathering information in order to form a whole and psychologically meaningful concept. Meaningfulness is apprehended on the basis of perceived cues and inferences about missing information. Gestalt theory asserts that the creation of perceptions causes persons to behave in meaningful ways according to the perceived context.[1]

While the Gestalt proponents hypothesize that people apprehend and create order out of necessity, the Functionalists propose that order is apprehended and created so people can adapt to their changing world.[2] As individuals attempt to adapt to their environment, they perceive, explore and think about their situation. The result of these cognitive activities is the apprehension of order which functions as a basis for behavior. Dieterly and Schneider refer to those acts of seeking information and apprehending order for the purpose of adapting behavior as locationary perceptions.[3]

By studying the process by which organizational perceptions become transformed into individual behavior, Dieterly and Schneider hypothesized that behavior was a function of self-perceptions of power and the perception of the

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., pp. 451-452.

[3] Duncan L. Dieterly and Benjamin Schneider, "The Effects of Organizational Environment on Perceived Power and Climate: A Laboratory Study," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 11 (June 1974) :317.

organization. Self-perceptions of power and climate perceptions were found to be necessary prerequisites for the evaluation of planned behavior.[1] Such locationary perceptions help individuals make behavioral decisions prior to acting.

Schneider hypothesized that people adapt to achieve some kind of homeostatic balance with their psychological environment.[2] He reasoned that if people strived for homeostatis with their environment through perception then it would be difficult for them to resist going along with a climate they perceived. It would also be difficult for people to change climate perceptions and their behavior. If Schneider's hypotheses are correct, then early perceptions of environmental cues play a vital role in defining an individual's perceptions of the climate. Initial cues fill an information void and are therefore extremely influential in determining climate perceptions.[3]

Tracing the Functionalists' interest in the role individual differences play in the capacity to adapt to an environment, Schneider proposed that situational characteristics may overwhelm individual differences when the range of indivdual differences was relatively low.[4] Through self-selection and organizational screening, the range of individual differences may be limited in

---

[1]Ibid. p. 317.

[2]Schneider, "Organizational Climates," p. 453.

[3]Ibid., p. 454.

[4]Ibid.

certain organizations. As climates are created within organizations, appropriate behavior is learned by new members. The organizational climate causes people to behave similarly.

By restricting stimuli and restraining activities, the resulting behavior of organizational members becomes selective. The human relations advocates assume that freedom from constraint results in greater satisfaction.[1] Individual performance levels are expected to increase as persons are allowed more freedom in expressing individuality within a selected climate.[2] Environments which supress individual differences have their greatest effect on the most able because their range of possible behavior is greater than the range of other people.[3]

Although Schneider concentrates his conceptualization and assessment of climate in a work setting, he acknowledges that similar ideas are applicable to all types of organizations.[4] Climate refers to the molar perceptions people develop of the organization. These perceptions have psychological unity based on actual or inferred events, practices, and procedures. People have no choice in developing these psychologically meaningful molar perceptions. Such perceptions are utilized in the selection of appropriate behavioral responses.[5]

---

[1] Forehand and Gilmer, "Environmental Variation," p. 372.

[2] Dieterly and Schneider, "Organizational Environment," p. 455.

[3] Marvin D. Dunnette, Personnel Selection and Placement (Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole, 1966), p. 136.

[4] Schneider, "Organizational Climates," p. 473.

[5] Ibid., p. 47.

Schneider and Hall theorize that climate reflects the interaction of personal and organizational characteristics.[1] Schneider's conceptualization has been characterized as a perceptual measurement-individual attribute approach.[2] Theoretical approaches to climate based solely on objective organizational characteristics (e.g., structure) are excessively organizationally oriented. Research strategies based on personal characteristics of members seem too individually oriented.[3] Therefore, climate may be theoretically conceptualized as an intervening variable because it is created by the interaction of organizational and individual attributes.

How does the organizational climate affect human behavior? Organizational climate may affect behavior, according to Forehand and Gilmer, by defining the stimuli confronting the individual, placing constraints upon the freedom of behavioral choice, and rewarding or punishing behavior.[4] The stimuli conditions of the organizational environment place bonds upon the set of behaviors that might be selected. Additional restrictions are imposed by the formal and informal characteristics of the organization through routine,

---

[1]Schneider and Hall, "Specifying Climate," p. 447.

[2]Lawrence R. James and Allan P. Jones, "Organizational Climate: A Review of Theory and Research," Psychological Bulletin 81 (December 1974) :1096.

[3]Schneider and Hall, "Specifying Climate," p. 447.

[4]Forehand and Gilmer, "Environmental Variation," p. 369.

institutionalized procedures or preferred problem solving criteria.[1]

Forehand and Gilmer identify two kinds of influence that an environment has on an individual.[2] Direct influence is being exerted when a particular organizational property influences the behavior of all or almost all members of an organization. Interactive influence exists when an organizational condition has a certain affect upon the behavior of some independent identifiable persons, but a different, or no affect, on other participants.

As interactive influence is exerted by the organization, the individual's reaction and response is further affected by the personalistic qualities of the participant. There is evidence that a person's perceptions affect behavior. Perceptions are influenced by abilities, values, and personality traits of the perceiver and by the organizational role assumed.[3] Therefore, individuals are differentially sensitive to organizational stimuli.

In their early review of climate research, Forehand and Gilmer postulated that the affect of organizational climate on individual behavior could be seen in terms of stimuli definition presented to members, constraints placed upon the individual's freedom of behavioral choice, and the reward and punishment process.[4] They noted that direct influence of climate on

---

[1] Ibid., p. 371.

[2] Ibid., p. 369.

[3] Ibid., p. 370.

[4] Ibid., p. 369.

behavior has rarely been demonstrated by experimental research methodology. Two noteworthy exceptions are cited here in order to demonstrate that research evidence does exist concerning the direct influence of climate on human activity.

Litwin and Stringer developed the Organizational Climate Questionnaire to test the hypothesis that different environments demand or arouse different types of motivation.[1] Their research was based on the motivation theory developed by Atkinson and by McClelland.[2] In one of the few rigorously designed experimental studies utilizing the organizational climate construct, Litwin and Stringer studied the affect or organizational climate on individuals. While subjects played a business game over an eight day period, the researchers manipulated the leader's style in order to produce different climates: authoritarian, democratic, and achieving. They successfully demonstrated that an experimentally created climate can temporarily arouse a particular motive appropriate for its demands and, correspondingly, influence performance and job satisfaction.[3]

In a laboratory study by Dieterly and Schneider, three aspects of the organization were manipulated to measure the affect on the dependent variables

---

[1]Litwin and Stringer, Organizational Climate, p. 140.

[2]John W. Atkinson, A Theory of Achievement Motivation (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1964) and David C. McClelland, The Achieving Society (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1961).

[3]Litwin and Stringer, Organizational Climate, p. 144.

of power perceptions and perceptions of climate.[1] The independent variables were level of formal position, degree of participation in decision-making, and philosophy of the organization toward customers. Results indicated that different environments can produce different perceptions of power and climate.

In their review of organizational climate research, Hellriegel and Slocum pointed out that with perceptual measurements there may be a great variety of climates within an organization.[2] They observed a critical lack of systematic effort to determine whether perceptions of climate vary when evaluated on the basis of such objective individual measures as age, sex, years of service, hierarchical position and educational level. Selected research studies are cited below in support of Hellriegel and Slocum's assertion that multiple climates do exist within certain organizations or institutions.

Payne and Mansfield examined the relationships among contextual, structural, and climate variables at the organizational level of analysis while examining the affect of the position of indivduals in the organizational hierarchy on perceptions of climate.[3] They hypothesized that people at different levels in the organization would view the organizational climate differently. Significant differences by hierarchical level were found on fifteen of the twenty

---

[1]Dieterly and Schneider, "Organizational Environment," p. 318.

[2]Don Hellriegel and John W. Slocum, Jr., "Organizational Climate: Measures, Research and Contingencies," Academy of Management Journal 17 (June 1974) :256.

[3]Payne and Mansfield, "Perceptions of Organizational Climate," p. 515.

climate scales.[1]

Schneider and Bartlett gathered data from 125 managers and 386 agents employed with 69 life insurance agencies.[2] A total lack of congruence was discovered between managers and assistant managers on all climate dimensions. The researchers concluded that the evidence of the study strongly suggested that the adoption of a single measure of perceived environment should be done with caution since there was limited agreement between levels on the way the organization behaved.[3]

Schneider and Snyder gathered responses on an organizational climate survey from 522 subjects in 50 life insurance agencies.[4] They developed climate scores for each level of the agencies studied. There was a significant difference between hierarchical levels on five of six climate dimensions.[5]

Drexler investigated the affect of organizational hierarchy on climate.[6]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 525.

[2]Benjamin Schneider and C. J. Bartlett, "Individual Differences and Organizational Climate II: Measurement of Organizational Climate by Multi-Trait, Multi-Rater Matrix," Personnel Psychology 23 (Winter 1970) :493-512.

[3]Ibid., p. 510.

[4]Benjamin Schneider and Robert A. Snyder, "Some Relationships Between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Climate," Journal of Applied Psychology 60 (June 1975) :318-328.

[5]Ibid., p. 323.

[6]John A. Drexler, Jr., "Organizational Climate: Its Homogeneity Within Organizations," Journal of Applied Psychology 62 (February 1977) :38-42.

He observed that the conditions and procedures set by the highest level members influenced or constrained the behavior of persons in the next level and so on down through the organizational hierarchy. Drexler's hypothesis was supported that significant differences in climate did exist among departments within the same organization.[1]

Schneider gathered responses to a climate questionnaire from life insurance agency managers, assistant managers and agents in 228 agencies.[2] The results showed that employees at different hierarchical levels did not tend to agree on the climate of their agency. Not only was there a low correlation between perceptions of climate by different role occupants but also different role occupants did not agree on the extent to which the perceived climate was positive. Such findings caused Schneider to generalize that there was probably no such thing as the organizational climate.[3]

Johnston's study provides further evidence that certain organizations may produce multiple climates.[4] Johnston compared two samples of professional employees of a single-office firm. Members were placed into groups based on length of employment. Results of the study showed that each generational

---

[1]Ibid., p. 40.

[2]Schneider, "Organizational Realities," p. 211.

[3]Ibid., pp. 212-213.

[4]Johnston, "Organizational Climate," p. 95.

group perceived a different climate within the organization.[1]

The studies cited above give credence to the proposition that organizational factors such as level of hierarchy or longevity can result in more than one climate being experienced within an organization. Johnston claims that such variational factors and their influence on individual behavior may account for much of the failure of climate studies to show a strong link between perceived climates and productivity.[2]

If multiple climates are proven to exist in organizations, then the concept of organizational climate conceived as a molar/macro organizational attribute or as arising from personality variables seems questionable. Climate is preferably conceived to be a product of the interacting effects of situational variables and the personality-based reactions of the individual. Climate is an attribute of both the individual and the organization.[3]

The hierarchical, departmental, and longitudinal differences in observed organizational climate mentioned above may be applicable in forming a hypothesis concerning the existance of multiple climates within an educational institution. Since a new law school class is admitted each year and the successful class members progress together to the next year, it logically follows that length of attendance may influence climate perceptions. Therefore, the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 101.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 102.

following hypothesis is posed for investigation:

HYPOTHESIS I: There is a difference between first, second, and third year law students on each of the measures of learning climate.

Several organizational behavior studies have investigated the affects of organizational entry on new members. Dunnette, Campbell, and Hakel analyzed turnover rates of college graduates in a large company.[1] Employees leaving the organization within four years indicated that their jobs were generally worse than expected. Bray, Campbell and Grant longitudinally gathered information on the expectations of college graduates employed with American Telephone and Telegraph.[2] Newcomers were found to hold unrealistic positive expectations about their work and the organization. These positive expectations declined steadily over seven years of experience for both successful and unsuccessful employees.

Schneider investigated the relationship between customers' perceptions of climate and the tendency to continue or terminate banking services.[3] Schneider hypothesized that the longer individuals had been in contact with an organization, the more difficult it would be to alter their climate perceptions.[4]

---

[1]Marvin D. Dunnette, John P. Campbell, and M. D. Hakel, "Factors Contributing to Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction in Six Occupational Groups," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 2 (1967) :143-174.

[2]Bray, Campbell, and Grant, Formative Years in Business, p. 21.

[3]Benjamin Schneider, "The Perception of Organizational Climate: The Customer's View," Journal of Applied Psychology 57 (June 1973) :248-256.

[4]Ibid., p. 255.

As a result of continual specific perceptions, summary perceptions constituted the individual's conception of an organization and were less subject to change. Early perceptions of specific events had more effect on the development of summary perceptions than later observations. The extreme impact of early experiences contributed to the tendency of climate perceptions to remain constant over time.

Schneider investigated the extent to which future employees perceptions of work climate related to current employees' descriptions of insurance agencies.[1] Correlations across agencies showed new agent expectations to have a low significant correlation with the climate of the agency they joined as measured by current employee perceptions. Results also indicated that new agent preferences were not significantly related to the climate. Schneider concluded that new members modified their preferences so that expectations became somewhat congruent with the agency they joined.

Wanous longitudinally investigated the form, strength and direction of perceptual changes of new organizational members.[3] Wanous theorized their organizational entry could have a profound affect on the cognitive maps of individuals. Perceptions formed by persons outside the organization seemed to be both biased and deficient when compared to those of experienced participants.[4]

---

[1]Schneider, "Organizational Realities," p. 211.

[2]Ibid., p. 215.

[3]Wanous, "Organizational Entry," p. 23.

[4]Ibid., p. 23.

The results clearly showed a decline in expectations occurring between the newcomer and insider stages.[1] Newcomer expectations were not significantly lower than those of outsiders. The data indicated that several months of organization experience was necessary for expectations to be lowered.[2]

A new law student enters the first year of professional training with expectations that may or may not be valid. During the intense and rigorous introduction to legal studies, the student's initial perceptions still may be influenced by previously held expectations. During the course of the first year of study, individual perceptions of the institution are possibly altered to fit what has been experienced. The second hypothesis addresses the question of perception change:

> HYPOTHESIS II: There is a difference in the measures of learning climate during the first year of law school.

Satisfaction Theory and Research

Limited information is available concerning student dissatisfaction, alienation or disaffection with the educational environment.[3] A systematic study of student dissatisfaction would assist in the formation of programs designed to decrease dissatisfaction and perhaps provide information about the alteration of the student selection process. The variable satisfaction has been included in this

---

[1] Ibid., p. 26.

[2] Ibid., p. 27.

[3] Schmidt and Sedlacek, "University Student Satisfaction," p. 233.

study in order to contribute to the understanding of the student environment and the process by which student dissatisfaction my occur.

Lawler posited that no well-developed theories of satisfaction have appeared and little theoretically based research has been done on satisfaction.[1] Since most of the satisfaction research has been completed by psychologists interested in work organizations, the term job satisfaction has been used to refer to affective attitudes or orientations on the part of individuals toward their jobs. While early satisfaction studies were prompted by the desire to link job satisfaction with productivity, more recent investigations have shown interest in the causes and effects of dissatisfaction.[2]

Lawler identified four developing approaches to the study of satisfaction: fulfillment theory, equity theory, two-factor theory, and discrepancy theory. Researchers investigating fulfillment theory view satisfaction as depending on how much of a given outcome or groups of outcomes a person receives.[3] The fulfillment theory has limited applicability since it fails to consider individual differences and desired outcomes. Equity theory states that satisfaction or dissatisfaction is determined by the perceived equity between input and output in terms

---

[1]Edward E. Lawler III Motivation in Work Organizations (Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1973), p. 61.

[2]Ibid., p. 62.

[3]Ibid., p. 65.

of a person's rewards.[1] Thus, satisfaction is defined in terms of the ratio between what a person receives compared to what a person perceives as his individual effort.

The recent two-factor theory of satisfaction is proposed by Herzberg and associates.[2] According to the two-factor theory, certain job factors are classified according to their contribution to satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The results of voluminous research reports generated by the two-factor theory have been inconclusive.[3]

Organizational psychologists supporting the discrepancy theory approach argue that satisfaction is determined by the differences between the actual outcomes a person receives and some other expected or desired outcome level. Satisfaction, or dissatisfaction, is therefore a result of the discrepancy between actual outcome received and the comparison level outcome. Lawler prefers the concept of satisfaction to be understood in terms of the comparison between what a person perceives he actually receives and what he feels he should receive.[4]

A genus of discrepancy theory may be found in Thibaut and Kelley's

---

[1] Ibid., p. 69

[2] Fredrick Herzberg et al., The Motivation to Work, 2d ed, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959).

[3] Lawler, Motivation in Work Organizations, p. 70.

[4] Ibid., p. 72.

analysis of the rewards and costs experienced in human interaction.[1] The comparison level theory of Thibaut and Kelley denotes a criterion of outcome acceptability with which an individual evaluates the attractiveness of a situation in terms of what is deserved. As expectations are disconfirmed, dissatisfaction develops regarding the quality of the relationship.

Thibaut and Kelley describe the consequences of interaction by making a distinction between the rewards a person receives and the costs he incurs. Rewards refer to the satisfaction experienced. "The provision of a means whereby a drive is reduced or a need fulfilled constitute a reward.[2] Costs are defined as "any factors that operate to inhibit or deter the performance of a sequence of behavior."[3] The cost is high when great physical or mental effort is required, when embarrassment or anxiety accompanies the action or when there are conflicting forces of any kind.[4]

In evaluating the adequacy of experienced or anticipated outcomes of an interaction, the individual applies a personal standard of evaluation. In Thibaut and Kelley's theory there are at least two important standards. In the comparison level standard, the individual evaluates the rewards and costs and thereby determines the satisfaction derived from the relationship. If a person's evaluation

---

[1]Thibaut and Kelley, The Social Psychology of Groups, p. 14.

[2]Ibid., p. 12.

[3]Ibid., p. 14.

[4]Ibid., p. 13.

determines that the relationship falls above the personal comparison level standard, the relationship would be considered satisfying. The outcomes of relationships falling below the comparison level would be labeled dissatisfying. A person's evaluation scale of outcomes is influenced by all outcomes experienced directly or symbolically.[1]

The second personal standard of evaluation, according to Thibaut and Kelley, is called the comparison level for alternatives which is used in deciding whether to remain in or leave the relationship. The comparison level for alternatives is individually established in light of available alternative opportunities. As soon as outcomes drop below an acceptable alternative level, the member will leave the relationship. In this case the member's costs exceed the rewards of the association and a more satisfactory alternative is sought.[2]

According to Thibaut and Kelley's comparison level theory, a mid-point for the comparison scale of outcomes exists which is the neutral point on the hypothetical satisfaction-dissatisfaction continuum. If the outcomes of a given relationship surpass the comparison level, the relationship is considered to be satisfactory. If the outcomes endured are below the mid-point on the comparison scale, the person is said to be dissatisfied with the relationship. It is expected that if a person receives increasingly poor outcomes a negative emotive evaluation takes place and the mood changes from positive to negative thus producing a

---

[1] Ibid., p. 21.

[2] Ibid., p. 22

sense of dissatisfaction.[1]

An individual's comparison level is subject to situational variation.[2] The comparison level actually represents the adaptation level to the instigated outcomes. This adaptation level is affected by available information about the goodness of outcomes in other relationships and by outcomes in the present relationship. As a person's outcomes fluctuate with changes in interaction and in memberships, he adjusts his behavior in an effort to maintain better outcomes and avoid poorer ones. The individual is under continual influence by external controls placed on him by other persons as well as the organizations with which he is intimately associated.

Within an organizational setting, satisfaction is conceived as an evaluative reaction to the organization based upon an interaction between the organizational climate and personal needs and values.[3] Satisfaction implies an affective state. At any specific point in time, an individual's satisfaction rating may range from strongly positive to strongly negative. The individual's satisfaction state depends on both internal and external variables.[4] By referring to external organizational conditions according to some internal system of needs and values, the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 81.

[2] Ibid., p. 82.

[3] James and Jones, "Organizational Climate," p. 1103.

[4] Frank J. Landy, "An Opponent Process Theory of Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology 63 (October 1978), p. 533.

resulting satisfaction or dissatisfaction is a summary of the person rather than a characterization of the organization.[1]

The information presented above lends credance to the assertion that organizations influence the satisfaction levels of its members. Research evidence indicates that various satisfaction levels may exist within an organization. Porter and Lawler reported significant differences in job satisfaction among managers depending on their level within the organization.[2] Hierarchical level was found to relate to how an individual evaluated the organization. Lawler has stated that satisfaction has a tendency to be higher among long-term organizational members.[3] The satisfaction differences within an organization seem to be produced by the effects of selective turnover and the development of realistic expectations about what the organization has to offer.

In Schneider and Bartlett's study of life insurance employees, a significant manager-agent agreement on general satisfaction was found.[4] Otherwise, there were no other significant relationships discovered between the two levels of employees on measures of organizational climate. In his analysis of another data

---

[1]Schneider, "Organizational Climates," p. 462.

[2]Lyman W. Porter and Edward E. Lawler III, "Properties of Organizational Structure in Relation to Job Attitudes and Job Behavior," Psychological Bulletin 64 (July 1965) :33.

[3]Lawler, Motivation in Work Organizations, p. 82.

[4]Schneider and Bartlett, "Individual Differences and Organizational Climate II," p. 509.

source, Schneider found that different role occupants did not concur on the degree to which perceived climate was positive.[1] Therefore, Schneider's information points to a possible difference in satisfaction among different hierarchical role occupants.

In order to gain a broader understanding of college students' attitudes, researchers have begun to provide data so that concerned faculty and administrators could evaluate student satisfaction. The measurement of student satisfaction could be a useful way of providing clues as to how students evaluate their environment and what kinds of changes might be implemented to improve student learning experiences.

Starr, Betz, and Menne investigated the proposition that the probability of an individual voluntarily leaving the work environment was inversely related to the person's satisfaction. Testing this proposition within a college setting, the researchers discovered that overall satisfaction with the college environment was inversely related to student retention.[2] Student satisfaction is an important factor in student tenure.

Schmidt and Sedlacek investigated college student satisfaction as related to length of attendance. The results of this study showed a low degree of anticipated dissatisfaction on the part of new students compared to a relatively high

---

[1]Schneider, "Organizational Realities," p. 213.

[2]Starr, Betz, and Menne, "College Student Satisfaction," p. 321.

level of dissatisfaction on the part of previously enrolled students.[1] Length of attendance was inversely related to dissatisfaction.

The satisfaction theory developed above and the reported research prompt the following hypothesis:

> HYPOTHESIS III: There is a difference between first, second, and third year law students at the beginning of the school year on a measurement of overall satisfaction with the learning process.

Litwin and Stringer attempted to explain how organizational climate influenced the behavior of organizational participants. They argued that theoretically a climate created certain kinds of beliefs or expectancies about what kinds of consequences follow from various actions. Also, they asserted that different climates stimulated or aroused different kinds of motivation and strongly influenced both feelings of satisfaction and performance levels.[2]

In one of the few rigorously designed experimental studies utilizing the organizational climate construct, Litwin and Stringer investigated the affect of organizational climate on the motivation, performance, and job satisfaction of participants. While subjects played a business game over an eight day period, the researchers manipulated the leader's style in order to produce different climates. The researchers found job satisfaction to be highest in the affiliation induced climate, relatively high in the achievement induced climate, and low in the power induced climate.[3]

---

[1] Schmidt and Sedlacek, "University Student Satisfaction," p. 383.

[2] Litwin and Stringer, Motivation and Organizational Climate, p. 188.

[3] Ibid., p. 144.

Such findings suggest that satisfaction is an outcome variable and exists under different types of climate to varying degrees.

Conceptualizing climate as an independent variable, Pritchard and Karasich investigated the influence of organizational climate on behavior.[1] After gathering data from 76 managers from two industrial organizations, the researchers found significant correlations between ten climate dimensions and the individuals' reported satisfaction scores.[2]

Friedlander and Margulies investigated the multiple impact of organizational climate components and individual job values upon workers' satisfaction.[3] They drew three pertinent conclusions: (1) organizational climate was a significant determinant of individual satisfaction; (2) the degree of impact of climate upon satisfaction varied with the type of climate and the type of satisfaction; and (3) the work values held by the individual moderated these diverse impacts in a complex manner.[4]

Payne and Pugh reported the results of previously unpublished data which related climate and satisfaction. The subjects were 348 managers, supervisors, and staff personnel from a large manufacturing company. Sixteen of the twenty-four

---

[1]Robert D. Pritchard and Bernard W. Karasich, "The Effect of Organizational Climate on Managerial Job Performance and Job Satisfaction," Organizational Behavior and Human Performanee 9 (February 1973) :126-146.

[2]Ibid., p. 138.

[3]Frank Friedlander and Newton Margulies, "Multiple Impacts of Organizational Climate and Individual Value Systems upon Job Satisfaction," Personnel Psychology 22 (Summer 1969) :p. 171.

[4]Ibid., p. 181.

possible correlations between climate and satisfaction ranged between .20 and .44.[1]

In their study of Catholic priests, Hall and Schneider studied the relationship between self-perceived work climate and satisfaction.[2] They reported moderately strong relationships between each of the work climate scales and each of the satisfaction dimensions except pay.[3]

Schneider and Snyder gathered data from 522 subjects in 50 life insurance agencies during a study of the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational climate.[4] While organizational climate perceptions were considered to be descriptive of conditions within the work environment, job satisfaction was understood to be an affective response consisting of evaluative perceptions filtered through the individual's system of norms, values, and expectations.[5] The results showed that climate and satisfaction were significantly correlated only for people in selected positions. People had a tendency to agree more on climate than they did on satisfaction. Schneider and Snyder concluded that the lack of consistent relationship between organizational perceptions and satisfaction for certain hierarchically distinct groups indicated that satisfaction may be tied also to other

---

[1]Payne and Pugh, "Organizational Structure and Climate," pp. 1147-1148.

[2]Douglas T. Hall and Benjamin Schneider, Organizational Climates and Careers: The Work Lives of Priests (New York: Simon Press, 1973).

[3]Payne and Pugh, "Organizational Structure and Climate," p. 1161.

[4]Schneider and Snyder, "Job Satisfaction and Organizational Climate," pp. 318-328.

[5]Ibid., p. 319.

unmeasured elements of the organization.[1]

Prompted by an anticipated decline in graduate student enrollment, recent interest in student satisfaction has encouraged studies of sub-groups within higher education institutions. Several researchers have expressed interest in the more mature graduate or professional student. Selected studies investigating the relationship between student satisfaction with the academic setting and the learning climate of graduate education are cited below.

In the early study, Wright examined certain facets of integrating graduate students into the graduate school environment.[2] He investigated such dimensions as whether students talk to faculty members about personal matters, whether students talk to faculty members frequently outside of the classroom, and whether they consider some fellow graduate students as close friends. In general he found that social adjustments and integration into the department was consistently, and often significantly related to academic success on the doctoral level.[3]

Field, Holly and Armenakis investigated the intrinsic and extrinsic factors of graduate student satisfaction.[4] Variables intrinsic to graduate students' education did not predict overall satisfaction with graduate school better than extrinsic

---

[1]Ibid., p. 327.

[2]Wright, "Earning Graduate Degrees," pp. 73-97.

[3]Ibid., p. 92.

[4]Field, Holly, and Armenakis, "Graduate Students' Satisfaction," pp. 8-15.

variables.[1] Quality of instruction, flexibility in selecting courses, intellectual stimulation, opportunity for independent thought, and professor-student discussions in courses were factors contributing to graduate student satisfaction. An adequate physical plant of the university also contributed to graduate student satisfaction. The results of this study tended to show that graduate student satisfaction was based on a multitude of factors.

Investigating the graduate student population of a large midwestern university, Gregg successfully predicted a positive correlation between the existence of collegial faculty-student relationships and academic and non-academic satisfaction.[2] The more collegial the faculty-student relationship the higher the level of satisfaction, both academic and non-academic, that was found. The predicted inverse relationship between competition and satisfaction held for all groups of students at the .05 level.[3]

Bowen and Kilmann developed the Learning Climate Questionnaire to assess the learning climate of professional schools.[4] Overall student satisfaction scores were correlated with each of the climate factors within six student groups. Two of the student groups were samples from a law school. The satisfaction scores of lower division law students were positively related to all climate dimensions. The

---

[1] Ibid., p. 14.

[2] Gregg, "Graduate Student Satisfaction," pp. 483-498.

[3] Ibid., p. 493.

[4] Bowen and Kilmann, "Learning Climate in Professional Schools," pp. 71-79.

satisfaction of upper division law students was significantly related only to two dimensions -- Task Relationships with Faculty and Course Material Presentation.[1] Within this particular sample, learning climate was significantly related to professional student satisfaction.

The selected research reports presented along with the theoretical development of the concepts satisfaction and climate prompt the investigation of the following hypothesis:

> HYPOTHESIS IV: There is no relationship between learning climate and satisfaction for first, second, and third year law students at the end of the academic year.

Wanous examined the form, strength and direction of changes in perceptions of new members entering an organization.[2] When a newcomer to an organization experiences an environment quite different from that which is expected, dissatisfaction may occur. Wanous observed that entering a new organization may have a profound effect on the cognitive maps of individuals. "Outsider perceptions seem to be both biased and deficient when compared to those of experienced organizational members."[3] Student information was gathered prior to entry, immediately after entrance, and at the end of the academic year. A change from naive expectations to lower realistic beliefs about intrinsic factors was observed

---

[1] Ibid., p. 77.

[2] Wanous, "Organizational Entry," pp. 22-29.

[3] Ibid., p. 23.

but no change was noticed for extrinsic factors.[1] Wanous remarked that his MBA data indicated that several months of organizational experience were required for expectations to be lowered.[2]

According to Thibaut and Kelley's comparison level theory, if a high subjective probability of attaining a favorable outcome exists the comparison level should rise and satisfaction should result. Failure to achieve such an outcome lowers the person's comparison level and dissatisfaction results.[3] As an individual has time for processing and integrating information about the organization, the person develops a general and relatively constant expectation of the satisfaction he can achieve. That level of expected satisfaction may or may not be above the personal comparison level established. Thibaut and Kelley propose that the comparison level depends in general upon the outcomes which are salient at any given time. According to the outcomes experienced the comparison level tends to move to the level of outcomes currently being attained. The person adapts to the currently experienced levels. After a shift upward to a new level, the once longed for outcomes gradually lose their attractiveness. After a downward shift to a new lower level, the disappointment gradually wears off and the once dreaded outcomes become accepted.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 27.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Thibaut and Kelley, The Social Psychology of Groups, p. 87.

[4] Ibid., p. 98.

Winston completed a context specific research report investigating the expectations of entering graduate students.[1] Comparing the expectation of new graduate students with graduate students completing at least one year of advanced study, Winston's results indicated that entering graduate students were indeed unrealistic.[2] Entering students unrealistically expected a relatively structured departmental environment, a highly intellectual atmosphere, intimate and social relationships with peers and faculty, and cosmopolitan interests among their fellow students.[3] Winston's study did not gather additional information about how well the graduate students adjusted to their departments.

In Gregg's study of graduate student satisfaction, he hypothesized that both academic and non-academic satisfaction were negatively associated with expectation-reality discrepancy.[4] The predicted negative relationships between expectation-reality discrepancy scores and academic satisfaction did obtain for most but not all categories of graduate students. The inverse relationship between high discrepancy scores and low non-academic satisfaction was found to be true as well.[5] Generally, expectation-reality discrepancy scores were a better negative

---

[1]Roger B. Winston, Jr. "Graduate School Environments: Expectations and Perceptions," Journal of College Student Personnel 17 (January 1976) :43-49.

[2]Ibid., p. 46.

[3]Ibid., pp. 46-47.

[4]Gregg, "Graduate Student Satisfaction," pp. 483-498.

[5]Ibid., p. 493.

predictor of academic satisfaction than non-academic satisfaction.

Lokitz and Sprandel reported on preliminary data gathered during a longitudinal study designed to follow students through their undergraduate college career.[1] Results indicated that students were predominately concerned with academic competence during their initial year. As students began to assimilate information about academic requirements and the competition encountered, an increase in satisfaction was observed during the six month study. A continual decline in social satisfaction scores took place during the period of investigation.

Schmidt and Sedlacek found that new students held optimistic expectations regarding anticipated satisfaction during the first year of college.[2] New students expected to find that instructors, faculty, and administrators cared about individual students, that courses would be stimulating, and that channels for expressing complaints would be readily available. Results indicated that these expectations were not fulfilled.[3] Such results do not necessarily point to a great sense of disillusionment among new organizational entrants since optimism is to be an expected part of adapting to a new setting. However, the disconfirmation of highly important expectations may create a great sense of dissatisfaction which in

---

[1] Ibid., p. 493.

[2] Barbara D. Lokitz and Hazel Z. Sprandel, "The First Year: A Look at the Freshman Experience," Journal of College Student Personnel, 17 (July 1976) :274-279.

[2] Schmidt and Sedlacek, "University Student Satisfaction," pp. 233-238.

[3] Ibid., p. 237.

turn could create adjustment difficulties.

Student satisfaction is an important factor in student retention. Starr, Betz and Menne examined the relationship between student satisfaction and leaving college.[1] They reasoned that if an individual were to remain in the college environment, the student must fulfill the requirements of that environment and the college environment must be meeting the student's needs or provide personal satisfaction. As hypothesized, overall satisfaction with the college environment was inversely related to whether or not the student remained in the environment.[2]

The study of student satisfaction will provide insight into the effect of institutional climate on student satisfaction. If student tenure is as closely related to student satisfaction as suggested above, the study of professional school student satisfaction becomes an important source of information for administrators when making plans to reduce attrition during the initial year of law school. Therefore, the following hypothesis is investigated:

> HYPOTHESIS V: There is an increase in dissatisfaction during the first year of law school.

Alienation Theory and Research

The concept of alienation identifies an affective reaction accompanying behavior in which an individual is being forced to act self-destructively. Alienation lies in every direction of human experience where basic emotional desire is

---

[1] Starr, Betz and Menne, "College Student Satisfaction," pp. 318-322.

[2] Ibid., p. 321.

frustrated or where a person may be compelled by social situations to do violence to his own nature.[1] When the social system tends to abort the realization of the higher socio-psychological needs, alienation emerges. Thus, alienation comprises a social component manifested in the non-responsiveness of a social system to the needs of its members.[2]

Etzioni attempted to restore the concept of basic human needs as an important construct to modern sociological theory.[3] He claimed that it was useful to assume that a universal set of basic human needs existed which were not determined by social structure, cultural patterns, or socialization processes.[4] He proposed that a specific need requires no specific response since a need can be satisfied in a variety of ways. Etzioni asserted that classifications of human needs were a-empirical and could not be tested because they were never encountered in pure form.[5]

There is an aura of impersonal authority relationships attached to the modern large-scale organization. Organizational rules and procedures do not

---

[1]Lewis Feuer, "From What is Alienation: the Career of a Concept," in Alienation: A Case Book, eds. David J. Burrows and Frederick R. Lapides (New York: Crowell, 1969), p. 95.

[2]James J. Hearn, "Alienation: Another Administrative Agony," Contemporary Education 45 (Winter 1974), p. 113.

[3]Amitai Etzioni, "Basic Human Needs, Alienation and Inauthenticity," American Sociological Review 33 (December 1968) :870-885.

[4]Ibid., p. 871.

[5]Ibid., p. 871.

easily lend themselves to the fulfillment of such human needs as security, affective relations and recognition. Even though basic human needs demand gratification, the formal organization cannot immediately adjust to the immediacy of each participant's needs. Hearn observed a built-in temporal lag between the appearance of needs in any given participant and the capability of the system to satisfy those needs.[1] Alienation lies within the temporal lag structured into the system and the participant's perception of it.

The concept of alienation has been typically identified as occurring within the framework of the total society or its major social institutions. Clark was the first researcher to propose that alienation be investigated within a specific context.[2] In following Clark's approach, alienation may be viewed as the development of a personal orientation involving negative feelings and cynical beliefs toward a specific social context.[3] A negative response from the individual results when there is an incompatibility between the social context and the person's characteristics such as values or needs.[4]

Alienation has come to be identified as a multi-dimensional concept.

---

[1]Hearn, "Alienation: Another Agony," p. 133.

[2]John P. Clark, "Measuring Alienation in a Social System," American Sociological Review 24 (December 1959) :849-852.

[3]Eldon L. Wegner, "The Concept of Alienation: A Critique and Some Suggestions for a Context Specific Approach," Pacific Sociological Review 18 (April 1975) :171-193.

[4]Ibid., p. 172.

Each or all of the various dimensions may be identified in a specific alienating context depending on the different patterns of person-situation incompatibility. Seeman's historical explication of the concept of alienation led him to conclude that the literature contained five distinct usages of the term: powerlessness, meaninginglessness, normlessness, social isolation, and self estrangement.[1] These five states may stand as dependent variables or individual subjective responses to the structurally prior organizational climate.

Dean sought to employ three categories of alienation - powerlessness, normlessness and isolation - in a paradigm for measuring alienation by social class and other demographic variables.[2] In an attempt to incorporate the best of Seeman and Dean, Middleton proposed an operationalized typology: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, social estrangement, and estrangement from work.[3] Without regard for any specific social context, these researchers have clearly shown that extreme personal discontent may have more than one basis.

Wegner offers the following definition: "Alienation is a negative orientation involving feelings of discontent and cynical beliefs toward a specific social context."[4] The opposite orientation to alienation is institutional involvement where the individual experiences a unity between a personal fulfillment and role

---

[1]Seeman, "The Meaning of Alienation," pp. 783-791.

[2]Dean, "Alienation," pp. 753-757.

[3]Middleton, "Alienation, Race, and Education," pp. 973-977.

[4]Wegner, "The Concept of Alienation," p. 177.

performance in the social context. The use of a subjective definition of alienation acknowledges the importance of existential reality for the actor apart from the outside judgment of an observer.[1]

Alienation is the disenchantment directed toward a social context. It develops when a discrepancy occurs between an individual's characteristics and the structural conditions experienced within that context.[2] Wegner asserts that whether or not an individual finds fulfillment and develops attachments within a social context depends on the person's compatibility with the activities undertaken.

Stokols has developed a theoretical framework for the study of alienation in small groups. He describes alienation as a sequential-development process. The experience of alienation is brought about through a decline in the quality of one's relationship within a particular context. This perceived deterioration evokes dissatisfaction with the present situation.[3] By assuming that the experience of alienation involves a disillusionment process, Stokols attempts to use Thibaut and Kelley's comparison level theory as the conceptual framework for developing an operational model of alienation.

The alienation process begins with the awareness of the dislike for a particular contextual referent. Within such a situation, frustration leads to results in specific motivational overtones: the desire for dissassociation, the search for

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 178.

[3] Stokels, "Theory of Alienation," p. 27.

alternatives, or the tendency to injure some person or object.[1] Such conditions lead to the general experience of dissatisfaction.

Stokols summarizes the three basic stages of the alienation experience: (1) a sense of disillusionment results from an unexpected thwarting which strains the participant's commitment to the organization; (2) a post-thwarting process of appraisal where the participant evaluates the future viability of a continued relationship with the organization; and (3) the participant determines whether his relationship with the organization is any longer tenable.[2] The participant's decision results in an irreversible cognitive change. Stokols considers the point of irreversible cognitive change to be the unique and central feature of the alienation experience.[3] The above description of alienation as irreversible is meant to distinguish its phenominological features from those of other psychological phenomena which are relatively more transitory and remain subject to modification and amelioration (i.e., dissatisfaction).

More than fifteen years ago Kerr described the modern university as being replete with alienating factors.[4] He wrote a high degree of complexity which was unmanageable for many students, of the hughness of the institution, of large

---

[1] Ibid., p. 29.

[2] Ibid., p. 37.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963).

impersonal classes, and the neglect of students by absentee faculty. These factors were observed to be conspiring to produce a sense of futility in many students.

Miles labels the role of the college student as that of trainee within industrialized higher education.[1] The industrialization of higher education involves an increasing division of labor, loss of control over the educational process, and the atomization of the social environment.[2] Such conditions, Miles claims, are contributing factors to the development of student alienation.[3]

Spady proposes that student alienation can be understood as the result of a disjunction between student values and the operational goals of the institution and the means through which they are attained.[4] When either the goals or means fail to be considered legitimate by the students, compliance with the goals and means will not be automatic and alienation may result. The alienated student has one or a combination of four available alternatives: rebellion, protest, apathy, or withdrawal.[5]

---

[1]Michael W. Miles, "Student Alienation in the U.S. Higher Education Industry," Politics and Society 4 (1974) :311.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid., p. 312.

[4]William G. Spady, "The Authority System of the School and Student Unrest: A Theoretical Exploration," in Uses of the Sociology of Education The Seventy-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education Part II, ed. Calvin W. Gordon (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), pp. 36-77.

[5]Ibid., pp. 73-74.

It is not uncommon for students to meet contradictory expectations when they enter new educational settings. Such situational incongruity may convince the student that the institutional structures are incapable of fulfilling the expectations that these very structures evoke.[1] If the student perceives that his expectations are unrealizable without major personal reorientation, alienation may develop. Alienation is related to the fact that the learning climate of the educational institution is not always capable of providing the means by which the student may achieve personal goals. Therefore, it seems important to investigate the correlates of student alienation within the context of the institution's learning climate.

Evan posits that within the hierarchical structure of any organization an inequality exists between the members' knowledge, authority, information and rewards.[2] With the existence of such hierarchical distribution of resources, Evan hypothesizes that organizational participants low on the continua of skills, information, authority and rewards will experience alienation in the sense of powerlessness and self-estrangement from their institutional role.[3]

In the often cited study of Aiken and Hage on the organizational alienation of sixteen welfare organizations, it was found that highly centralized and highly formalized structures were characterized by greater work alienation and

---

[1]Edwin Vaughn, "The Relationship Between Student Alienation and Participation in Extracurricular Activities," Journal of College Student Personnel 13 (January 1972) :33.

[2]William M. Evan, "Hierarchical Alienation, Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness," Human Relations 30 (1977) :77-78.

[3]Ibid., p. 81.

greater alienation from expressive relations.[1] These two types of alienation were related to the absence of opportunities to participate in decision-making. Alienating structures existed where rules were strictly and rigidly enforced.

Etzioni defines organizational control structure as "a distribution of means used by an organization to elicit the performance it needs and to check whether the quantities and qualities of such performances are in accord with organizational specifications."[2] Out of concern for meeting organizational goals, institutionalized allocation of rewards and penalties is implemented to enhance compliance with established norms, regulations and orders. The use of symbols such as prestige, esteem or acceptance is referred to as identitive power.[3] Identitive power is predominantly used in colleges and universities.

If organizations could educate their participants so they would perform adequately without supervision, there would be no need for a structure of control. There are significant differences in the degree of control needed in organizations because of differences in the selection and socialization processes.[4] While selection determines the quality of participants upon entry, organizational

---

[1]Michael Aiken and Jerald Hage, "Organizational Alienation: A Comparative Analysis," American Sociological Review 31 (August 1966) :506.

[2]Amitai Etzioni, "Organizational Control Structure," in Handbook of Organizations ed. James G. March (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965), p. 650.

[3]Ibid., p. 651.

[4]Ibid., p. 655.

socialization alters their existing qualities to insure successful performance of organizational roles.[1]

Etzioni emphasizes the importance of control as applied in professional schools. While some organizations have a limited pervasiveness and attempt to control only some of the activities of its members, professional schools are highly pervasive. The intense socialization taking place in law schools affects the beliefs, values, and characteristics of law students. It becomes highly desirable for organizational norms to influence the student to such an extent that his activities are altered even outside the organization.[2]

The major premise of Argyris' Personality and Organization is that a basic incongruity develops, between the growth potential of a healthy personality and the requirements of the formal organization.[3] If the principles of the formal organization existed in ideal form, members of the organization would (1) experience minimal control over their daily activities; (2) react in a passive, dependent, and subordinate manner, (3) develop a short time perspective; (4) perfect and value the use of a few surface abilities; and (5) assume the responsibility of being productive under conditions leading to psychological failure. Since formal organizations make demands that are not supportive of peoples' needs, Argyris hypothesizes that the formal organization creates feelings of failure and frustration, short time

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 636-657.

[2]Ibid., p. 670.

[3]Christ Argyris, Personality and Organization, (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1975), p. 66.

perspective and conflict in healthy individuals.[1]

The organizational participant may adapt to the frustration, conflict, failure and short time perspective in several ways by (1) decreasing the psychological importance of the organization or self; (2) giving up and leaving the situation; (3) becoming hostile and aggressive; (4) becoming apathetic and disinterested.[2] By experiencing failure, Argyris theorizes that the organizational member may (1) lose interest in work; (2) lose self-confidence; (3) lose persistence; (4) lower standards of achievement; (5) expect more failure; or (6) escape by daydreaming.[3]

Argyris alleges that certain changes need to be made in the formal organization in order to meet organizational goals and, at the same time, create a healthy psychological climate for its members. The formal organization must be changed so that participants experience more activity than passivity and become more independent rather than remain dependent on superiors for direction.[4] While pointing to the possible benefits of democratic leadership, Argyris proposes that the resulting self-actualization increases sharply for individuals as their dependence, subordination, and submissiveness decreases and their control over their own work

---

[1]Ibid., p. 77.

[2]Ibid., pp. 77-78.

[3]Ibid., p. 96.

[4]Ibid., p. 177.

increases.[1]

The professional school has as its major goal the maximization of student achievement while simultaneously serving as certifier and screening agent. The student role actually becomes involuntary in terms of accepting the consequences of selection, evaluation and certification.[2] While the student may control what is actually learned within the formal curriculum of the school, he has little influence on the required information that will be evaluated, the criteria, standards, and mechanisms of evaluation, and the uses made of the evaluation results.

The selection and certification functions of law school place the student in a highly vulnerable position. The legal education process may be perceived as legitimate and nonproblematic to most people but conflict may develop for some students. The failure of particular individuals to cope with the pervasive climate of law school may result in student alienation. Therefore the following null hypothesis is proposed for study:

> HYPOTHESIS VI: There is no relationship between learning climate and alienation for first, second and third year law students at the beginning of the academic year.

The psychological theory of alienation developed by Stokols emphasizes the experiential dimensions of alienation.[3] Alienation results as a person evaluates a situation in terms of what is expected and is forced to evaluate the relationship

---

[1] Ibid., p. 181.

[2] Spady, "The Authority System," pp. 41-42.

[3] Stokols, "Theory of Alienation," p. 27.

as being less than desirable. The experience of alienation persists over time and remains salient as long as the individual feels constrained to remain in the undesirable context.

Stokols hypothesizes that alienation develops most severely when a person experiences disillusionment. The sense of disillusionment initially results from an unexpected thwarting which strains the individual's commitment to the organization. The member begins to sense a dislike of the organization and feels dissatisfied with an inferior quality of outcomes. As the individual persists in the negatively valued situation, cognitive imbalance and frustration result. A post-thwarting process of appraisal then takes place as the participant evaluates the future viability of his relationship with the organization. Finally, the individual concludes that his relationship with the organization is no longer tenable. Such a decision results in cognitive changes leading to an irreversible state of alienation.

The initial contact with an organization is instrumental in forming the member's present and future evaluation of his experience. An individual's behavior is most subject to change during the initial period of exposure but becomes progressively more inflexible during continual interaction with the organization.[1] As the new member holds positive sentiment for the organization, the accumulation of negative information must exceed the person's threshold of disconfirmation before the person's commitment begins to dissolve. The participant's expectations thereby establish a level of disillusionment that is modified by the extent of the person's

---

[1] Ibid., p. 31.

prior involvement with the organization.[1] Therefore, according to the theory outlined by Stokols, as a new organizational member experiences positive sentiment with the organization, the reversal of that sentiment becomes more difficult. The initial positive sentiment can be easily reversed if the individual's costs exceed rewards to the extent that continual experience with the organization does not provide for a minimal acceptable level of expectation fulfillment.

In the organizational entry research of Wanous, an analysis of the transition from newcomer to insider was made.[2] Wanous hypothesized that expectations decline as a consequence of entry. Results from two of the three schools of business indicated that a significant decline in intrinsic expectations did occur between the newcomer and insider stages. The data indicated that several months of organizational experience was necessary for naive expectations to be lowered to more realistic beliefs.[3]

Meile investigated some of the factors related to student adjustment and performance during the first year of law school.[4] Defining reality shock as the discrpancy between expectations and reality, he discovered that reality shock was positively related to adjustment difficulty. Nearly one-half of the entering

---

[1] Ibid.,

[2] Wanous, "Organizational Entry," p. 22.

[3] Ibid., pp. 26-27.

[4] Richard L. Meile, "Performance and Adjustment of First Year Law Students" (Ph.D. dissertation University of Washington, 1961).

students felt there was some discrepancy between what they had expected of law school and what they subsequently experienced.[1]

Meile also observed a positive relationship between reality shock and dropping out of school.[2] While most dropouts left voluntarily, many of the school leavers developed social isolation patterns. While displaying the alienated behavior of social isolation, many dropouts stated that they did not wish more contact with faculty and that the present relations with the faculty were satisfactory.[3]

The theory and research previously cited point to the importance of the initial organizational entry period as the time when cognitive structures are formed which greatly affect continued membership. The following hypothesis investigates the development of alienation within the context of legal education:

HYPOTHESIS VII: There is no difference in alienation scores during the first year of law school.

Since a new member of an organization is in an emotional state of flux, certain personal adjustments must be made to the organization's climate. Thibaut and Kelley theorize that unstable and transient relationships continue to exist as long as a discrepancy remains between instigations to behavior and outcomes.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 157.

[2] Ibid., p. 158.

[3] Ibid., p. 160.

[4] Thibaut and Kelley, The Social Psychology of Groups, p. 28.

The person experiencing an unfavorable climate would be forced to make some accomdations or withdraw from the organization. The person experiencing frustration and dissatisfaction with an organization and who is unable to adapt may either terminate attendance or become alienated. Since the first year student would not have had time to develop a sense of alienation until the end of the first or second semester of study, the following hypothesis is researched:

> HYPOTHESIS VIII: At the beginning of the school year, first year law students acknowledge less alienation than either the second or third year students.

Organizations require a certain amount of conformity. The function of control brings about conformance to organizational requirements and achievement of organizational goals. This coordination of order may result in problems of organizational functioning and individual adjustment. While individual differences exist, organization members generally prefer exercising influence to being powerless. Research consistently shows that the average organization member is more likely to be concerned over too little authority in his work rather than too much. The desire for control may be attributed to the psychological satisfaction that comes from exercising control, or it may be derived from the pragmatic implications of power -- affecting the situation so that it is always favorable to one's personal interests.[1] Hence, it may be reasoned that the person who exercises control is less alienated from the organization than his less influential counterparts.

Using Rotter's internal-external locus of control measurement which is

---

[1]Arnold S. Tannenbaum, ed. Control in Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1968), p. 307.

closely related to a measurement of powerlessness, Organ and Green investigated the relationship between locus of control and satisfaction.[1] The researchers gathered data from ninety-four scientists and engineers employed with a large electronics manufacturing firm. External locus of control was found to be significantly correlated with low work and low job satisfaction.[2]

Korman found similar results in his study of college and university students.[3] He discovered that environmental ambiguity was far less important as a determinant of satisfaction than the control aspects of the environment. In other words, the extent to which students felt they were expected to exert self-control in student life was positively related to their sense of satisfaction.[4]

A study of the relationship between alienation and social learning was conducted by Bickford and Neal.[5] The investigators were also concerned with the level of satisfaction with the educational program experienced by the students. Satisfaction was defined in terms of the degree to which student expectations about the training

---

[1]Dennis W. Organ and Charles N. Greene, "Role Ambiguity, Locus of Control, and Work Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology 59 (February 1974) :101-102.

[2]Ibid., p. 102.

[3]Abraham K. Korman, "Environmental Ambiguity and Locus of Control as Interactive Influences on Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology 55 (August 1971) :339-342.

[4]Ibid., p. 341.

[5]Hugh L. Bickford and Arthur G. Neal, "Alienation and Social Learning: A Study of Students in a Vocational Training Center," Sociology of Education 42 Spring 1969) :141-153.

program were accomplished.[1] The proposed hypothesis was confirmed that there was an inverse relationship between high levels of alienation from society and low levels of satisfaction with the training center. Satisfaction was negatively correlated with the alienation dimensions of meaninglessness, normlessness, social isolation and powerlessness.[2]

The commonly assumed positive relationship between alienation and dissatisfaction was investigated by Bacharach and Aiken according to organizational level.[3] The correlation results between the six dimensions of work process alienation and employee satisfaction led Bacharach and Aiken to conclude that the relationship could not be generalized across levels of an organization.[4] After reviewing their results, Bacharach and Aiken concluded that their findings generally supported the assertation that alienation and satisfaction were inversely related in the middle echelons of the bureaucracies studied.[5]

The theoretical development of the concept of alienation along with the research cited above prompt an investigation of the relationship between satisfaction

---

[1]Ibid., p. 143.

[2]Ibid., p. 148.

[3]Samuel B. Bacharach and Michael Aiken, "The Impact of Alienation, Meaninglessness, and Meritocracy on Supervision and Subordinate Satisfaction," Social Forces 57 (March 1979) :853-870.

[4]Ibid., p. 863.

[5]Ibid., p. 868.

and alienation. If some first year law students develop a sense of dissatisfaction, alienation may also occur. The following hypothesis is proposed for investigation:

HYPOTHESIS IX: There is positive relationship between dissatisfaction and alienation among students completing the first year of law school.

One of the primary goals of an educational organization is the maximization of student achievement. Kemper claims that there are three reference group functions which must be operating in order to enhance individual achievement in school.[1] The learner requires a normative reference group, a role model, and an audience group.[2] The normative reference group is composed of at least one individual who sets high performance standards and who possesses the capacity to apply negative sanctions if these standards are not met. A role model is a person who exemplifies and demonstrates the skills necessary for high performance as demonstrated by his own achievements. The audience group is made up of at least one person who provides meaningful positive rewards for the student's efforts. Consistent high achievement is therefore regarded as the product of the student's experience of confronting expectations with a sense of direction for accomplishing the set standards in anticipation of available positive rewards.

Spady comments that the normative reference group function of setting standards of performance and reinforcing them with the threat of sanctions is potentially

---

[1]Theodore D. Kemper, "Reference Groups, Socialization, and Achievement," American Sociological Review 33 (February 1968) :31-45.

[2]Ibid., pp. 32-34.

alienating.[1] The threatened use of sanctions is characteristic of control by means of power or coercion. Spady proposes that the deterioration of the legitimacy of some important component of the achievement-evaluation system results in student disaffection. This disaffection, in turn, provides the basis for withdrawing support from the major values and structures of the school. It may also lead to one or more of the manifestations of alienation.[2] Therefore, it may be proposed that the continual experience of negative reinforcement will result in feelings of resentment, frustration, and alienation.

Gurin and associates applied Rotter's internal-external control theory in their analysis of minority student reactions to college.[3] Internal control was defined in terms of a person's belief that rewards follow from his own behavior. External control represented the belief that rewards are controlled by forces outside the individual and occur independently of the person's own actions. Gurin and associates found that people who believed rewards were controlled by forces outside the individual were less effectively motivated and performed less well in achievement situations.[4]

Bickford and Neal tested the hypothesis that alienated students learned less

---

[1]Spady, "The Authority System of the Schools," p. 56.

[2]Ibid., p. 58.

[3]Patricia Gurin, et al.,"Internal-external Control in the Motivational Dynamics of Negro Youth," Journal of Social Issues 25 (Summer 1969) :29-53.

[4]Ibid., p. 51.

information that was objectively relevant for future employment.[1] The results indicated that high alienation inhibited the learning of control-relevant information and that low alienation facilitated the receptiveness and retention of information.[2]

Holian studied the relationship between alienation and social learning.[3] A significant low-order correlation was observed between high alienation and low retention of information about the university.[4] Normlessness, meaninglessness and estrangement from college were inversely related to the students' grade point averages. Alienation in terms of powerlessness, social isolation, and instrumentalism was not significantly related to grade point average.[5] Holian acknowledged that his study did not determine whether feelings of alienation led to poor learning or whether poor learning led to feelings of alienation.

It is important to investiage the behavioral correlates of student alienation within the institutional setting. If university students feel alienated from their institutions and are less integrated into their particular school or college, one might predict that alienated students would earn lower grades. The following hypothesis is investigated:

---

[1]Bickford and Neal, Alienation and Social Learning," pp. 141-153.

[2]Ibid., p. 151.

[3]John Holian, Jr., "Alienation and Social Awareness Among College Students," The Sociological Quarterly 13 (Winter 1972) :114-125.

[4]Ibid., p. 121.

[5]Ibid., p. 122.

HYPOTHESIS X: There is a negative relationship between scholastic achievement and alienation among students completing the first year of law school.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Restatement of the Problem

The principal problem for research is: What is the relationship between the perceived learning climate of a law school and the satisfaction and alienation of law students? This study identifies five dimensions of learning climate and examines these climate characteristics as they relate to student satisfaction and to student alienation. The investigation provides an opportunity to examine possible differences in students' perceptions according to longevity of attendance. An analysis of changes in perceptions and behavioral reactions during the first year of law school gives information about organizational entry adjustment. The expected direct relationship between dissatisfaction and alienation is explored. Finally, this study examines the relationship between alienation and scholastic achievement among first-year law students.

Definition of Terms

Organizational Climate: The relatively enduring quality of the internal environment of an organization that is experienced by its members, influences their behavior, and can be described in terms of a particular set of characteristics and/or attributes of the organization.

Learning Climate: The perceived dimensions of the organizational climate moderating the impact of the objective properties of the professional school on student behavior.

Course Material Presentation: A dimension of learning climate referring to the usual manner and method by which course information is presented in professional school classes.

Grading Process: A dimension of learning climate referring to the academic evaluation of students in professional schools.

Social Relationships with Faculty: A dimension of learning climate referring to the social distance and the opportunities for informal contact between students and faculty.

Task Relationships with Faculty: A dimension of learning climate referring to faculty members' concern for student learning and faculty members' expressed interest in providing course-related assistance outside of class.

Physical Environment: A dimension of learning climate referring to the availability and design of physical facilities within the professional school.

Alienation: A multidimensional concept referring to a person's development of disenchantment directed toward a social context which has its source in the discrepancy between an individual's characteristics and the structural conditions faced within that context.

Meaninglessness: A dimension of alienation referring to the lack of clarity as to what an individual ought to believe or when the individual's minimal standards for clarity in decision-making are not met.

Powerlessness: The expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrences of the outcomes or reinforcements sought.

Social Estrangement: A dimension of alienation referring to the feeling of being rejected, unwanted, deserted, or being alone.

Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction: A personal comprehensive positive or negative evaluation of the learning process experienced in the professional school.

Scholasitc Achievement: The cumulative grade point average in law school.

Research Design and Presentation of Hypotheses

Campbell and Stanley recommended the Recurrent Institutional Cycle Design for those situations in which a given aspect of an institutional process is continuously

being presented to a new group of respondents.[1] Such a design is applicable to a school setting when an evaluation is desired of the effects of such a global and complex treatment as the initial year of school attendance. This design combines the longitudinal and cross-sectional approaches commonly employed in developmental research. In association with the theoretical and research development of the variables studies, the proposed design is applied to the testing of Hypotheses I, II, III, V, VII and VIII.

In order to gain a complete cross-sectional view of the law school, males attending the second and third years of legal studies were included in the design. The addition of the third year students to the proposed design allowed for the testing of Hypotheses IV and VI. Hypotheses IX and X, developed from theory and research, are tests of relationship and are accomodated by the existing research design which follows:

THIRD-YEAR LAW	Third L	X	O_1		
SECOND-YEAR LAW	Second L	X	O_2		
FIRST-YEAR LAW	First L_1		RO_3	X	O_4
	First L_2		R	X	O_5

The cross-sectional comparison of $O_2 > O_3$ provides differences which could not be explained by the effect of history or a test-retest effect. The differences

[1] Donald T. Campbell and Julian C. Stanley, Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1966), p. 57.

obtained could be due to differences within each law class from year to year or by the fact that the respondents were one year older. In any comparison of differences between first and second year students, the affect of mortality becomes a rival explanation. To avoid an explanation of mortality, Campbell and Stanley suggest that the weakness could be avoided if the data were analyzed after the first years students completed the first year of study.[1] By eliminating the pre-test scores of the first year students (0_3) who failed to complete training, mortality would no longer be a contaminating influence.

The pretest-posttest comparison ($0_3 < 0_4$) rules out the rival hypotheses that the difference is due to a shift in the selection or recruitment of students between the two classes and further rules out any possibility that mortality is the explanation for a change. The first-year students tested only during the Spring administration allows for a more precise measurement of the treatment and avoids test-retest effects by comparing 0_3 with 0_5.

Therefore, the effect of the treatment received during the first year of law school is documented in three separate comparisons: $0_2 > 0_3$, $0_3 < 0_4$ and $0_3 < 0_5$. Campbell and Stanley point out that this design fails to control for maturation.[2] The interpretation of results require the consideration of the maturation factor as a plausible rival explanation and a limiting factor of the study.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 58.

[2] Ibid., p. 59.

The following hypotheses are presented for investigation:

HYPOTHESIS I: There is no significant difference between first, second and third year law students at the beginning of the school year on each of the measures of learning climate.

HYPOTHESIS II: There is a significant difference in the measures of learning climate during the first year of law school.

HYPOTHESIS III: There is a significant difference between first, second and third year law students at the beginning of the school year on a measurement of overall satisfaction with the learning process.

HYPOTHESIS IV: There is no significant relationship between learning climate and satisfaction for first, second and third year law students at the end of the academic year.

HYPOTHESIS V: There is a significant increase in dissatisfaction during the first year of law school.

HYPOTHESIS VI: There is no significant relationship between learning climate and alienation for first, second and third year law students at the beginning of the academic year.

HYPOTHESIS VII: There is no significant difference in alienation scores during the first year of law school.

HYPOTHESIS VIII: At the beginning of the school year, first year law students acknowledge significantly less alienation than either the second or third year students.

HYPOTHESIS IX: There is a significant positive relationship between dissatisfaction and alienation among students completing the first year of law school.

HYPOTHESIS X: There is a significant negative relationship between scholastic achievement and alienation among students completing the first year of law school.

Selection of Subjects

The subjects of the study consisted of all 210 full-time male students enrolled in the day division of the School of Law at Oklahoma City University.

Full-time student status was defined as an enrollment in twelve or more semester hours. The first year male subjects were beginning their initial year of professional school and had not completed any law school courses. Second year students had completed a minimun of twenty-eight, but not more than fifty-five, semester hours in law school. Third year law students had completed fifty-six or more semester hours in law school.

Eighty-eight first year students attended the day division and were enrolled in twelve or more semester hours. Sixty-seven second year subjects were identified as attending full-time. Fifty-five students participating in the study were completing their third and final year of study. The eighty-eight first year students were randomly assigned to two groups of forty-four subjects each since a control group was needed to compare the affect of the first year law school on entering students.

Response rates from the initial questionnaire administration ranged from sixty-six to seventy-three percent. Thirty-two subjects, or seventy-three percent, from the First Year Pre-Test Group responded during the Fall Semester administration of the questionnaire. Forty-four subjects, or sixty-six percent, from the Second Year Group completed usable questionnaires. Thirty-five third year students completed questionnaires providing a response rate of sixty-six percent.

First year subjects were divided into two groups of forty-four subjects each. Twenty-eight subjects assigned to the First Year Spring Group, or sixty-four percent, provided responses only during the April administration. Of the forty-four subjects assigned to the group requested to respond to the questionnaire during

the Fall and Spring administration, twenty-two students, or fifty percent, responded on both administrations. Two subjects in the Pre/Post-Test Group who responded during the pre-test administration did not complete the second semester of of law school. Two subjects assigned to the Pre/Post-Test Group responded only during the Spring Administration. Therefore, twenty-four subjects, or fifty-five percent, from the Pre/Post-Test Group participated in the second questionnaire administration.

Description of the Instruments

The author requested permission from the originators of the Learning Climate Questionnaire and the University Alienation Scale to use the instruments in the study (See Appendix A for correspondence pertaining to written requests). Correspondence from the researchers granting permission to use the instruments is contained in Appendix B. A copy of the questionnaire containing both instruments is found in Appendix C.

Learning Climate Questionnaire (LCQ)

The Learning Climate Questionnaire was developed by Bowen and Kilmann in 1975. The instrument was constructed to assess the perceptual aspects of professional school students.

The design of the LCQ was based on Lewin's notion of restraining versus driving forces in a situation. Section A contains ten items and asks students:

"To what extent do you feel influential in determining the following?" Section B requests responses to the same ten items contained in Section A but asks the following question: "To what extent would you want to be influential in determining the following?" These ten responses were evaluated in terms of the discrepancy between experienced and desired influence. A discrepancy in response to each item represents the operationalization of the degree of student participation in governing the learning process.

Section C of the LCQ measures the restraining forces in the environment. Sixteen responses are made to the following question: "To what extent have you experienced the following as obstacles to a meaningful and useful learning environment?" Sections A, B, and C use a seven-point Likert response format.

A measurement of student satisfaction is contained in Section D of the LCQ. The nine items in Section D measure overall satisfaction with the learning process. Student satisfaction responses are made on a five-point Likert format.

During Bowen and Kilmann's initial validation procedure, seven student groups consisting of 455 subjects were examined. Five of the groups were made up of graduate students in business. The other two groups consisted of first and third year law students. Responses from all seven samples (N=455) were standardized for each of the thirty-six questions.

Validation of the LCQ sought to achieve: (a) substantive validity by defining the pool of relevant items for the instrument and the selection of items factor analyzing items to investigate the underlying dimensions of climate being assessed, and testing the internal consistency of items identified with each

dimension; (b) structural validity indicating that the format of the instrument and the calculation of individual and organizational scores was consistent with the theoretical understanding of climate; and (c) external validity by investigating the expected relationship between climate and student satisfaction.

Viewing the entire sample as the unit of analysis, Bowen and Kilmann computed Spearman rank-order correlations (rho) for sample means between each climate scale and the satisfaction measurement. Since the sample size was small (N=6), only the rho for Physical Environment was significant ($p < .01$, one-tailed test). However, all of the associations were relatively sizable and positive.

In summary, the factor analysis and measet reliabilities provided evidence for the substantive and structural validity of the LCQ measets. Support for the external validity of the instrument was demonstrated by the correlations between measets and the satisfaction measurement.

University Alienation Scale (UAS)

The contextually-centered University Alienation Scale (UAS) was designed by Burbach to assess the feelings of alienation with the context of the University.[1] Babbit, Burbach and Thompson stated that it was possible to use the UAS in measuring alienation within other contexts by substituting the desired organizational referent across all items.[2] In this study all scale items were written with "this

[1] Harold J. Burbach, "The Development of a Contextual Measure of Alienation," Pacific Sociological Review 15 (April 1972) :225-234.

[2] Charles E. Babbit, Harold J. Burbach, and Myron A. Thompson, III, "Organization Alienation Among Black College Students: A Comparison of Three Educational Settings," Journal of College Student Personnel 16 (January 1975) :53-56.

law school" rather than with "this University."

The UAS is a twenty-four item multidimensional measure of alienation consisting of three subscales: Powerlessness, Meaninglessness, and Social Estrangement. Responses to UAS items were made on a five factor agree-disagree continuum. The total Alienation score for each individual was obtained by summing the responses for each of the three subscales.

A randomly selected sample of 356 first-year university students was used in the initial analysis of validity and reliability of the instrument. The construct validity of the UAS was examined by item-to-total analysis. Every item-to-total correlation coefficient was found to be significant ($p < .01$) indicating that all scale items contributed to the measurement of the scale's general property.

Criterion-related validity was completed by correlating the UAS with the Dean Alienation Scale. All correlation coefficients were significant at the .01 level of significance. The corrected split-half reliability coefficients for powerlessness, meaninglessness, and social estrangement scales were .79, .89, and .72, respectively. The corrected reliability for the total scale was .92.[1]

Procedure for Collecting the Data

Permission to conduct the study was requested from the President of Oklahoma City University during a personal conference. After reviewing the purpose and methodology of the investigation, the President tentatively approved the study contingent upon a favorable response from the Acting Dean of the School of Law.

---

[1]Burbach, "Contextual Measure of Alienation," p. 33.

A memo and a copy of the dissertation prospectus were sent to the Acting Dean. See Appendix D for a speciman of the memo. After discussing the merits of the study during a personal interview, the Acting Dean gave permission to conduct the research and agreed to write a cover letter to accompany the questionnaire. See Appendix E for specimen of the letter.

The names and addresses of all subjects were secured from the University Records Office. The names and addresses of all participants were entered on memory cards of an IBM Magcard II typewriter. A personal cover letter was produced for each participant. See Appendix F for a specimen of the letter.

A personal letter containing instructions, a copy of the Acting Dean's endorsement letter, the questionnaire, and return envelope were mailed to the school address of the pre-test first year group, second year group, and the third year subjects. The instructions on the cover letter encouraged participants to complete the questionnaire, seal it in the envelope provided and return it to the Office of Admissions and Records of the School of Law. Participants were requested to sign their name on the form provided in the office so that the researcher would know who had completed the questionnaires.

Two weeks after the questionnaires were mailed, personally signed post cards were mailed to those students whose names did not appear on the returned questionnaire list. See Appendix G for a specimen of the post card.

One month prior to the end of the Spring Semester, a personal letter (See Appendix H for a specimen of the letter), a questionnaire, and a return envelope were mailed to the First Year Pre/Post-Test Group. A different cover

letter and a questionnaire were mailed to the first year students selected to complete the questionnaire for the first time during the Spring administration (See Appendix I for specimen of letter). The First Year Spring Group also received a copy of the Acting Dean's endorsement letter. The same return procedures were used.

Two weeks after the questionnaires were mailed during the Spring administration, follow-up postcards were prepared with different messages for each group. A personally typed and signed postal card was mailed to each student who had not participated in the Spring administration. See Appendix J for a specimen of the postcard. The message on each postal card emphasized the limited response received as of that date, reiterated the importance of participating in the study and thanked the respondent for his assistance.

Statistical Methods

This study has three primary interests: (1) to observe perceptual and affective changes among first year law students; (2) to discover the differences between each of the law student groups on measures of learning climate and satisfaction; and, (3) to investigate the relationships between learning climate, satisfaction, alienation and scholastic achievement. The law school group is the unit of analysis for this study.

The Learning Climate Questionnaire and the University Alienation Scale used in this study have a Likert response format. Proponents of Likert-type

scaling do not claim that the format is anything more than an ordinal scale.[1] Ordinal measurement is possible when the measurer can detect differing degrees of an attribute or property in objects but cannot discern equal differences between the objects.[2] Therefore, the application of ordinal level statistics was applied to the data received in this study.

The data was analyzed through the application of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).[3] SPSS contains a variety of parametric and non-parametric programs. SPSS was run on an IBM 370/148 computer.

Hypotheses I, II, III, V, VII, and VIII investigated possible differences between law school groups on measures of learning climate, satisfaction and alienation. When at least ordinal measurement has been achieved, the Mann-Whitney U test may be used to test whether two independent groups have been drawn from the same population.[4] The Mann-Whitney U is sensitive to any type of difference in the two distributions being compared such as median, dispersion and skewness. The Mann-Whitney U is one of the most powerful of the non-

---

[1]Claire Selltiz, Lawrence S. Wrightsman, and Stuart W. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations 3rd ed. New York: (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976), p. 420.

[2]Gene V. Glass and Julian C. Stanley, Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1970), pp. 8-10.

[3]Norman H. Nie et al., SPSS Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2nd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975).

[4]Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), p. 116.

parametric tests and is, therefore, applied in the investigation of the hypotheses listed above.

The SPSS application of the Mann-Whitney U computes a cumulative distribution for both groups. Cases are ranked in order of increasing size. The Statistic U is computed as the number of times a score from Group 1 precedes a score from Group 2. The rationale is that if the samples are from the same population, the distribution of scores from the two groups in the ranked list will be random. A non-random pattern will be indicated by an extreme value of U.[1] For samples larger than thirty cases, U is corrected for ties and transformed into a normally distributed Z statistic. SPSS cites Siegel's explanation of the Mann-Whitney U as the authoritative reference used in the development of algorithms for the calculation of the U statistic and the Z-score transformation.[2] Therefore, the following formula for U, as presented by Siegel, was used.[3]

$$U = n_1 n_2 + \frac{n_1(n_1 + 1)}{2} - R_1$$

---

[1]C. Hadlai Hull and Norman H. Nie, SPSS Update: New Procedures and Facilities for Releases 7 and 8 (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1979), p. 86.

[2]Ibid., p. 87.

[3]Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics, pp. 123-124.

where n_1 = size of the smaller of the two independent samples

n_2 = size of the larger of the two independent samples

R_1 = sum of the ranks assigned to groups with sample size of n_1

The average rank for each group is

$$\bar{R}_{ij} = \frac{R_i}{n_i}$$

where n_i is the sample size of group i.

When tied scores occur in the computation of ranks, each of the tied observations receive the average of the ranks they would have had if no ties had occurred.

A correction for ties is applied in the Z formula:

$$Z = \frac{U - \frac{n_1 n_2}{2}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{n_1 n_2}{N\,N-1}\right)\left(\frac{N^3 - N - \Sigma T}{12}\right)}}$$

where $N = n_1 + n_2$

ΣT is found by summing the T's over all groups of tied observations

$$T = \frac{t^3 - t}{12}$$

t = number of observations tied for a given rank.

If the value of Z is equal to or greater than 1.96 or 2.58, the null hypothesis for a nondirectional test could be rejected at the .05 or .01 level, respectively. For a directional test of significance, the Z score must equal or exceed 1.64 or 2.33 before the hypotheses could be accepted at the .05 or .01 level of significance, respectively.[1]

Hypotheses II, V, and VII require the comparison of scores recorded for the first year group during both the Fall and Spring administration of the questionnaire. The appropriate statistical technique to discover differences between correlated groups utilizing ordinal scaling measurement instruments is the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test.[2] After the difference between each pair of scores is computed, differences are ranked from the smallest to largest absolute rank and ranks are assigned. The average rank is used in case of ties. All zero differences are disregarded.

The SPSS Wilcoxon program calculates the sums of the ranks corresponding to positive differences and negative differences.[3] The average positive rank is:

$$\overline{X}_p = S_p/n_p$$

---

[1]George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis in Psychology & Education 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), p. 327.

[2]Ralph H. Kolstoe, Introduction to Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences rev. ed. (Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1973)., pp. 254-255.

[3]M.J. Norusis, SPSS Statistical Algorithms (Chicago: SPSS, Inc. 1979), p. 121.

where S_p is the sum of ranks corresponding to positive differences and n_p is the number of cases with positive differences.

The average negative rank is

$$\overline{X}_n = S_n/n_n$$

where S_n is the sum of ranks corresponding to negative differences and n_n is the number of cases with negative differences.

The Z score for use with the Wilcoxon T is:

$$Z = \frac{T - \frac{N(N+1)}{4}}{\sqrt{\frac{N(N+1)(2N+1)}{24}}}$$

where

T = the smaller sum of signed ranks

N = the number of cases with non-zero differences.[1]

Hypotheses IV, VI, IX, and X propose relationships between learning climate and alienation, satisfaction and alienation, and alienation and scholastic achievement, respectively. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient measures the degree of agreement that exists between variables.

The following formula of rho corrected for tied scores was used as presented by Siegel.[2]

---

[1]Kolstoe, Introduction to Statistics, p. 254.

[2]Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics, p. 207.

$$r_s = \frac{\Sigma x^2 + \Sigma y^2 - \Sigma d^2}{2\sqrt{\Sigma x^2 \; \Sigma y^2}}$$

where

$$\Sigma x^2 = \frac{N^3 - N}{12} - \Sigma T_x$$

$$\Sigma y^2 = \frac{N^3 - N}{12} - \Sigma T_y$$

T is found by summing the various values of

T for all the various groups of tied observations.

$$T = \frac{t^3 - t}{12}$$

t = the number of observations tied at a given rank for a respective group.

$$\Sigma d^2 = \Sigma x^2 + \Sigma y^2 - 2\Sigma xy$$

The significance of rho is tested by using a t given by

$$t = r_s \sqrt{\frac{N - 2}{1 - r_s^2}}$$

The exact significance level of rho is calculated by the SPSS program for either a one-tailed or a two-tailed test.[1]

[1]Norusis, SPSS Statistical Algorithms, p. 30.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The statistical results and analysis of data presented in this chapter were based on the research design presented in Chapter III. The research design required the administration of the University Alienation Scale (UAS), the Learning Climate Questionnaire (LCQ), and the overall satisfaction index of the LCQ. The cumulative grade point average for first year students was also gathered. The presentation and analysis of data has been organized according to the order in which the hypotheses were proposed in Chapter III. This chapter begins with a brief but pertinent analysis of the response levels to learning climate obstacles, satisfaction/dissatisfaction, and alienation.

In their reported findings of organizational alienation utilizing the UAS, Babbitt, Burbach, and Thompson recognized that there were no definitive guidelines to mark levels of alienation according to raw scores on the UAS.[1] They proposed that a comparison of the group alienation scale mean with the hypothetical midpoint of the scale would serve the general purpose of identifying the existence of midly alienated student groups.[2] Table 14 in Appendix K identifies

[1] Babbitt, Burbach, and Thompson, "Organizational Alienation," p. 55.

[2] Ibid.

the measures of central tendency and variability for raw scale scores by law school group.

Data from the results of the UAS indicated that no group mean or median equalled or exceeded the hypothetical midpoint of the Meaninglessness scale (midpoint = 20). Every law school group mean and median scored on the Powerlessness scale exceeded the hypothetical midpoint of 22.5. The sense of moderate powerlessness existed throughout each law school group. Even though no group means or medians exceeded the hypothetical midpoint of 17.5 on the Social Estrangement Scale, every group median was close. Perhaps it may be asserted that Social Estrangement existed in the law school climate to a mild degree. Comparing the group measures of central tendency with the hypothetical midpoint of 60 on the Alienation (Total) Scale, only the First Year Spring Group mean and median did not equal or exceed the hypothetical midpoint. It may be concluded that Alienation did exist to a moderate degree among male students enrolled in each of the three law school classes.

If the comparison of a scale mean or median with the hypothetical midpoint of the scale is applicable, some relevant descriptive results emerge when reviewing the results of the learning climate and satisfaction scales. An analysis of the results on the LCQ revealed that no group means or medians equalled or exceeded the hypothetical midpoint on the Course Material Presentation, Grading Process or Social Relationship with Faculty measets. The First Year Post-Test Group and the Second Year Group means exceeded the hypothetical midpoint of fifteen on the Task Relationship with Faculty measet. For these two groups, the

task relationship experienced in the learning environment was observed to be a moderate obstacle to a meaningful and useful learning environment.

The physical environment of the institution was considered by all but one group to be a distracting factor. The First Year Spring Group was the only group having a mean below the hypothetical midpoint on the Physical Environment measet. Even the students entering the first year of law school reacted negatively to what was considered to be inadequate physical facilities in which to learn.

With the exception of the First Year Spring Group, students who had completed, or nearly completed, at least one year of law school registered a moderate sense of dissatisfaction with the overall learning climate. Exceeding the hypothetical midpoint of fifteen on the satisfaction index, the experienced students expressed a modest dislike for their learning environment.

Learning Climate Perceptions

The LCQ was developed to measure the dimensions of organizational climate moderating the impact of the objective properties of the professional schools on the motivation, learning, and satisfaction of the students. The LCQ was administered to all full-time male students attending the day division of the School of Law at Oklahoma City University. As recommended by the authors of the LCQ, responses to selected climate questions were dropped from the data analysis to improve reliability.[1] In the Course Material measet, items 4 and 14 were not included. In the Grading Process measet, items 5, 15, 6, 16, 8, and

---

[1] Bowen and Kilmann, "Developing a Measure of Learning Climate," p. 74.

18 were deleted. Increased reliability was gained by dropping item 28 in the Task Relationship with Faculty measet and items 21 and 32 in the Physical Environment measet. Item 36 was not included in any of the five measets and was therefore disregarded during the analysis of data.

The first hypothesis tested the proposition that multiple climates may develop within an organization. Considering longevity as the major factor in the development of multiple climates within an educational setting, the following hypothesis was formed:

> HYPOTHESIS I: There is no significant difference between first, second, and third year law students at the beginning of the school year on each of the measures of learning climate.

With one notable exception, the law school learning climate was similarly perceived by first, second and third year students (See Table 1). The sole significant difference occurred between first and second year students in their understanding of the task relationship which existed between students and faculty. The inexperienced first year students, questioned at the beginning of the year, perceived their task relationship with faculty differently than either second or third year law students ($p < .001$). Since no other differences in the learning climate were observed between law classes, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Organizational theory and research stresses the importance of institutional entry on the formation of individual perceptions. Having found evidence in the literature for a decline in expectations experienced by newcomers to an organization, the second hypothesis was formulated as follows:

TABLE 1

THE MANN-WHITNEY U TEST BETWEEN LAW SCHOOL GROUPS ON THE LEARNING CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR

Learning Climate Measet	Group I Mean Rank	Group II Mean Rank	U	Z
Group I: First Year Pre-Test (N=32) X	Group II: Second Year (N=44)			
Course Material Presentation	40.16	37.30	651.00	-0.56
Grading Process	37.63	39.14	676.00	-0.30
Social Relationship with Faculty	36.36	40.06	635.50	-0.72
Task Relationship with Faculty	28.92	45.47	397.50	-3.23***
Physical Environment	33.56	42.09	546.00	-1.67
Group I: First Year Pre-Test (N=32) X	Group II: Third Year (N=35)			
Course Material Presentation	35.58	32.56	509.50	-0.64
Grading Process	33.83	34.16	554.50	-0.07
Social Relationship with Faculty	34.66	33.40	539.00	-0.26
Task Relationship with Faculty	29.52	38.10	416.50	-1.80
Physical Environment	33.73	34.24	551.50	-0.11

TABLE 1 -- Continued

Learning Climate Measet	Group I Mean Rank	Group II Mean Rank	U	Z
Group I: Second Year (N=44) X	Group II: Third Year (N=35)			
Course Material Presentation	40.16	39.80	763.00	-0.07
Grading Process	40.27	39.66	758.00	-0.12
Social Relationship with Faculty	42.72	36.59	650.50	-1.18
Task Relationship with Faculty	44.06	34.90	591.50	-1.77
Physical Environment	43.73	35.33	606.50	-1.62

***p < .001, two-tailed.

HYPOTHESIS II: There is a significant difference in the measures of learning climate during the first year of law school.

The Recurrent Institutional Cycle Design used in this study tests for the effects of the first year of law school on the students' perceptions of learning climate. The directional nature of the hypothesis assumes that the new students' perceptions of the legal training process would change during the course of the year. The nature of the research instrument, along with the characteristics of the applied research design, called for the application of two statistical techniques (See Tables 2 and 3). In order to confirm Hypothesis II, significant differences in a consistently positive or negative direction must be observed between the pre-test and the post-test for the First Year Pre/Post-Test Group as well as differences between the First Year Pre-Test Group and both the First Year Spring Group and the Second Year Group.

No consistent and significant differences between groups were observed. Task Relationship with Faculty was perceived differently by the First Year Pre/Post-Test Group during the year and was found to be significantly different between the First Year Pre-Test Group and the Second Year Group. The lack of observed difference between the First Year Pre-Test Group and the First Year Spring Group on the task relationship measet prevented the partial acceptance of Hypothesis II.

The test-retest effects controlled for by the comparison between the Pre-Test and Spring groups may explain the heightened concern expressed in the First Year Post-Test results. However, the highly significant difference ($p < .01$) between the First Year Pre-Test Group and the Second Year Group on the Task

TABLE 2

THE MANN-WHITNEY U TEST BETWEEN LAW SCHOOL GROUPS ON LEARNING CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE MEASETS

Learning Climate Measet	Group I: Mean Rank	Group II: Mean Rank	U	Z
Group I: First Year Pre-Test (N=30) X Group II: Second Year (N=44)				
Course Material Presentation	39.63	36.05	596.00	-0.71
Grading Process	36.75	38.01	637.50	-0.25
Social Relationship with Faculty	35.73	38.70	607.00	-0.58
Task Relationship with Faculty	27.36	44.36	358.00	-3.33***
Physical Environment	33.37	40.32	536.00	-1.37
Group I: First Year Pre-Test (N=30) X Group II: First Year Spring (N=28)				
Course Material Presentation	35.60	22.96	237.00	-2.86**
Grading Process	30.47	28.46	391.00	-0.46
Social Relationship with Faculty	32.70	26.07	324.00	-1.50
Task Relationship with Faculty	27.83	31.29	370.00	-0.78
Physical Environment	33.88	24.80	288.50	-2.05*

* $p < .05$, one-tailed.

** $p < .01$, one-tailed.

*** $p < .001$, one-tailed.

TABLE 3

THE WILCOXON MATCHED-PAIRS SIGNED-RANKS TEST FOR TWENTY-TWO FIRST YEAR STUDENTS COMPARING PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST RESPONSES ON THE LEARNING CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE

Learning Climate Measets	- Ranks	Mean of - Ranks	+ Ranks	Mean of + Ranks	Ties	Z
Course Material Presentation	9	9.33	11	11.45	2	-0.78
Grading Process	7	8.79	9	8.28	6	-0.34
Social Relationships with Faculty	11	9.59	10	12.55	1	-0.35
Task Relationships with Faculty	6	7.00	14	12.00	2	-2.35**
Physical Environment	7	9.14	10	8.90	5	-0.59

** $p < .01$, one-tailed.

Relationship with Faculty measet points heavily toward the occurrence of task relationship changes during the first year of law school. Nonetheless, Hypothesis II must be rejected; no changes in perceived learning climate were observed on students completing the first year of law school.

Overall Satisfaction with the Learning Process

Satisfaction with an organizational setting was conceived as an evaluative reaction to the organization based upon the interaction between the organizational climate and personal needs and values. Research evidence was cited in Chapter II indicating that various satisfaction levels may exist within an organization. Schmidt and Sedlacek concluded from their study of college student satisfaction that length of attendance was inversely related to satisfaction.[1] The following hypothesis was posed for investigation:

> HYPOTHESIS III: There is a significant difference between first, second and third year law students at the beginning of the school year on a measurement of overall satisfaction with the learning process.

Since higher scores on the overall satisfaction index indicated greater satisfaction, second and third year students were significanfly more dissatisfied with their learning process than first year students (See Table 4). A significant difference also existed between second and third year groups. It may be concluded that there were significant differences in satisfaction between law class groups and Hypothesis III was accepted.

First year students questioned at the beginning of the first semester pro-

---

[1] Schmidt and Sedlacek, "University Student Satisfaction," p. 383.

TABLE 4

THE MANN-WHITNEY U TEST BETWEEN LAW SCHOOL GROUPS ON THE OVERALL SATISFACTION INDEX

Groups Compared	Group I: Mean Rank	Group II: Mean Rank	U	Z
Group I: First Year Pre-Test (N=32)				
X	28.55	45.75	385.50	-3.36***
Group II: Second Year (N=44)				
Group I: First Year Pre-Test (N=32)				
X	28.72	38.83	391.00	-2.13*
Group II: Third Year (N=35)				
Group I: Second Year (N=44)				
X	43.76	35.27	604.50	-1.65*
Group II: Third Year (N=35)				

* $p < .05$, one-tailed.

*** $p < .001$, one-tailed.

bably had not been confronted with the demands of the entire legal education climate. The higher satisfaction level for first year students may be explained by the theory that their experiences were, at the time of examination, relatively congruent with their expected or desired outcomes. On the other hand, a significantly larger discrepancy between desired and expected outcomes existed for second and third year students.

Organizational theorists assert that different climates strongly influence feelings of satisfaction.[1] Research studies acknowledging a significant relationship between learning climate variables and satisfaction were cited in Chapter II. To test this assumed relationship, the following hypothesis was proposed:

> HYPOTHESIS IV: There is no significant relationship between learning climate and satisfaction for first, second and third year law students at the end of the academic year.

Correlations of individual scores on LCQ measets and the overall satisfaction index were computed for each law school group (See Table 5). No significant correlations were observed for the First Year Pre-Test Group, Second Year Group, and Third Year Group. Significant relationships emerged for the two first year groups completing the second semester of law school. Course Material Presentation and Task Relationship with Faculty were significantly associated with overall satisfaction for the First-Year Post-Test Group (+.49, $p < .01$) and for the First Year Spring Group (+ .60, $p < .001$). The adjustment to the teaching methods and the student-teacher relationship in a professional school are the major sources of dissatisfaction for first-year students. These results are consistent with those

---

[1] Litwin and Stringer, Motivation and Organizational Climate, p. 188

TABLE 5

THE SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL SCORES ON THE LEARNING CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE MEASETS AND THE OVERALL SATISFACTION INDEX FOR EACH GROUP

		Learning Climate Questionnaire				
Group	N	Course Material Presentation	Grading Process	Social Relationship with Faculty	Task Relationship with Faculty	Physical Environment
First Year Pre-Test	32	.32	.09	.25	.21	-.01
First Year Post-Test	24	.53**	.17	.08	.49**	.12
First Year Spring	28	.49**	.48**	.42*	.60***	.21
Second Year	44	.22	.28	.17	.26	.11
Third Year	35	.04	.09	.22	.23	-.06

* $p < .05$, two-tailed.

** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

*** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

reported by Bowen and Kilmann.[1] Therefore, conditional rejection of the null hypothesis was allowed for the first year groups completing the second semester of law school, but the null was accepted for the Second and Third Year Groups.

New members of organizations often bring biases and faulty assumptions with them. When a newcomer experiences an environment quite different from that which is expected, dissatisfaction may occur. Hypothesis V provides the researcher with an opportunity to investigate the existence of an initial drop in student satisfaction (increase in dissatisfaction) during the first year of law school:

> HYPOTHESIS V: There is a significant increase in dissatisfaction during the first year of law school.

As required by the Recurrent Institutional Cycle Design, the First Year Pre-Test Group was compared with the Second Year and First Year Spring groups (See Table 6). A comparison of individual satisfaction level scores was made on those twenty-two pre-tested subjects also participating in the post-test administration (See Table 7).

Second year students were significantly less satisfied (more dissatisfied) than the new first year students ($p < .001$). First year subjects participating in both questionnaire administrations also registered a decline in satisfaction (increase in dissatisfaction) at the .05 level of significance. No significant difference in satisfaction scores was observed when comparing the First Year Pre-Test Group with the First Year Spring Group. Once again the effects of test administration must account for these inconsistent results. Administering the questionnaire a

---

[1] Bowen and Kilmann, "Developing a Measure of Learning Climate," pp. 76-77.

TABLE 6

THE MANN-WHITNEY U TEST BETWEEN LAW SCHOOL GROUPS ON THE OVERALL SATISFACTION INDEX

Groups Compared	Group I: Mean Rank	Group II: Mean Rank	U	Z
Group I: First Year Pre-Test (N=30) X	26.22	45.19	321.50	-3.74***
Group II: Second Year (N=44)				
Group I: First Year Pre-Test (N=30) X	29.07	29.96	407.00	-0.20
Group II: First Year Spring (N=28)				

*** $p < .001$, one-tailed.

TABLE 7

THE WILCOXON MATCHED-PAIRS SIGNED-RANKS TEST FOR TWENTY-TWO FIRST YEAR STUDENTS COMPARING PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST RESPONSES ON THE OVERALL SATISFACTION INDEX

Satisfaction Index	- Ranks	Mean of - Ranks	+ Ranks	Mean of + Ranks	Ties	Z
Overall Satisfaction with Learning Process	6	6.25	12	11.13	4	-2.09*

* $p < .05$, one-tailed.

second time to the Pre/Post-Test Group may have heightened the subjects' awareness of dissatisfying experiences. The greater sense of dissatisfaction acknowledged by the second year students may be based on past as well as current experiences. Hypothesis V must be rejected even though strong evidence existed that satisfaction may decline during the course of the first year of law school.

Student Alienation

The multidimensional concept of alienation identifies an affective reaction accompanying behavior in which an individual is being forced to act self-destructively. Organizational members learn that rules and procedures are seldom altered to accommodate individual needs. Alienation results as the student develops a sense of disenchantment with the social context. The source of the student disenchantment is the discrepancy between an individual's characteristics and the experience of personal structure imposed by the pervasive institutional climate. Hypothesis VI provides an opportunity to investigate relationship between learning climate and alienation by law school class. Since no research reports have been identified which investigated the relationship between learning climate and alienation, the hypothesis is stated in null form:

> HYPOTHESIS VI: There is no significant relationship between learning climate and alienation for first, second and third year law students at the beginning of the academic year.

Some moderately significant positive relationships between learning climate measets and alienation scales were discovered for each law class (See Table 8). A sense of meaninglessness (i.e., confusion, lack of situational clarity preventing

TABLE 8

THE SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL SCORES ON THE LEARNING CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE AND THE UNIVERSITY ALIENATION SCALE FOR EACH LAW SCHOOL GROUP

Alienation Scales	Learning Climate Questionnaire				
	Course Material Presentation	Grading Process	Social Relationship with Faculty	Task Relationship with Faculty	Physical Environment
First Year Pre-Test (N=32)					
Meaninglessness	.35*	.42**	.63***	.36*	.39*
Powerlessness	.06	-.08	.10	.45**	.18
Social Estrangement	.29	.23	.47**	.37*	.13
Alienation (Total)	.30	.15	.47**	.50**	.23
Second Year (N=44)					
Meaninglessness	.24	.16	.47***	.68***	-.16
Powerlessness	.25	.08	.30*	.46**	-.07
Social Estrangement	.15	.13	.34*	.40**	-.18
Alienation (Total)	.25	.13	.45**	.62***	-.14

TABLE 8 — Continued

Alienation Scales	Learning Climate Questionnaire				
	Course Material Presentation	Grading Process	Social Relationship with Faculty	Task Relationship with Faculty	Physical Environment
	Third Year (N=35)				
Meaninglessness	-.08	.02	.32*	.32*	.37*
Powerlessness	.36*	.43**	.41**	.42**	.39**
Social Estrangement	.14	.07	.12	.08	.09
Alienation (Total)	.21	.27	.36*	.35*	-.38*

* $p < .05$, two-tailed.

** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

*** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

confidence in making personal decisions) was significantly associated with each of the learning climate measets for the first year students. The entering first year students were still confused and uncertain of how to adjust to the law school climate. The social distance experienced between faculty and entering students was significantly related to the students' sense of meaninglessness (+ .63, $p < .001$). Adjusting to the demands of legal training along with the perceived lack of faculty interest in individual students brought on a sense of powerlessness (+ .44, $p < ,01$) among first year students. Social Estrangement (i.e., feelings of rejection or being alone) was positively related to Social Relationships with Faculty (+ .47, $p < .01$) and to Task Relationship with Faculty (+ .37, $p < .05$). The sense of Alienation among first year students correlated positively at the .01 level with Social Relationships with Faculty and Task Relationships with Faculty.

Both the social and task relationships with faculty, as expressed by second year law students, were positively associated with each alienation scale. Clarity in decision-making, as recorded by the meaninglessness scale, was associated with the social and task relationships measets at the .001 level. The social and task relationships with faculty were observed to be major contributing factors in the prolonged development of student alienation.

Each of the learning climate measets was positively related to the third year students' sense of powerlessness (i.e., the inability to determine future outcomes). Even though the third year students were reasonably assured of completing their legal studies, their concern for more control of the learning process remained high. Total Alienation scores were positively related at the .05

significance level to Social Relationship with Faculty, Task Relationships with Faculty, and Physical Environment.

In summary, each law class revealed significant relationships between learning climate and alienation variables. Each law class evaluated their climate differently depending on the concerns and interests expressed within the immediate situation. The results of the data analysis allowed for the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Organizational theory and research emphasize the importance of the initial entry period and its affect on student cognitive structures. Alienation develops most severely when a person experiences an unexpected thwarting of needs during the course of interaction with the organization. Research data indicates that several months of organizational experience will generally result in a lowering of the members' expectations. This study provides an opportunity to investigate any possible changes in alienation from the beginning of the first semester of law school to the end of the first year of legal studies. The following null hypothesis is proposed:

> HYPOTHESIS VII: There is no significant difference in alienation scores during the first year of law school.

The values resulting from the application of the Mann-Whitney U Test (See Table 9) and the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test (See Table 10) on the comparison of alienation scores generally indicate no significant changes in group alienation levels. The increase in Powerlessness by the end of the year as observed in the Pre/Post-Test Group may be explained by a heightened sensitivity

TABLE 9

THE MANN-WHITNEY U TEST BETWEEN LAW SCHOOL GROUPS ON THE UNIVERSITY ALIENATION SCALE

Alienation Scales	Group I Mean Rank	Group II Mean Rank	U	Z
Group I: First Year Pre-Test (N=30)	X	Group II: Second Year (N=44)		
Meaninglessness	36.65	38.08	634.50	-0.28
Powerlessness	35.47	38.89	599.00	-0.67
Social Estrangement	37.30	37.64	654.00	-0.07
Alienation (Total)	36.38	38.26	626.50	-0.37
Group I: First Year Pre-Test (N=30)	X	Group II: First Year Spring (N=28)		
Meaninglessness	32.48	26.30	330.50	-1.41
Powerlessness	31.53	27.32	359.00	-0.95
Social Estrangement	30.97	27.97	376.00	-0.69
Alienation (Total)	31.33	27.54	365.00	-0.86

TABLE 10

THE WILCOXON MATCHED-PAIRS SIGNED-RANKS TEST FOR TWENTY-TWO FIRST YEAR STUDENTS COMPARING PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST RESPONSES ON THE UNIVERSITY ALIENATION SCALE

Alienation Scale	- Ranks	Mean of - Ranks	+ Ranks	Mean of + Ranks	Ties	Z
Meaninglessness	7	11.79	14	10.61	1	-1.15
Powerlessness	5	8.00	15	11.33	2	-.243*
Social Estrangement	10	10.00	9	10.00	3	-0.20
Alienation (Total)	6	9.25	14	11.04	2	-1.85

* P < .05, two-tailed.

to the lack of student control over the environment caused by the retesting effect. Since no changes in alienation were observed in the various group comparisons made, Hypothesis VII, stated in the null form, must be accepted.

It has been noted that the personal adjustment required during the first year of law school may result in a sense of disillusionment for some students. Depending on individual abilities to make necessary adjustments, alienation may develop during the first year of school. Second and third year students have either made adjustements to the pervasive law school climate and remained in school or they have terminated their attendance. It may be reasoned that alienation among first year students would be lower than among either second or third year students at the beginning of the school year.

HYPOTHESIS VIII: At the beginning of the school year, first year law students acknowledge significantly less alienation than either the second or third year students.

There are no significant differences in alienation levels between first, second and third year students (See Table 11). As an emotive reaction, first year students do not develop comparatively higher levels of alienation than the more advanced students. Therefore, the directional Hypothesis VIII must be rejected.

The present study allows for the investigation of the assumed inverse relationship between satisfaction and alienation. First year students completing their initial year of studies were selected for the testing of the relationship because of the potentially aroused sense of dissatisfaction, and possibly alienation, which could occur by the end of the first year.

TABLE 11

THE MANN-WHITNEY U TEST BETWEEN FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD YEAR LAW SCHOOL GROUPS ON THE UNIVERSITY ALIENATION SCALE

Alienation Scales	Group I Mean Rank	Group II Mean Rank	U	Z
Group I: First Year Pre-Test (N=32)	X	Group II: Second Year (N=44)		
Meaninglessness	36.84	39.70	651.00	-0.56
Powerlessness	36.22	40.16	631.00	-0.77
Social Estrangement	38.41	38.57	701.00	-0.03
Alienation (Total)	36.89	39.67	652.50	-0.54
Group I: First Year Pre-Test (N=32)	X	Group II: Third Year (N=35)		
Meaninglessness	35.09	33.00	525.00	-0.44
Powerlessness	32.47	35.40	511.00	-0.62
Social Estrangement	35.14	32.96	523.50	-0.46
Alienation (Total)	33.33	34.61	538.50	-0.27
Group I: Second Year (N=44)	X	Group II: Third Year (N=35)		
Meaninglessness	42.35	37.04	666.50	-1.03
Powerlessness	39.84	40.20	763.00	-0.07
Social Estrangement	41.11	38.60	721.00	-0.49
Alienation (Total)	41.10	38.61	721.50	-0.48

HYPOTHESIS IX: There is a significant positive relationship between dissatisfaction and alienation among students completing the first year of law school.

The Spearman rank correlation coefficient test reported in Table 12 indicates that powerlessness is positively related to a high sense of dissatisfaction for the First Year Post-Test Group (+ .35, $p < .05$) and the First Year Spring Group (+ .72, $p < .001$). Meaninglessness, Social Estrangement, and Alienation (Total) were moderately to highly related to overall dissatisfaction among the First Year Spring Group. The values resulting from the correlation coefficient support the proposed relationship between variables hypothesized above. Hypothesis IX is accepted.

This study attempts to discover possible relationship between student alienation and scholastic achievement. Inconsistent research results have been reported concerning the inverse relationship between learning, or scholastic achievement, and alienation.[1] It has been reasoned that since the more alienated students are less integrated into their educational institution, they may earn lower grades. The following hypothesis prompts the investigation of the relationship between scholastic achievement and alienation:

HYPOTHESIS X: There is a significant negative relationship between scholastic achievement and alienation among students completing the first year of law school.

A high score on the Social Estrangement scale was inversely related to a low grade point for both student groups completing the first year of law school

---

[1] See pp. 105-108 above.

TABLE 12

THE SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN SATISFACTION AND UNIVERSITY ALIENATION SCALE FOR GROUPS COMPLETING THE FIRST YEAR OF LAW SCHOOL

Group	N	University Alienation Scale			
		Meaning-lessness	Power-lessness	Social Estrange-ment	Alienation (Total)
First Year Post-Test	24	.30	.35*	.11	.30
First Year Spring	28	.48**	.72***	.59***	.77***

* $p < .05$, one-tailed.

** $p < .01$, one-tailed.

*** $p < .001$, one-tailed.

(See Table 13). First year students experiencing a sense of rejection, being unwanted or being alone were also likely to experience lower grade point averages than students not socially estranged (Post-Test: - .34, $p < .05$; Spring: - .32, $p < .05$). Non-significant correlation coefficients between grade point average and both powerlessness and alienation were still toward the negative direction. Since one alienation scale - Social Estrangement - was inversely related to grade point average, Hypothesis X was accepted.

Summary

This chapter presented the analysis of statistical results of the data collected through the administration of the LCQ, UAS, overall satisfaction index, and first year student grade point averages. The chapter was organized into three sections according to the order in which hypotheses were presented in Chapter III. After a brief introductory analysis of response levels, section one introduced the two hypotheses strictly limited to data resulting from the LCQ. The second section investigated the differences between groups on overall satisfaction and the correlation between the overall satisfaction index and learning climate. The third section of this chapter presented an analysis of the differences between groups on the alienation scales, correlations between alienation and learning climate, between alienation and satisfaction, and alienation and scholastic achievement. The final section also listed the results of proposed changes in alienation within the first year group as well as reporting on the possible differences in student groups based on tenure.

TABLE 13

THE SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITY ALIENATION SCALE AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT FOR GROUPS COMPLETING THE FIRST YEAR OF LAW SCHOOL

Group	N	University Alienation Scale			
		Meaning-lessness	Power-lessness	Social Estrange-ment	Alienation (Total)
First Year Post Test	24	-.22	-.11	-.34*	-.24
First Year Spring	28	.01	-.14	-.32*	-.18

* $p < .05$, one-tailed.

Results of the data analysis prompted the investigator to make the following decisions concerning the acceptance or rejection of the proposed hypotheses: Hypotheses I, III, VII, IX, and X were accepted. Hypotheses II, IV, V, VI and VIII were rejected.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study emerged from an interest in researching the human consequences developing from current legal training practices. After reviewing the legal education literature, it became apparent that an investigation of an institution's learning climate would divulge policies, practices, and procedures having direct affect on student satisfaction and alienation. A longitudinal and cross-sectional research design was chosen. The longitudinal design monitored changes in learning climate perceptions, student satisfaction, and alienation during the first year of legal education. The cross-sectional research approach provided an opportunity to observe the possibility of multiple climates, different satisfaction levels, and differences in alienation developed within each law school class. The investigation of significant association between variables revealed possible cause-effect relationships requiring further study to confirm the direction of the cause and effect.

Many of the hypotheses tested in this study were condensed propositions producing multiple interpretations. The conclusions made from the analysis of data are multifaceted. Such an exploratory investigation of a professional school generated as many questions to be answered as there were conclusions to be

drawn from the questions posed for study. In this chapter a summary of results will be made according to the functional grouping of hypotheses. Recommendations for future study will be discussed when the results of this report raise concerns for future investigation.

Hypotheses II, V, and VII investigated changes in learning climate, overall satisfaction, and alienation, respectively, among first year law students. Campbell and Stanley's Recurrent Institutional Cycle Design was selected to investigate possible changes from the beginning to the end of the first year of law school.

> HYPOTHESIS II: There is a significant difference in the measures of learning climate during the first year of law school.
>
> HYPOTHESIS V: There is a significant increase in dissatisfaction during the first year of law school.
>
> HYPOTHESIS VII: There is no significant difference in alienation scores during the first year of law school.

In order to confirm changes in perceptions or emotive reactions, the research design required consistent confirmation of change to be observed when comparing the First Year Pre-Test Group with itself during the post-test, with the First Year Spring Group completing the questionnaire only at the end of the school year and with the Second Year Group who had recently completed their first year of legal studies. If no significant changes were observed on all three of the comparisons, Hypothesis II and V had to be rejected and Hypothesis VII had to be accepted in the null form.

The lack of significant and consistent differences between groups on

learning climate measets reauired the rejection of Hypothesis II. Second year students felt that the Task Relationship with Faculty was more of an obstacle to a useful learning environment than the First Year Pre-Test Group. The First Year Spring Group was less concerned with the physical environment and desired less control over the method by which course material was presented than the First Year Pre-Test Group. A significant change was observed on the task relationship measet during the pre versus post-test comparison. A possible explanation for the inconsistent yet significant results was that the effects of testing heightened the new students' awareness of the learning climate at the beginning of the year. The processes of maturation and different histories as extraneous variables could have accounted for the difference between second year students and the First Year Pre-Test Group on the task relationship measet.

Hypothesis V was rejected even though a significant difference in satisfaction level was registered between second year students and the first year students tested at the beginning of the school year. The significant increase in dissatisfaction between the pre-test and the post-test was offset by no difference being found between the First Year Pre-Test Group and the First Year Spring Group. Once again the test-retest effects may have prompted an increase in dissatisfaction among the pre/post-test group.

With the exception of an increased sense of powerlessness among the pre/post-test group, no other changes in alienation were observed. The investigator accepted Hypothesis VII which proposed that there were no significant differences betweeen alienation scores during the first year of law school. The

effects of testing may, once again, explain the increase in powerlessness observed among the first year students at the end of the year.

The analysis of the data gathered to test Hypotheses II, V, and VII led the investigator to conclude that no change was observed in learning climate perceptions, in overall satisfaction with the learning process, or in alienation among first year law students. The results of the study required the researcher to underscore the impact that the initial semester of law school had on new students. Climate perceptions, overall satisfaction and feelings of alienation remained constant as observed at the beginning and ending of the first year. Fluctuation in students' perceptions and evaluations could have taken place between testing administrations. Further research is necessary to investigate the stability of perceptions, satisfaction levels and alienation scores. If initial impressions and reactions to law school were constant, it may be possible to predict a student's adjustment and academic success for the first year of law school.

Hypotheses I, III, and VIII investigated differences in learning climate perceptions, overall satisfaction, and student alienation, respectively, between law classes. Research reports were cited that indicated each generation of students may perceive a different organizational climate. As organizations influence the satisfaction levels of its members, a low degree of anticipated dissatisfaction was expected on the part of new students compared to a relatively high level of dissatisfaction on the part of previously enrolled students. Since previously enrolled students were expected to report relatively higher levels of dissatisfaction than first year students, it was reasoned that the advanced students

would also be more alienated than entering students. The following hypotheses were tested in order to investigate the effects of longevity on student perceptions and evaluations:

> HYPOTHESIS I: There is no significant difference between first, second, and third year law students at the beginning of the school year on each of the measures of learning climate.
>
> HYPOTHESIS III: There is a significant difference between first, second and third year law students at the beginning of the school year on a measurement of overall satisfaction with the learning process.
>
> HYPOTHESIS VIII: At the beginning of the school year, first year law students acknowledge significantly less alienation than either the second or third year students.

There was little evidence produced in this study to support the existance of multiple climates within a school of law. Hypothesis I, stated in null form, was accepted. Only on one measet -- Task Relationships with Faculty -- was there a significant difference in perception between first and second year students. First, second and third year students were in agreement on their perceptions of Course Material Presentation, Grading Process, Social Relationships with Faculty, and the Physical Environment. The analysis of data prompted the investigator to conclude that there was common agreement about the learning climate of the law school among all three student groups. Longevity did not result in more than one climate being experienced within the organization.

The question of different satisfaction levels between law school classes was raised through Hypothesis III. Organizations influence the satisfaction levels of its members. Research evidence on satisfaction indicates that various satisfac-

tion levels may exist within an organization. Length of college attendance has been found to be inversely related to satisfaction.

The results of this study confirmed the inverse relationship between length of attendance and student satisfaction. Hypothesis III was accepted. New law school students reported a significantly higher overall satisfaction level than either the second or third year students. Or, stated another way, second and third year students were significantly more dissatisfied than first year students.

An unexpected and interesting result appeared as satisfaction levels were compared between second and third year students. Second year students were more dissatisfied than third year students. Perhaps the successful completion of two years of law school allowed third year students to become more future oriented rather than be mainly concerned about the immediate task of completing the middle year of professional school.

Further research needs to address the following questions: Why are second year students more dissatisfied with the learning process than first and third year students? What effects does this higher dissatisfaction rate have on student achievement and attrition? Does the second year dissatisfaction level significantly drop when the class advances to the third year of study?

In this study alienation was understood as a sequential-developmental process brought about through a decline in the quality of one's relationship with a particular context. New members of an organization seldom have spent enough time with the organization for the disillusionment process to fully take place. Hypothesis VIII proposed that the new members of an organization, first year

students, would report significantly less alienation than either the second or third year participants.

An analysis of the research data revealed no significantly different alienation levels existing between first, second or third year law students. It was concluded that Hypothesis VIII should be rejected.

An analysis of alienation levels for each group revealed that alienation does exist, at least to some mild degree, within each law class. Considering the fact that alienation does exist along with the results of this study, further research is proposed. Future research should address the following questions: Do alienation levels change as first year students advance to succeeding years? Are individual alienation scores directly related to the probability of voluntarily withdrawing from school?

This study included exploratory hypotheses investigating relationships between student characteristics. Through the use of correlational data analysis, the investigation was able only to produce evidence that could support or disconfirm hypothesized relationships. Correlation studies provide a preliminary survey of hypotheses through which decisions may be made concerning the necessity of applying experimental techniques.

The relationship between learning climate and overall satisfaction with the learning process was explored through the following hypothesis:

> HYPOTHESIS IV: There is no significant relationship between learning climate and satisfaction for first, second and third year law students at the end of the academic year.

The First Year Post-Test Group and First Year Spring Group were also

included in the analysis along with the second and third year students. Data supporting the relationship between learning climate measets and satisfaction was found only among the groups completing the first year of legal studies. Data gathered from the First Year Post-Test Group and the First Year Spring Group provided evidence for the rejection of the null hypothesis. Course Material Presentation was positively related to overall satisfaction at the .01 level of significance for both the first year groups completing the initial year of training. The Task Relationship with Faculty measet was positively related to overall satisfaction among the post-test group ($r_s = .49$, $p < .01$) and for the spring administration group ($r_s = .60$, $p < .001$). A relatively large difference between actual versus desired control over the presentation of course work was positively related to a relatively high sense of dissatisfaction. Also, higher dissatisfaction scores were also associated with students' perceptions that their task relationships with faculty were obstacles to a useful learning environment.

The results of this study parallel the findings of Bowen and Kilmann. They discovered that significant relationships between learning climate and satisfaction were different depending upon the student group analyzed.[1] Also, they found that Task Relationship with Faculty and Course Material Presentation accounted for a disproportionate amount of variance in overall satisfaction.

Since the LCQ was designed to measure learning climate which affects the satisfaction of students, the investigator concluded that some evidence

---

[1]Bowen and Kilmann, "Learning Climate in Professional Schools," p. 76.

supported the proposed positive relationship. Hypothesis IV, stated in the null, was rejected. The investigator recommends that a more rigorous experimental investigation be undertaken in order to confirm the proposed direct affect of learning climate on satisfaction.

Research investigating the relationship between learning climate and student alienation have been seldom reported in the literature. The learning climate of an educational institution is not always capable of providing the means by which the student may achieve personal goals. If students perceive their expectations as being unrealizable without major personal reorientation, student alienation may develop. Hypothesis VI investigates correlates of student alienation within the context of the institutional learning climate:

> HYPOTHESIS VI: There is no significant relationship between learning climate and alienation for first, second and third year law students at the beginning of the academic year.

Significant correlations resulted between learning climate measets and alienation scales within each law class. A brief summary of findings and conclusions will follow. The results justify the rejection of Hypothesis VI.

For the First Year Pre-Test Group, all five climate measets were positively related to the Meaninglessness scale. Task Relationships with Faculty contributed to significant positive correlations with each of the alienation scales, especially with Powerlessness. Concern for Social Relationships with Faculty was expressed by the significant relationships with Meaninglessness and Social Estrangement.

The above results allow the investigator to draw some conclusions about

the first year students' initial perception-evaluation of the law school learning climate. Entering students are confused by the new learning climate. The demands of the environment require the student to make many personal adjustments or develop an increasing sense of meaninglessness. While becoming familiar with the new educational setting, the first year student desires meaningful interaction with faculty members. The new student's throughts of being alone, or even being unwanted is positively related both to social and task relationships with faculty members.

Second year subjects could be classified as moderately alienated. These students expressed similar concerns as their first year counterparts. Social Relationships with Faculty and Task Relationships with Faculty were positively related to each of the alienation scores. Meaninglessness, or the lack of clarity for personal decision-making, was highly related to the social relationships measet ($r_s = .47$, $p < .001$) and the Task Relationship with Faculty measet ($r_s = .68$, $p < .001$). It may be concluded that the continued sense of alienation among second year students was closely associated with the lack of quality contacts with faculty both in and out of class.

Third year students expressed a strong sense of Powerlessness. Each of the learning climate measets was significantly related to the subject's expressed inability to have some control over his educational future. These students who found the physical environment to be inadequate also directly related the physical environment to their lack of control over their final year of legal studies. Third year students were considered moderately alienated.

Hypothesis IX investigated the relationship between satisfaction and alienation among students completing the first year of law school. The directional nature of the hypothesis suggesting a positive relationship between dissatisfaction and alienation has been proposed in organizational theory and supported in research. The relationship was investigated within the legal education setting through the following hypothesis:

> HYPOTHESIS IX: There is a significant positive relationship between dissatisfaction and alienation among students completing the first year of law school.

The sense of Powerlessness was significantly related to student Dissatisfaction within both first year groups examined at the end of the first year of school. The relationships between Meaninglessness and Dissatisfaction and Alienation (Total) and Dissatisfaction approached significance for the First Year Post-Test Group. Meaninglessness, Social Estrangement, and Alienation (Total) were highly related to student Dissatisfaction among the First Year Spring Group tested only at the end of the initial year of law school. The data indicated that it was highly probable that if students became dissatisfied with the overall learning process a heightened sense of alienation would develop as well. Hypothesis IX was accepted.

The positive relationship between dissatisfaction and alienation found in this study allows the researcher to propose the need for an investigation of Stokols' sequential-developmental theory of alienation.[1] Stokols proposed that an organizational member experiences an irreversible cognitive change marking the

---

[1]Stokols, "Theory of Alienation," pp. 26-44.

transition from dissatisfaction to alienation from the organization.[1] Can the occurrence of irreversible cognitive change be observed and confirmed? What features of the learning climate contribute most highly to the students' disengagement from institutional involvement? Is there a critical period of time during the first year of law school when alienation is most likely to be confirmed? How does the individual student react to his environment after he becomes alienated? Answers to these questions may provide educational administrators with the information needed to prompt changes in the learning climate in order to reduce attrition and increase learning opportunities.

Hypothesis X investigated the association between alienation and scholastic achievement. Research confirmed that alienation and learning reciprocally effects the other. The following hypothesis was presented for study:

> HYPOTHESIS X: There is a significant negative relationship between scholastic achievement and alienation among students completing the first year of law school.

The analysis of data confirmed a negative association between Social Estrangement and scholastic achievement within both first year groups examined at the end of the first year of law school. Students who reported a relatively higher sense of being alone, unwanted or feeling rejected tended to have a lower cumulative grade point average at the end of their first year of law school.

Meaninglessness, Powerlessness and Alienation (Total) were not significantly related to scholastic achievement; however, the general direction of the relationships was negative.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 37.

Since one alienation scale, Social Estrangement, was significantly related to scholastic achievement and the direction of the non-significant correlations was negative, Hypothesis X was accepted. Alienation and cumulative grade point average were negatively associated.

Does a sense of alienation affect academic achievement? The answer to this question lies beyond the scope of this study. Research has been reported which suggests that alienation precedes and contributes to lower academic achievement. Further experimental research is necessary in order to confirm the direct affect of alienation on academic achievement while controlling for age, ability, and commitment to legal studies.

Conclusion

The thrust of this study was to thoroughly investigate the learning climate of a law school and measure the emotive reactions of its members to their environment. The investigation of learning climate was only as comprehensive as the measuring instrument allowed. Even though the Learning Climate Questionnaire revealed highly informative information about the climate of the institution, a further expansion of climate variables is needed. The development of an instrument primarily for use in law schools could force attention on the unique characteristics of legal training centers. Such an instrument would provide more specific information thereby enabling faculty and administrators to make more informed discussions affecting student retention and learning.

It was hoped that a study of a law school would make some small con-

tribution to the literature of the organizational climate of service-oriented single-purpose educational institutions. This study has raised many questions to be explored. Additional research is needed in order to gain a more comprehensive knowledge of the law school learning climate, the personal accommodations required of students, and the proposed direct affect of learning climate on student functioning. It was further hoped that this study will be fruitful beginning for those in the future who have similar research interests and concerns.

APPENDIX A

Correspondence Requesting Permission to Use

Research Instruments in Study

2321 N.W. 25th Street
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
May 5, 1976

Dr. Donald D. Bowan
Graduate School of Business
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260

Dear Dr. Bowen:

I have recently read your study entitled "Developing A Comparative Measure of the Learning Climate in Professional Schools" published in the Journal of Applied Psychology. I have been researching the literature for an appropriate instrument for use in my doctoral dissertation, and I was favorably impressed with the utility of your Learning Climate Questionnaire.

I am a Ph.D. candidate in general administration at the University of Oklahoma. My committee chairman, Dr. Thomas Wiggins, Associate Professor of Human Relations and Education, has encouraged me to request a copy of the Learning Climate Questionnaire as well as any relevant data that has been generated from the instrument's use subsequent to the publication of the initial report.

I have received tenative approval from my committee chairman to study the climate of a law school. Your article included information on a nonbusiness professional school. Would you please inform me concerning the type of nonbusiness school used in your study?

Therefore, I would be very grateful if you would send me a copy of the Learning Climate Questionnaire and grant permission for its use in my docoral dissertation.

Sincerely,

G. Kendell Rice

2321 N.W. 25th Street
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 74103
May 8, 1976

Dr. Harold J. Burbach
School of Education
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Dear Dr. Burbach:

In a recent review of the literature on alienation in higher education, I read your study jointly authored with Charles Babbit and Myron Thompson published in the January 1975 volume of the Journal of College Student Personnel. This article, and your published developmental study, introduced me to your University Alienation Scale. Your publications have heightened my interest in the use of a contextual measure of alienation in the approaching research for my doctoral dissertation.

I am a Ph.D. candidate in general administration at the University of Oklahoma. In discussing the proposed research with my committee chairman, Dr. Thomas Wiggins, Associate Professor of Education, I was encouraged to write and request a copy of the scale.

I am interested in studying the relationship between alienation and organizational climate as perceived by law students. If you have information concerning the use of your University Alienation Scale in studies related to graduate or legal education, I would appreciate knowing about them.

Therefore, I would be very grateful if you would send me a copy of the scale and grant permission for its use in my doctoral dissertation.

Sincerely,

G. Kendell Rice

APPENDIX B

Correspondence Granting Permission to Use the

Learning Climate Questionnaire

and the

University Alienation Scale

in the Proposed Study

The University of Tulsa
600 South College Ave.
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74104
(918) 939-6351

College of Business Administration
Management and Marketing

May 18, 1976

Mr. G. Kendall Rice
2371 N.W. 25th Street
Oklahoma City OK 73107

Dear Mr. Rice:

Your letter of May 5th, addressed to my former address at Pitt, arrived today. Clearly that is the long way around.

I'm enclosing a copy of the LCQ per your request. We have done a follow-up longitudinal study at "Business School IA" which yielded the same factor structure with all new respondents. The problem has been just to getting to writing up the results.

In regard to your using the LCQ, Kilmann and I have generally said "OK" for research purposes. We'd expect a write-up of your results if you do use it. It will help us to build a data bank. There are a couple of other studies presently being pursued at Temple U. and the U. of Toronto.

The "non-business professional school" in our first article was a law school--a fact which we do not wish to become general knowledge in order out of respect for the wishes of that school. Knowing this may be important to your study. If you do study a law school, I'd recommend that you get a pretty good idea of what happens in terms of socialization processes. That seemed to explain a lot of our data.

Good luck on your research, and give me a call if I can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

Donald D. Bowen
Associate Professor of Management

DDB:mc

Encl. (1)

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
THE CURRY MEMORIAL SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA 22903

Department of Foundations of Education

May 13, 1976

Mr. G. Kendell Rice
2321 N.W. 25th Street
Oklahoma City, Oklahama 73107

Dear Mr. Rice:

I'm sending you a copy of the University Alienation Scale with my permission to use it in connection with your dissertation research. Also, I am unaware of its use involving studies related to graduate or legal education.

Gool luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Harold J. Burbach

Harold J. Burbach
Associate Professor

HJB/ad

Enclosure

APPENDIX C

Law School Questionnaire

LAW SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire contains two parts. Part I of this questionnaire was originally designed at the University of Pittsburg to measure the learning environment of professional schools. Considerable research at Pitt and at other schools indicates that it does provide useful information about the impact of the school on the students which can be helpful in improving the educational process. Part II seeks information concerning your attitudes about law school.

Please do not write your name on this questionnaire. When you have completed it, please seal it in the enclosed envelope. Return the questionnaire to the Admissions and Records Office in the School of Law and place it in the receptacle provided. Please sign your name to the roster after you have turned in the questionnaire so that you will not be sent a letter of reminder to complete the survey.

If you have any questions about how the data are to be used or reported, please ask before filling out the questionnaire. You may call the researcher during the day at 525-5411, extension 2314, or in the evenings at 525-5426.

Your thoughtful and objective responses to the questions will be sincerely appreciated.

Will you please provide the following information to assist in the statistical analysis:

Sex: _____ Male _____ Female

Number of credit hours of current enrollment _____

Number of credit hours completed at end of current semester _____

I am enrolled in the _____ Day Division _____ Night Division

PART I

LEARNING CLIMATE

Please indicate your viewpoints by placing a check mark on the appropriate space for each item.

A. To what extent do you feel influential in determining the following in the law school program?

	not at all	not very	somewhat	moderately	quite	very	extremely
1. The material that the instructor presents.							
2. The manner in which class material is presented by the instructor.							
3. The use of audio/visual and other classroom aides (e.g. cases).							
4. The choice of which courses to take.							
5. The choice of instructor for a course.							
6. The type of graded assignments (e.g. problem sets, theory paper).							
7. The topic of graded assignments.							
8. The content and type of in-class exams.							
9. The grading process in quantitative courses.							
10. The grading process in qualitative courses.							

B. To what extent would you want to be influential in determining the following in the law school program?

11. The material that the instructor presents.							
12. The manner in which class material is presented by the instructor.							
13. The use of audio/visual and other classroom aids (e.g. cases).							
14. The choice of which courses to take.							
15. The choice of instructor for a course.							
16. The type of graded assignments. (e.g. problem sets, theory paper).							

PART I (cont.)

		not at all	not very	somewhat	moderately	quite	very	extremely
17.	The topic of graded assignments.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
18.	The content and type of in-class exams.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
19.	The grading process in quantitative courses.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
20.	The grading process in qualitative courses.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———

C. To what extent have you experienced the following as obstacles to a meaningful and useful learning environment?

21.	Size of classes.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
22.	Faculty do not know students by name.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
23.	Students do not feel free to address faculty by their first name.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
24.	Lack of social activities with faculty.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
25.	Faculty are not easily accessible outside class.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
26.	Faculty do not seem to value student opinions and experiences.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
27.	Faculty do not treat students as willing to learn.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
28.	The presence of the current grading system.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
29.	Faculty seem more interested in activities besides teaching.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
30.	Students do not feel they can be open with faculty.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
31.	Faculty do not know students by first name.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
32.	Lack of audio/visual aids.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
33.	Lack of conference rooms.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
34.	The physical design of classrooms.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
35.	Design of student lounge.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———
36.	General apathy of fellow students.	———	———	———	———	———	———	———

PART II

STUDENT ATTITUDES

Please check the appropriate blank which most accurately reflects your opinion about this law school.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	The size and complexity of this law school make it very difficult for a student to know where to turn.					
2.	It is only wishful thinking to believe that one can really influence what happens at this law school.					
3.	Classes at this law school are so regimented that there is little room for the personal needs and interests of the student.					
4.	The faculty has too much control over the lives of the students at this law school.					
5.	The bureaucracy of this law school has me confused and bewildered.					
6.	I feel that I am an integral part of this law school community.					
7.	Things have become so complicated at this law school that I really don't understand what is going on.					
8.	I seldom feel "lost" or "alone" at this law school.					
9.	Students are just so many cogs in the machinery of this law school.					
10.	I don't have as many friends as I would like at this law school.					
11.	Most of the time I feel that I have an effective voice in the decisions regarding my destiny at this law school.					
12.	Life at this law school is so chaotic that the student really doesn't know which way to turn.					

PART II (cont.)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
13. Many students at this law school are lonely and unrelated to their fellow human beings.					
14. More and more, I feel helpless in the face of what's happening at this law school today.					
15. There are forces affecting me at this law school that are so complex and confusing that I find it difficult to effectively make decisions.					
16. I can't seem to make much sense out of my law school experience.					
17. My experience at this law school has been devoid of any meaningful relationships.					
18. The law school administration has too much control over my life at this law school.					
19. This law school is run by a few people in power and there is not much the student can do about it.					
20. The student has little chance of protecting his personal interests when they conflict with those of this law school.					
21. In spite of the fast pace of this law school, it is easy to make close friends that you can really count on.					
22. My life is so confusing at this law school that I hardly know what to expect from day to day.					
23. In this fast- changing law school, with so much conflicting information available, it is difficult to think clearly about many issues.					
24. This law school is just too big and impersonal to provide for the individual student.					

APPENDIX D

Memo Requesting Permission to Survey Law Students

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dean Sylas Lyman

FROM: G. Kendell Rice

SUBJECT: Request of permission to study law student perceptions and attitudes for the required research in a doctoral dissertation.

Dear Dean Lyman:

I have contacted President Dolphys Whitten concerning the possibility of conducting the research for my doctoral dissertation on the learning climate and student attitudes in the School of Law. He has suggested that I discuss this matter with you and seek your approval.

I plan to mail questionnaires to a selected group of students from each law class. The questionnaire contains two parts. Part I seeks students' perceptions of the learning climate and Part II requests information concerning students' feelings of alienation.

This study is planned to take place from September 6 to September 17, 1976. During this phase of the study approximately 150 questionnaires will be mailed. A post-test of first year students will take place April 4-15, 1977, in order to measure changes in perceptions and attitudes.

I shall need your assistance. I would appreciate your writing a letter of endorsement of the study so that it may be reproduced and mailed with the questionnaire. I would like to discuss this study with you personally and shall be calling for an appointment.

APPENDIX E

Letter of Endorsement from the Acting Dean

of the School of Law

Oklahoma City University

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73106
(405) 525-5411

School of Law



September 8, 1976

Dear OCU Law Students:

I have reviewed and approved the study presently being undertaken by Mr. G. Kendell Rice, a staff member at Oklahoma City University. He is making the study in partial fulfillment of the Doctor of Philosophy degree. He has randomly selected a group of students in the School of Law to complete a questionnaire. The questionnaire seeks information concerning your attitudes and perceptions about your experience in law school.

Only the results of the survey will be reported to my office. I believe that the information gathered will be helpful in our current self-study efforts. The information gathered on attitudes of students enrolled in the Oklahoma City University School of Law is a vital part of the review process.

Please take the time to reflect on your experience as a student in the School of Law and thoughtfully complete the questionnaire.

Sincerely yours,

Silas R. Lyman
Acting Dean

APPENDIX F

Cover Letter for Law School Questionnaire

2321 N.W. 25th Street
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73107

Mr. Law Student
Address
City, State Zip

Dear Mr. Student:

I have recently received permission from Dr. Dolphus Whitten, President of Oklahoma City University, and Silas R. Lyman Acting Dean of the School of Law, to study the learing climate of the law school and the attitudes of law students. This study is being conducted in partial fulfillment for the doctoral degree in General Administration.

Your name was recently selected from your law school classification, and I am requesting your assistance in providing a personal reaction to your learning experience in the Oklahoma City University School of Law. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential. No student's answers will every be personally identified. Only final results will be given to President Whitten and Dean Lyman.

Would you please complete the enclosed questionnaire, seal it in the envelope provided, and return it to the Office of Admissions and Records in the School of Law. Please sign your name on the paper provided so that I will know who has completed the questionnaire.

Thank you for your assistance. If you have any questions concerning this survey or its use, please call me during the day at 525-5411 or in the evenings at 525-5426.

Sincerely,

G. Kendell Rice

APPENDIX G

Reminder Postcard for Fall Administration

September 20, 1976

Dear_____:

I would like to express my appreciation in advance for your assistance in completing the Law School Questionnaire that was recently mailed to you. Response to the survey has been good, but I still need your personal reactions to your law school experience.

As a personal favor, would you please complete the questionnaire and return it to the OCU School of Law Office of Admissions and Records.

Thanks for your cooperation and assistance.

Signed
G. Kendell Rice

APPENDIX H

Cover Letter to First-Year Post-Test Group

2321 N.W. 25th Street
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73107
April 4, 1977

Mr. Law Student
Address City, State Zip

Dear Mr. Student:

Last September I received permission from Dean Lyman, Oklahoma City University School of Law, to conduct a survey of law student attitudes and perceptions. The study is being conducted in partial fulfillment for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in General Administration.

I greatly appreciate your participation in completing the questionnaire during the Fall Semester and have one final favor to ask. Several first-year students expressed an inability to accurately respond to some questions since they had attended law classes only two weeks. For this reason as well as an interest in possible changes in attitudes and perceptions, I am requesting your indulgence in completing the questionnaire once again.

Your responses will be kept strictly confidential. No student's answers will ever be personally identified. Would you please complete the enclosed survey, seal it in the envelope provided, and return it to the School of Law Admissions and Records Office. Please sign your name on the paper provided so that I will know who has completed the questionnaire.

Realizing the many demands on your time, let me express in advance my appreciation for your willingness to take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire. If you have any questions concerning this survey or its use, please call me during the day at 521-5294 or in the evenings at 525-5426.

Sincerely,

G. Kendell Rice

APPENDIX I

Cover Letter to First-Year Spring Group

2321 N.W. 25th Street
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73107
April 4, 1977

Mr. Law Student
Address
City, State Zip

Dear Mr. Student:

At the beginning of the Fall Semester, I received approval from Dean Lyman, Acting Dean of the School of Law, to study the learning climate of the OCU School of Law and the attitudes of law students. The study is being conducted in partial fulfillment for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in General Administration.

Your name was selected to participate in the final evaluation for the Spring Semester 1977. I am requesting your assistance in providing a personal reaction to your learning experience in the Oklahoma City University School of Law. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential. No student's answers will ever be personally identified. Only final results will be given to Dean Lyman.

Would you please complete the enclosed questionnaire, seal it in the envelope provided, and return it to the School of Law, Admissions and Records Office. Please sign your name on the paper provided so that I will know who has completed the survey.

Realizing the many demands on your time, let me express in advance my appreciation for your willingness to take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire. If you have any questions concerning this survey or its use, please call me during the day at 521-5294 or in the evenings at 525-5426.

Sincerely,

G. Kendell Rice

APPENDIX J

Reminder Postcard for Spring Administration

April 20, 1977

Dear _____:

Two weeks ago I mailed a Law School Questionnaire to you and 43 other OCU law students. As of this date, less than one-half of the surveys have been returned to the Law School, Office of Admissions and Records.

Since the information about law student attitudes is being gathered for my doctoral dissertation, your responses and participation are vital to the project.

I NEED YOUR HELP!

I realize you will soon be studying for final Exams and your spare time is limited, but I would greatly appreciate your assistance by taking just a few minutes to complete the survey. I am greatly indebted to you for your participation.

Sincerely,

G. Kendell Rice

APPENDIX K

The Mean, Standard Deviation, Median and Range of Scores on the Learning Climate Questionnaire, Satisfaction Index and University Alienation Scale by Law School Group

TABLE 14

THE MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, MEDIAN AND RANGE OF SCORES ON THE LEARNING CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE, SATISFACTION INDEX, AND UNIVERSITY ALIENATION SCALE BY LAW SCHOOL GROUP

	Learning Climate Questionnaire					Sat. Index	University Alienation Scale			
Measurement	Course Material Presentation	Grading Process	Social Relationship with Faculty	Task Relationship with Faculty	Physical Environment	Overall Satisfaction with Learning Process	Meaninglessness	Powerlessness	Social Estrangement	Alienation (Total)
First Year Pre-Test (N=32)										
Mean	6.25	5.03	9.84	10.66	11.81	13.44	18.06	26.03	17.37	61.47
Standard Deviation	3.13	4.00	4.68	5.25	5.84	3.95	4.81	5.11	3.63	11.55
Median	6.50	4.21	9.50	8.50	12.50	13.17	17.07	25.50	17.17	60.00
Range	14.00	12.00	19.00	19.00	18.00	16.00	25.00	23.00	16.00	55.00

TABLE 14 - Continued

Measurement	Learning Climate Questionnaire: Course Material Presentation	Grading Process	Social Relationship with Faculty	Task Relationship with Faculty	Physical Environment	Sat. Index: Overall Satisfaction with Learning Process	University Alienation Scale: Meaninglessness	Powerlessness	Social Estrangement	Alienation (Total)
First Year Post-Test (N=24)										
Mean	7.29	5.71	11.83	15.08	12.21	15.33	19.50	28.00	17.08	64.96
Standard Deviation	4.38	3.39	6.89	6.58	4.52	4.13	4.70	5.19	3.33	10.87
Median	7.00	6.17	10.50	15.50	12.17	15.00	18.25	26.50	16.90	60.50
Range	17.00	10.00	21.00	21.00	17.00	19.00	19.00	19.00	11.00	36.00

TABLE 14 - Continued

Measurement	Learning Climate Questionnaire					Sat. Index	University Alienation Scale			
	Course Material Presentation	Grading Process	Social Relationship	Task Relationship With Faculty	Physical Environment	Overall Satisfaction with Learning Process	Meaninglessness	Powerlessness	Social Estrangement	Alienation (Total)
First Year Spring (N=28)										
Mean	4.04	4.57	8.68	12.10	8.89	13.43	17.61	24.89	16.32	58.82
Standard Deviation	3.81	4.02	5.46	7.14	5.53	4.37	5.04	6.10	3.50	12.15
Median	3.50	4.50	7.00	10.00	8.00	13.50	16.36	25.00	16.83	57.50
Range	16.00	12.00	19.00	25.00	18.00	18.00	23.00	26.00	13.00	52.00

TABLE 14 - Continued

Measurement	Learning Climate Questionnaire					Sat. Index	University Alienation Scale			
	Course Material Presentation	Grading Process	Social Relationship with Faculty	Task Relationship with Faculty	Physical Environment	Overall Satisfaction with Learning Process	Meaninglessness	Powerlessness	Social Estrangement	Alienation (Total)
Second Year (N=44)										
Mean	6.00	5.09	10.93	15.27	14.09	16.57	18.48	27.27	17.36	63.39
Standard Deviation	3.60	3.01	5.57	6.66	4.65	3.65	5.26	7.09	4.10	13.84
Median	5.64	5.58	9.33	13.50	14.75	16.00	18.50	26.93	17.50	60.50
Range	18.00	12.00	23.00	27.00	18.00	17.00	24.00	29.00	18.00	59.00

TABLE 14 - Continued

Measurement	Learning Climate Questionnaire					Sat. Index	University Alienation Scale			
	Course Material Presentation	Grading Process	Social Relationship with Faculty	Task Relationship with Faculty	Physical Environment	Overall Satisfaction with Learning Process	Meaninglessness	Powerlessness	Social Estrangement	Alienation (Total)
	Third Year (N=35)									
Mean	5.74	5.06	9.60	12.71	12.06	15.43	17.69	27.63	16.97	62.29
Standard Deviation	3.58	3.82	4.92	6.20	5.51	3.67	4.28	7.15	3.60	12.19
Median	6.12	5.57	7.94	12.57	12.00	14.75	16.75	25.33	16.43	61.00
Range	14.00	12.00	18.00	28.00	18.00	20.00	18.00	30.00	20.00	55.00

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aiken, Michael and Hage, Jerald. "Organizational Alienation; a Comparative analysis." American Sociological Review 31 (August 1966) :496-507.

Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1957.

_____. "Some Problems of Conceptualizing Organizational Climate: A Case Study of a Bank." Administrative Science Quarterly 2 (March 1958) :501-520.

Astin, Alexander W. "Classroom Environment in Different Fields of Study." Journal of Educational Psychology 56 (October 1965) :275-282.

Astin, Alexander W. and Holland, John L. "The Environmental Assessment Technique: A Way to Measure College Environments." Journal of Educational Psychology 52 (December 1961) :308-316.

Atkinson, John W. A Theory of Achievement Motivation. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1964.

Babbitt, Charles E.; Burbach, Harold J.; and Thompson, III, Myron A. "Organizational Alienation Among Black College Students: A Comparison of Three Educational Settings." Journal of College Student Personnel 16 (January 1975) :53-56.

Bacharach, Samuel B. and Aiken, Michael. "The Impact of Alienation, Meaninglessness, and Meritocracy on Supervision and Subordinate Satisfaction." Social Forces 57 (March 1979) :853-870.

Baird, Leonard L. "Focusing on Measures of College Environments." The College Board Review 86 (Winter 1972-73) :3-4, 34-38.

Berdie, Ralph F. "Prediction of College Achievement and Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology 28 (June 1944) :239-245.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - Continued

Bickford, Hugh L. and Neal, Arthur G. "Alienation and Social Learning: A Study of Students in a Vocational Training Center." Sociology of Education 42 (Spring 1969) :141-153.

Bowen, Donald D. and Kilmann, Ralph H. "Developing A Comparative Measure of the Learning Climate in Professional Schools." Journal of Applied Psychology 60 (February 1975) :71-79.

Bray, Douglas W.; Campbell, Richard J.; and Grant, Donald L. Formative Years in Business. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974.

Burbach, Harold J. "The Development of a Contextual Measure of Alienation." Pacific Sociological Review 15 (April 1972) :225-234.

Campbell, Donald T. and Stanley, Julian C. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1966.

Campbell, John P.; Dunnette, Marvin; Lawler, III, Edward; and Weick, Jr., Karl. Behavior Performance and Effectiveness (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970).

Clark, John P. "Measuring Alienation in a Social System." American Sociological Review 24 (December 1959) :849-852.

Cooper, Joseph H. "The Law School Way." Journal of Legal Education 27 (1975) :268-292.

Dean, Dwight G. "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement." American Sociological Review 26 (October 1961) :753-757.

Dieterly, Duncan L. and Schneider, Benjamin. "The Effects of Organizational Environment on Perceived Power and Climate: A Laboratory Study." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 11 (June 1974) :316-337.

Drexler, J., John A. "Organizational Climate: Its Homogeneity Within Organizations." Journal of Applied Psychology 62 (February 1977) :38-42.

Dunnette, Marvin D. Personnel Selection and Placement. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole, 1966.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - Continued

Dunnette, Marvin D.; Campbell, John P.; and Hakel, M.D. "Factors Contributing to Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction in Six Occupational Groups." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 2 (1967) :143-174.

Durkheim, Emile. Suicide. New York: Free Press, 1951. Originally published, 1897.

Ephraim, Harold M. "From Alienation and Anomie." In Alienation: A Casebook, pp. 99-110. Edited by David J. Burrows and Frederick R. Lapides. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1969.

Etzioni, Amitai. "Basic Human Needs, Alienation and Inauthenticity," American Sociological Review 33 (December 1968) :87-885.

_____. "Organizational Control Structure." In Handbook of Organizations, pp. 650-677. Edited by James G. March. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965.

Evan, William M. "Hierarchical Alienation, Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness," Human Relations 30 (1977) :77-94.

Field, Hubert S.; Holley, William H.; and Armenakis, Achilles A. "Graduate Students' Satisfaction with Graduate Education: Intrinsic Versus Extrinsic Factors." The Journal of Experimental Education 43 (Winter 1974) :8-15.

Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

Feuer, Lewis. "From What is Alienation: The Career of a Concept." In Alienation: A Case Book, pp. 78-98. Edited by David J. Burrows and Frederick R. Lapides. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1969.

Forehand, Garlie A. "On the Interaction of Persons and Organizations." In Organizational Climate: Exploration of a Concept, pp. 65-82. Edited by Renato Tagiuri and George H. Litwin. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968.

Forehand, Garlie A. and Gilmer, B. von Haller. "Environmental Variation in Studies of Organizational Behavior." Psychological Bulletin 62 (December 1964) :361-382.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - Continued

Friedlander, Frank and Margulies, Newton. "Multiple Impacts of Organizational Climate and Individual Value Systems upon Job Satisfaction." Personnel Psychology 22 (Summer 1969) :171-183.

Fromm, Erich. The Sane Society. New York: Harper Publishing Company, 1946.

Glass, Gene V. and Stanley, Julian C. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Gregg, Wayne E. "Several Factors Affecting Graduate Student Satisfaction," Journal of Higher Education 43 (June 1972) :483-498.

Gurin, Patricia; Gurin, Gerald; Lao, Rosina C.; and Beattie, Muriel. "Control in the Motivational Dynamics of Negro Youth," Journal of Social Issues 25 (Summer 1979) :29-53.

Hall, Douglas T. and Schneider, Benjamin. Organizational Climates and Careers: The Work Lives of Priests. New York: Simon Press, 1973.

Hearn, James J. "Alienation: Another Administrative Agony." Contemporary Education 45 (Winter 1974) :255-280.

Herzberg, Fredrick; Mausner, G.; and Snyderman, Barbara B. The Motivation to Work 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.

Holian, Jr., John. "Alienation and Social Awareness Among College Students," The Sociological Quarterly 13 (Winter 1972) :114-125.

Hull, C. Hadlai and Nie, Norman H. SPSS Update: New Procedures and Facilities for Releases 7 and 8. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1979.

Insel, Paul M. and Moos, Rudolf H. "Psychological Environments Expanding the Scope of Human Ecology." American Psychologist 29 (March 1974) :186-194.

James, Lawrence R. and Jones, Allan P. "Organizational Climate: A Review of Theory and Research," Psychological Bulletin 80 (December 1974) :1096-1112.

Johnstone, Quintin. "Student Discontent and Educational Reform in Law Schools," Journal of Legal Education 23 (1971) :255-275.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - Continued

Johnston, H. Russell. "A New Conceptualization of Source of Organizational Climate." Administrative Science Quarterly 21 (March 1976) :95-103.

Kahn, Robert L. and Rosenthal, Robert A. Organizational Stress. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Kemper, Theodore D. "Reference Groups, Socialization, and Achievement." American Sociological Review 33 (February 1968) :31-45.

Kerr, Clark. The Uses of the University. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Kolstoe, Ralph H. Introduction to Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. revised ed. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1973.

Korman, Abraham K. "Environmental Ambiguity and Locus of Control as Interactive Influences on Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology 55 (August 1971) :339-342.

Landy, Frank J. "An Opponent Process Theory of Job Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology 63 (October 1978) :533-547.

Lawler III, Edward E. Motivation in Work Organizations. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1973.

Lewin, Kurt. Field Theory in Social Science. Edited by Dorwin Cartwright. New York: Harper Publishing Co., 1951.

Lewin, Kurt.; Lippitt, Ronald; and White, Ralph K. "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created 'Social Climates'." Journal of Social Psychology 10 (May 1939) :271-299.

Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

Lippitt, Ronald and White, Ralph K. "An Experimental Study of Leadership and Group Life.: In Readings in Social Psychology, pp. 496-511. Edited by Theodore M. Newcomb and Eugene L. Hartley. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - Contined

Litwin, George H. "Climate and Behavior Theory," In Organizational Climate: Exploration of a Concept, pp. 35-61. Edited by Renato Tagiuri and George H. Litwin, Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968.

Litwin, George H. and Stringer, Jr., Robert A. Motivation and Organizational Climate. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968.

Lokitz, Barbara D. and Sprandel, Hazel Z. "The First Year: A Look at the Freshman Experience." Journal of College Student Personnel 17 (July 1976) :274-279.

Mannheim, Karl. Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1950.

Marx, Karl. Early Writings, Translated and Edited by T. B. Bottomore. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974. Originally published, 1844.

McClelland, David C. The Achieving Society. Princeton: D. van Nostrand Company, 1961.

McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.

Meile, Richard L. "Performance and Adjustment of First Year Law Students." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, 1961.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glenco, Illinois: Free Press, 1957.

Middleton, Russell. "Alienation, Race and Education," American Sociological Review 28 (December 1963) :973-977.

Miles, Michael W. "Student Alienation in the U.S. Higher Education Industry." Politics and Society 4 (1974) :311-342.

Mizruchi, Ephraim H. "From Alienation and Anomie." In Alienation: A Casebook, pp. 99-110. Edited by David J. Burrows and Frederick R. Lapides. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1969.

Murray, Henry A. Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - Continued

Nettler, Gwynn. "A Measure of Alienation." American Sociological Review 22 (December 1975) :670-677.

Nie, Norman H.; Hull, C.H.; Jenkins, J. G.; Steinbrenner, K.; and Bent, D.H. SPSS Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Norusis, M.J. SPSS Statistical Algorithms Release 8.0 Chicago: Computer Software for Data Analysis, 1979.

Olsen, Marvin E. The Process of Social Organization. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Organ, Dennis W. and Greene, Charles N. "Role Ambiguity, Locus of Control, and Work Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology 59 (February 1974) :101-102.

Pace, C. Robert. "College Environments." In Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 4th ed. London: MacMillan, 1969.

Pace, C. Robert and Stern, George G. "An Approach to the Measurement of Psychological Characteristics of College Environments," Journal of Educational Psychology 49 (1958) :269-277.

Parsons, Talcott and Platt, Gerald M. "Age, Social Structure, and Socialization in Higher Education." Sociology of Education 21 (Winter 1970) :1-37.

Patton, Michael J. "The Student, the Situation, and Performance During the First Year of Law School." Journal of Legal Education 21 (1968) :10-19.

Payne, Roy L. and Mansfield, Roger. "Relationships of Perceptions of Orgnizational Climate to Organizational Structure, Context, and Hierarchical Position." Administrative Science Quarterly 18 (December 1973) :515-526.

Payne, Roy L. and Pugh, Derek S. "Organizational Structure and Climate." In Handbook of Industrial-Organizational Psychology, pp. 1125-1173. Edited by Marvin D. Dunnette. Chicago: Rand-McNally & Company, 1975.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - Continued

Porter, Lyman W. and Lawler III, Edward E. "Properties of Organizational Structure in Relation to Job Attitudes and Job Behavior." Psychological Bulletin 64 (July 1965) :31-37.

Pritchard, Robert D. and Karasich, Bernard W. "The Effects of Organizational Climate on Managerial Job Performance and Job Satisfaction." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 9 (February 1973) :126-146.

Schmidt, DuMont K. and Sedlacek, William E. "Variables Related to University Student Satisfaction," Journal of College Student Personnel 13 (May 1972) :233-238.

Schneider, Benjamin. "Organizational Climates: An Essay." Personnel Psychology 28 (Winter 1975) :447-479.

_____. "Organizational Climate: Individual Preferences and Organizational Realities." Journal of Applied Psychology 56 (June 1972) :211-217.

_____. "The Perception of Organizational Climate: The Customer's View." Journal of Applied Psychology 57 (June 1973) :248-256.

Schneider, Benjamin and Bartlett, C. J. "Individual Differences and Organizational Climate II: Measurement of Organizational Climate by the Multi-Trait, Multi-Rater Matrix." Personnel Psychology 23 (Winter 1970) :493-512.

Schneider, Benjamin and Hall, Douglas T. "Toward Specifying the Concept of Work Climate: A Study of Roman Catholic Diocesan Priests." Journal of Applied Psychology 56 (December 1972) :447-455.

Schneider, Benjamin Schneider and Snyder, Robert A. "Some Relationships Between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Climate." Journal of Applied Psychology 60 (June 1975) :318-328.

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

Seltiz, Claire; Wrightsman, Lawrence S.; and Cook, Stuart W. Research Methods in Social Relations. 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - Continued

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Spady, William G. "The Authority System of the School and Student Unrest: A Theoretical Exploration." In Uses of the Sociology of Education: Seventy-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Pt. 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Starr, Ann; Betz, Ellen L.; and Menne, John. "Difference in College Student Satisfaction: Academic Dropouts, Nonacademic Dropouts, and Nondropouts." Journal of Counseling Psychology 19 (July 1972) :318-322.

Stokols, Daniel. "Toward a Psychological Theory of Alienation." Psychological Review 82 (January 1975) :26-44.

Tagiuri, Renato. "The Concept of Organizational Climate." In Organizational Climate: Exploration of a Concept, pp. 10-32. Edited by Renato Tagiuri and George H. Litwin. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968.

Tagiuri, Renato and Litwin, George h. eds. Organizational Climate: Exploration of a Concept. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968.

Tannenbaum, Arnold S. ed. Control in Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968.

Taylor, James B. "Law School Stress and the Deformation Professionelle." Journal of Legal Education 27 (1975) :251-267.

Thibaut, John W. and Kelley, Harold H. The Social Psychology of Groups, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959.

Thistlethwaite, Donald L. "College Press and Student Achievement." Journal of Educational Psychology 50 (1959) :183-191.

Vaughan, C. Edwin. "The Relationship Between Student Alienation and Participation in Extracurricular Activities." Journal of College Student Personnel 13 (January 1972) :31-38.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - Continued

Vroom, Victor H. and Deci, Edward L. "The Stability of Post Decisional Dissonance: A Follow-Up Study of the Job Attitudes of Business School Graduates." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 6 (January 1971) :36-49.

Wanous, John P. "An Experimental Test of Job Attraction Theory in an Organizational Setting." Ph.D dissertation, Yale University, 1972.

_____. "Organizational Entry: From Naive Expectations to Realistic Beliefs." Journal of Applied Psychology 61 (February 1976) :22-29.

Wagner, Eldon L. "The Concept of Alienation: A Critique and Some Suggestions for a Context Specific Approach." Pacific Sociological Review 18 (April 1975) :171-193.

Winston, Jr., Roger B. "Graduate School Environments: Expectations and Perceptions." Journal of College Student Personnel 17 (January 1976) :43-49.

Wright, Charles R. "Success or Failure in Earning Graduate Degrees." Sociology of Education 38 (Fall 1964) ;73-97.