

1972

# The dimensions of alienation : a survey of organized industrial workers.

Robert. Renaud  
*University of Windsor*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

---

## Recommended Citation

Renaud, Robert., "The dimensions of alienation : a survey of organized industrial workers." (1972). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 3848.

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email ([scholarship@uwindsor.ca](mailto:scholarship@uwindsor.ca)) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.



THE DIMENSIONS OF ALIENATION  
A SURVEY OF ORGANIZED INDUSTRIAL WORKERS

by

Robert Renaud

Sociology and Anthropology Department  
University of Windsor

May, 1972

© Robert Renaud 1972

406404

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	111
 Chapter	
I PROBLEM AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND . . . . .	1
II METHOD . . . . .	11
III A STUDY OF THE SCALES . . . . .	22
IV CONDITIONS GOVERNING THE DIMENSIONS OF ALIENATION . . . . .	28
V POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF ALIENATION . . . . .	47
VI A TEST OF THE MEDIATION THESIS . . . . .	59
VII A TEST FOR INTRINSIC SATISFACTION AND ITS EFFECT ON THE DIMENSION OF ALIENATION . . . . .	72
VIII CONCLUSION . . . . .	79
APPENDIX A: THE QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	85
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	91

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
2:1. Age and Sex Distribution . . . . .	14
2:2. Age and Marital Status Distribution . . . . .	14
2:3. Age and Education Distribution . . . . .	15
2:4. Age and Skill Level Distribution . . . . .	16
2:5. Skill Level and Seniority Distribution . . . . .	17
2:6. Return . . . . .	20
3:1. Powerlessness and Normlessness Distribution . . . . .	23
3:2. Powerlessness and Social Isolation Distribution . . . . .	23
3:3. Normlessness and Social Isolation Distribution . . . . .	24
3:4. Powerlessness and Total Alienation Distribution . . . . .	25
3:5. Normlessness and Total Alienation Distribution . . . . .	25
3:6. Social Isolation and Total Alienation Distribution . . . . .	26
4:1. Sex and Powerlessness Distribution . . . . .	29
4:2. Sex and Normlessness Distribution . . . . .	29
4:3. Sex and Social Isolation Distribution . . . . .	29
4:4. Sex and Total Alienation Distribution . . . . .	30
4:5. Age and Powerlessness Distribution . . . . .	31
4:6. Age and Normlessness Distribution . . . . .	31
4:7. Age and Social Isolation Distribution . . . . .	31
4:8. Age and Total Alienation Distribution . . . . .	32
4:9. Marital Status and Powerlessness Distribution . . . . .	33
4:10. Marital Status and Normlessness Distribution . . . . .	33
4:11. Marital Status and Social Isolation Distribution . . . . .	34

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
4:12. Marital Status and Total Alienation Distribution . . .	34
4:13. Education and Powerlessness Distribution . . . . .	36
4:14. Education and Normlessness Distribution . . . . .	37
4:15. Education and Social Isolation Distribution . . . . .	38
4:16. Education and Total Alienation Distribution . . . . .	39
4:17. Skill Level and Powerlessness Distribution . . . . .	40
4:18. Skill Level and Normlessness Distribution . . . . .	40
4:19. Skill Level and Social Isolation Distribution . . . . .	41
4:20. Skill Level and Total Alienation Distribution . . . . .	41
4:21. Seniority and Powerlessness Distribution . . . . .	42
4:22. Seniority and Normlessness Distribution . . . . .	42
4:23. Seniority and Social Isolation Distribution . . . . .	43
4:24. Seniority and Total Alienation Distribution . . . . .	43
5:1. Political Scale and Powerlessness Distribution . . . . .	48
5:2. Political Scale and Normlessness Distribution . . . . .	49
5:3. Political Scale and Social Isolation Distribution . . . . .	49
5:4. Political Scale and Total Alienation Distribution . . . . .	50
5:5. Political Scale and Powerlessness Distribution Controlling for Skill Level . . . . .	51
5:6. Political Scale and Normlessness Distribution Controlling for Skill Level . . . . .	52
5:7. Political Scale and Social Isolation Distribution Controlling for Skill Level . . . . .	52
5:8. Political Scale and Total Alienation Distribution Controlling for Skill Level . . . . .	53
5:9. Rates of Response on Political Scale . . . . .	55
6:1. Informal Work Group Participation and Powerlessness Distribution Controlling for Age . . . . .	61

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
6:2. Informal Work Group Participation and Normlessness Distribution Controlling for Age . . . . .	61
6:3. Informal Work Group Participation and Social Isolation Distribution Controlling for Age . . . . .	62
6:4. Attendance at Union Meetings and Powerlessness Distribution Controlling for Age . . . . .	62
6:5. Attendance at Union Meetings and Normlessness Distribution Controlling for Age . . . . .	65
6:6. Attendance at Union Meetings and Social Isolation Distribution Controlling for Age . . . . .	65
6:7. Attendance at Union Social Functions and Total Alienation Distribution Controlling for Age . . . . .	67
7:1. Satisfaction and Total Alienation Distribution . . . . .	73
7:2. Intrinsic-Extrinsic Satisfaction and Alienation Distribution . . . . .	74
7:3. Skill Level and Satisfaction Distribution . . . . .	75
7:4. Intrinsic-Extrinsic Satisfaction and Powerlessness Distribution Controlling for Skill Level . . . . .	75
7:5. Intrinsic-Extrinsic Satisfaction and Normlessness Distribution Controlling for Skill Level . . . . .	76
7:6. Satisfaction and Social Isolation Distribution Controlling for Skill Level . . . . .	76



## CHAPTER 1

### PROBLEM AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

This theme of the alienation of modern man runs through the literature and drama of two continents; it can be traced in the content as well as the form of modern art; it preoccupies theologians and philosophers, and to many psychologists and sociologists, it is the central problem of our time. <sup>1</sup>

These words of Eric and Mary Josephson point to the central position occupied by the theme of alienation in the interpretation of the human condition. It has been treated in terms of alienation from work, from politics, from self and from society. Theorists have pointed to its numerous correlates which include: "Apathy, Authoritarianism, Conformity, Cynicism, Hoboism, Political Activity, Political Hyperactivity or Personalization in Politics, Prejudice, Privatization, Psychosis, Regression and Suicide".<sup>2</sup> This study attempts to define the relevant dimensions of alienation and to test them on a sample of factory workers.

Even though the literature on alienation has been so pervasive, the concept, itself, had never been clearly defined. Neal and Rettig speak of it as having "a rich diversity of meanings".<sup>3</sup> Seeman <sup>4</sup>, in a review of the past literature on the theme, clarified the meaning by defining five dimensions: powerlessness, normlessness, meaninglessness, isolation, and self-estrangement.

By examining three such dimensions of alienation - namely powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation - this study seeks to accomplish two tasks: to further clarify the concept

of alienation by a study of its dimensions; and, to test for the presence of alienation in a sample of industrial workers with the aim of defining possible methods to effect change in the structural conditions which give rise to it. For this study, the dimensions of alienation will be defined in terms of Dwight Dean's scale<sup>5</sup> which will be used as a measure for the concept.

The first element, powerlessness, is derived from "Hegel and Marx in their discussions of worker's separation from effective control over his economic destiny".<sup>6</sup> Dean defines it according to the description provided by Kris and Leites<sup>7</sup>:

... ordinary individuals have ever less the feeling that they can understand or influence the very events upon which their life and happiness is known to depend.

The second element, normlessness, is derived from Durkheim's conception of anomie, which according to DeGrazia<sup>8</sup>, had three characteristics:

... a painful uneasiness or anxiety, a feeling of separation from group standards, a feeling of pointlessness ... that no certain goals exist.<sup>9</sup>

Dean defines two distinct sub-types of normlessness: purposelessness as defined by MacIver<sup>10</sup> as "the absence of values that might give purpose and direction to life"<sup>11</sup>, and conflict of norms which DeGrazia<sup>12</sup> defined as the "contemporary conflict between the Cooperative and Competitive Directives and the Activist and Quietist Directives".<sup>13</sup> Horney<sup>14</sup> extended this to include the conflict between "the standards of Christianity and the success imperative"<sup>15</sup>.

The third dimension, social isolation, is also derived from Durkheim's conception of anomie, which included "a feeling

of separation from the group or isolation from group standards"<sup>16</sup>. Dean defines it as "the perception of losing effective contact from significant and supporting groups"<sup>17</sup>.

Among social scientists, the theme of alienation has reference in both classical and contemporary thought.

Marx viewed the alienation of labour as an essential feature of a capitalist economy.

... the work is external to the worker; ... it is not part of his nature; ... he does not fulfill himself in his work, but denies himself. ... It is not the satisfaction of a need, but only a means for satisfying other needs.<sup>18</sup>

Durkheim developed his concept of anomie in his effort to account for pathological forms and consequences of the division of labour<sup>19</sup> which resulted in increased "unpredictability and uncertainty ... and tendencies to social disintegration"<sup>20</sup>. It arose after,

the body of common rules which is the principal mechanism for the regulation of the relationships among the elements of the social system, had broken down.<sup>21</sup>

Weber, extended the notion of alienation beyond the industrial sphere.

The modern soldier is equally separated from the means of violence, the scientist from the means of inquiry, and the civil servant from the means of administration.<sup>22</sup>

Contemporary sociological and social psychological literature, in many cases, extends the themes presented in classical theory.

Fromm sees alienation in the Marxian sense, yet "more pervasive"<sup>23</sup>, as he applies the term "in connection with virtually every sphere of contemporary life"<sup>24</sup>.

Merton<sup>25</sup> refined the Durkheimian scheme in portraying anomie or alienation as a disjunction between goals and means which "leads to a weakening of men's commitment to the culturally prescribed goals or the institutionalized means"<sup>26</sup>

C.W.Mills<sup>27</sup> compliments Weber's conception of the extent of alienation by studying its growth and consequences in white collar occupations. He also posits the view that the alienated man "does not formulate his desires, they are insinuated into him"<sup>28</sup>, by the needs of a bureaucratic system.

Perhaps the greatest empirical contribution to the understanding of alienation has been that of Melvin Seeman. He felt that for the theme of alienation to become a theory it had to combine:

- 1) an historically - oriented account of social structure.
- 2) assertions about the psychological effects of that structure.
- 3) predictions about resulting individual behaviour.<sup>29</sup>

With such a theory, alienation would be the "crucial intervening variable"<sup>30</sup>, with the social structural features being the independent variable giving rise to certain behavioural consequences.

The first step was the clarification of the concept of alienation to give it "a more researchable statement of meaning"<sup>31</sup>. He classified the five independent uses of the term and then proceeded in his research almost exclusively with the dimension of powerlessness which he defined as:

the expectancy or probability held by the

individual that his own behaviour cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements he seeks.<sup>32</sup>

He demonstrated powerlessness to be related to the much discussed consequences of work alienation such as intergroup hostility, political awareness, status mindedness, and expert orientation.<sup>33</sup> An index of work alienation (developed in line with Blauner's<sup>34</sup> work with the industrial worker) did not correlate with these consequences.<sup>35</sup>

He demonstrated powerlessness to be a central factor in the learning of control-relevant information, in the situational contexts of a hospital<sup>36</sup> and a reformatory<sup>37</sup>, as well as in the general learning of political knowledge<sup>38</sup> and nuclear knowledge<sup>39</sup>.

He recognized the need for mediating organizations, as did Durkheim<sup>40</sup>, to serve as a link between the isolated individual and the massive state or corporations within which the individual must function. He demonstrated that "membership in a work-centred organization is associated with a relatively strong sense of control over events"<sup>41</sup> and that the actual degree of organizational involvement was correlated in the same manner<sup>42</sup>.

Research by Pearlin<sup>43</sup>, in a study of powerlessness among nurses, extended this hypothesis to include the work group.

... alienation occurs less among those who have established extra-work friendship relations with fellow-workers and this was found to be especially true when the friends were part of the same face to face work group.<sup>44</sup>

Seeman then proceeded to qualify some commonly held notions concerning alienation. He presented evidence to raise doubts as to "the unity or coherence of a syndrome of alienations".<sup>45</sup>

His previous research had indicated that "people typically reveal a rather discriminating alienation"<sup>36</sup>. Work alienation did not correlate with its proposed consequences<sup>47</sup>. High degrees of powerlessness were related only to the learning of specific control relevant information<sup>48</sup>. He also found that social isolation, defined in terms of "expectancies for social acceptance"<sup>49</sup>, and its presentation as a consequence of the lost community, to be overestimated. His own data leads him to think that "it is not the lost community ... that is the urban problem, but the sense of lost control (i.e. powerlessness)"<sup>50</sup>.

This study represents an effort to build on the theoretical framework proposed by Seeman using a sample of factory workers belonging to an industrial union.

First, the three dimensions of alienation will be tested for intercorrelations while seeking evidence as to the extent of independence among the sub-scales and the possibility of a central dimension which influences or dominates the other dimensions.

Second, the relative effect of specific structural conditions on each dimension will be examined.

Third, the influence of the respective dimensions on political ideology will be measured in order to further the knowledge concerning the behavioural consequences of alienation.

Fourth, the above having been tested, emphasis will be placed on seeking methods which could be applied to modify the social structural conditions which lead to alienation and its consequences among the factory workers.

Two hypothesis will be tested:

The first is based upon the mediation thesis proposed by Durkheim<sup>51</sup> and Seeman<sup>52</sup>, and states that a high degree of participation in the informal work group, in union meetings, and in union social functions will decrease feelings of alienation.

The second concerns the Marxian notion of the loss of intrinsic satisfaction in the work place. Marx saw capitalist labour as "not the satisfaction of a need, but only a means for satisfying other needs"<sup>53</sup>.

Blauner<sup>54</sup> amplified on this theme.

In non-alienated activity the rewards are in the activity itself; in alienated states they are largely extrinsic to the activity which has become primarily a means to an end.<sup>55</sup>

Seeman<sup>56</sup> confirmed Blauner's hypothesis when he found that the scores obtained on his work alienation index varied with "those who emphasize intrinsic values actually engaged in less alienated work".<sup>57</sup>

In this context, the dimensions of powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation will be measured on a sample of factory workers belonging to an industrial union in order to test the hypothesis that intrinsic satisfactions in work will be related to a low degree of alienation.

FOOTNOTES

1. E. and M. Josephson, Man Alone, New York: Dell Press, 1967, p.10.
2. Dwight Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement", American Sociological Review, 26:753-4, 1961.
3. Neal and Rettig, "Dimensions of Alienation among Manual and Non-Manual Workers", American Sociological Review, 28:599, 1963.
4. Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation", American Sociological Review, 24:783-791, 1959.
5. Cited in Delbert C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, New York: David McKay, 1970, pp318-320.
6. Dwight Dean, op.cit., p.754.
7. Ernst Kris and Nathan Leites, "Trends in Twentieth Century Propaganda", in Reader in Public Opinion and Communication, edited by Bernard Berelson and Morris Janowitz, Glencoe: The Free press, 1950, p.283.
8. Sebastian DeGrazia, The Political Community: A Study of Anomie, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.
9. Cited in Dwight Dean, op.cit., p.754.
10. Robert MacIver, The Ramparts We Guard, New York: MacMillan, 1950, pp84-87.
11. Cited in Dean, op.cit., p.754.
12. DeGrazia, op.cit., pp.47-72.
13. Cited in Dean, op.cit., p.755.
14. Karen Horney, "Culture and Neurosis", in Psychological Analysis, edited by Logan Wilson and William Kolb, New York: Harcourt Brace, 1949, pp.248-251.
15. Cited in Dean, op.cit., p.755.
16. Ibid.
17. Dwight Dean, "Alienation and Political Apathy", Social Forces, 38:186, 1960.
18. Cited in Shlomo Avineri, The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx, Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1970, p.106.
19. Emile Durkheim, The Division of Labour in Society, New York: The Free Press, 1968, pp.353-373.



20. Albert Cohen, Deviance and Control, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1966, p.75.
21. Cohen, op.cit., p.75.
22. Cited in H.H. Gerth and C.W. Mills, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, New York: Oxford, 1946, p.50.
23. Cited in Richard Schacht, Alienation, Garden City: Doubleday, 1970, pp.117-118.
24. Schacht, op.cit., p.118.
25. R.K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957, pp.113-194.
26. Cited in Albert Cohen, op.cit., p.76.
27. C. Wright Mills, White Collar, New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.
28. C.W. Mills, "The Mass Society", from Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society, op.cit., p.226.
29. Melvin Seeman, "Alienation, Membership and Political Knowledge", Public Opinion Quarterly, 30:353-367, 1966, p.354.
30. Ibid., p.354.
31. Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation", op.cit., p.784.
32. Ibid., p.784.
33. Melvin Seeman, "On the Personal Consequences of Alienation in Work", American Sociological Review, 32:273-285, 1967.
34. Robert Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964, pp.210-214.
35. Seeman, "On the Personal Consequences of Alienation in Work", op.cit.
36. Melvin Seeman, John Evans, "Alienation and Learning in a Hospital Setting", American Sociological Review, 27:772-782, 1962.
37. Melvin Seeman, "Alienation and Social Learning in a Reformatory", American Journal of Sociology, 69:270-284, 1963.
38. Melvin Seeman, "Alienation, Membership and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study", Public Opinion Quarterly, 30:353-367, 1966.
39. Melvin Seeman, "Powerlessness and Knowledge: A Comparative Study of Alienation and Learning", Sociometry, 30:105-123, 1967.
40. Emile Durkheim, Professional Ethics and Civic Morals, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958.

41. Melvin Seeman, "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis," American Sociological Review, 29:225, 1964.
42. Melvin Seeman, "Alienation, Membership and Political Knowledge" op.cit., pp.353-367.
43. Leonard Pearlin, "Alienation from Work: A Study of Nursing Personnel", American Sociological Review, 27:314-326, 1962.
44. Pearlin, op.cit., p.325.
45. Melvin Seeman, "The Urban Alienation: Some Dubious Theses from Marx to Marcuse", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol 19, No.2:139, 1971.
46. Ibid., p.139.
47. Melvin Seeman, "On the Personal Consequences of Alienation in Work", op.cit..
48. Melvin Seeman, "Powerlessness and Knowledge: A Comparative Study of Alienation and Learning, op.cit.
49. Melvin Seeman, "The Urban Alienations", op.cit., p.140.
50. Ibid., p.140.
51. Emile Durkheim, Professional Ethics and Civic Morals, op.cit.
52. Melvin Seeman, "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis", op.cit.
53. Shlomo Avineri, op.cit., p.106.
54. Robert Blauner, op.cit.
55. Ibid., p.27.
56. Melvin Seeman, "On the Personal Consequences of Alienation in Work", op.cit.
57. Ibid., p.283.

## CHAPTER 2

### METHOD

The data are based upon the results of a questionnaire mailed to a sample of manual workers belonging to a local of the United Automobile Workers in Southwestern Ontario.

The local represents a membership in excess of 7300 from over 60 companies. These companies are a cross-section of the city's industry and include: the automotive area; automotive supply; and non-automotive areas such as steel plants, plastic industries, and tool and die-shops. The majority of companies employ less than one hundred but the range is from 1400 to 10 in some of the tool and die shops.

A systematic sample of males and females was drawn from an alphabetical list of names and addresses in the union membership files, with 739 questionnaires being mailed. A total of 160, or 21.6%, were returned of which 8 were not used because the respondent failed to complete relevant portions of the questionnaire. The final sample consisted of 152 local members, or 20.6% of the initial mailing list.

### THE INDICATORS

Alienation - The primary concern was an index to measure several dimensions of alienation. Dwight Dean has developed a Likert-type scale to measure powerlessness, normlessness and social isolation<sup>1</sup>. It consists of 24 statements, 8 of which measure powerlessness, 6 normlessness and the remaining 8 social

isolation. The combined score of all the 24 statements indicates the total alienation score.

Social-Structural Features - Questions were asked concerning structural conditions which might exhibit some influence on the measures of alienation. These concerned: skill level, seniority, age, sex, marital status, and education.

Control-Relevant Information - The respondent was asked to place himself on a political scale from extreme left to extreme right. It was hoped that further information could be gained concerning the behavioural consequences of alienation in the political realm.

Mediating Participation - Participation in the informal work group was measured by having the respondent indicate how often he had socially visited with his work associates. This measure was derived from a study by Reiss<sup>2</sup> concerning differences in interpersonal contacts between rural and urban areas and different socioeconomic statuses.

The respondent was also asked to indicate how often he had socially visited with relatives and with neighbours and friends. It was felt that such information would help to clarify the relative importance played by the informal work group in effecting the degree of alienation.

Participation in the union was measured by asking the respondent to indicate how often he had attended union meetings and union-sponsored social functions.

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Satisfaction - The measure is derived from that developed by Herzberg<sup>3</sup> in The Motivation to

Work. The respondent is asked to relate the good points and the bad points about his job. Intrinsic satisfaction is indicated by response of: 1)independence, responsibility; 2)satisfying, interesting; 3)opportunity for advancement. Extrinsic satisfaction is indicated by a response of: 1)work associates; 2)work conditions; 3)pay and fringe benefits; 4)security; and 5)any other type of extrinsic satisfaction.

#### DETERMINATION OF GROUPS LOW AND HIGH ON ALIENATION

The scores obtained from the three dimensions of alienation and the total scores for each respondent were plotted on graphs. Two groups, high and low, were formed based on natural-occurring breaks within the curves which corresponded to the median scores on each dimension.

#### PRE-TEST

A pre-test was applied in the form of a mailed questionnaire to 27 members of the maintenance staff of a local school in order to refine the instruments. There was a return of 13 (48.1%) completed questionnaires.

#### CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

The final sample consisted of 152 respondents.

The distribution by age and sex is shown in Table 2:1. The men were, in general, somewhat younger than the women, with 41.9% compared to 21.1% falling in the "less than 30" category. There were only 2 people older than 60 and they were both males.

**TABLE 2:1 - AGE AND SEX DISTRIBUTION**

SEX	AGE			
	LESS THAN 30	30-59	60-64	
MALE	54 (41.9%)	73 (56.6%)	2 (1.6%)	129 (100.0%)
FEMALE	4 (21.1%)	15 (79.0%)	0 (0.0%)	19 (100.0%)

The majority of the workers who responded were married (76.9%). However, there were single, divorced and separated people as well. The distribution by marital status for the age groups is presented in Table 2:2. As would be expected, 39.7%

**TABLE 2:2 - AGE AND MARITAL STATUS DISTRIBUTION**

MARITAL STATUS	AGE	
	UNDER 30	30 OR MORE
SINGLE	23 (39.7%)	2 (2.3%)
MARRIED	33 (56.9%)	80 (89.8%)
WIDOWED	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
DIVORCED	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.3%)
SEPARATED	2 (3.4%)	5 (5.6%)
	58 (100.0%)	89 (100.0%)

**sig. (.001) WITH CHI-SQUARE TEST**

of the workers under 30 years old were single as compared to only 2.3% of those 30 and over. 89.8% of the 30 or over group were married with only 56.9% of those under 30 years old falling into this category.

The sample also covers every level of educational attainment. Table 2:3 gives a distribution of the level of

TABLE 2:3 - AGE AND EDUCATION DISTRIBUTION

EDUCATION	AGE	
	UNDER 30	30 AND OVER
LESS THAN GRADE 6	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.6%)
GRADES 6 TO 7	3 (5.6%)	7 (9.2%)
GRADE 8	2 (3.7%)	23 (30.3%)
SOME HIGH SCHOOL	29 (53.7%)	24 (31.6%)
HIGH SCHOOL GRAD.	15 (27.7%)	16 (21.1%)
SOME COLLEGE	2 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)
COLLEGE GRAD.	3 (5.6%)	1 (1.3%)
POST GRAD	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)
VOCATIONAL	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.6%)
TOTAL	54 (100.0%)	76 (100.0%)

Sig. (.001) WITH CHI-SQUARE TEST

education attained by each age group.

The younger workers are more highly educated with 37.0% being at least high school graduates as compared to 26.3% of the older group.

The largest difference occurs among those workers who are no more than grade school graduates. Only 9.3% of the young fall into this category compared to 42.1% of the older group.

In addition, the sample presented differences in skill level. Table 2:4 indicates that only 8.5% of the younger workers were skilled compared to 21.7% of the older group. This is probably an indication that it takes time to attain a skill where, usually, an apprenticeship or experience is needed. Although the differences are not great, they do point in this direction.

TABLE 2:4 - AGE AND SKILL LEVEL DISTRIBUTION

SKILL LEVEL	AGE	
	LESS THAN 30	30 OR MORE
SKILLED	4 (8.5%)	18 (21.7%)
NON-SKILLED	43 (91.5%)	65 (78.3%)
TOTAL	47 (100.0%)	83 (100.0%)



The seniority and skill level distribution presented in Table 2:5 demonstrates that 69.7% of the skilled workers have more than five years with their company compared to 59.1% of the non-skilled workers.

**TABLE 2:5 - SKILL LEVEL AND SENIORITY DISTRIBUTION**

SENIORITY	SKILL LEVEL	
	SKILLED	NON-SKILLED
LESS THAN 6 MONTHS	0 (0.0%)	7 (6.4%)
6 MONTHS TO ONE YEAR	1 (4.3%)	6 (5.5%)
ONE TO THREE YEARS	5 (21.7%)	20 (18.2%)
THREE TO FIVE YEARS	1 (4.3%)	13 (11.8%)
FIVE TO TEN YEARS	4 (17.4%)	27 (24.5%)
TEN TO TWENTY YEARS	4 (17.4%)	25 (22.7%)
20 YEARS OR MORE	8 (34.8%)	12 (10.9%)
TOTAL	23 (100.0%)	110 (100.0%)

The greatest percentage of skilled workers have been with their company for 20 or more years (34.8%). However, the next largest percentage (21.7%) occurs in the "one to three years" category. Perhaps many of the workers of this group reached their skill level at other companies and then were hired at their present job because of this skill. The available evidence offers little explanation.

#### METHODOLOGICAL QUESTIONS

Before proceeding with the study, several methodological questions should be answered.

Are the results obtained from a mailed questionnaire as valid as those obtained from interviews? Seeman, realizing this problem, tested for differences in the response scores concerning powerlessness<sup>4</sup> and control-relevant information (nuclear knowledge)<sup>5</sup>.

With powerlessness, he found "no significant difference"<sup>6</sup> in a comparison of "those who were personally interviewed and those who returned the questionnaire".<sup>7</sup>

With regard to control-relevant information;

The nuclear score of the interviewed men, who took the test under direct supervision, is the same as that achieved by men who completed the test and returned it by mail.<sup>8</sup>

Another question concerns the relationship between alienation and the response to a mailed questionnaire. In other words, would those who score high on alienation tend to delay the return? Seeman<sup>9</sup> made a comparison of those who returned the questionnaire on the first appeal and those who returned on

subsequent appeals. Ferber<sup>10</sup> had suggested that "such a comparison of early and late returns approximates differences between respondents who return a questionnaire and those who do not."<sup>11</sup> Seeman found "no significant difference between the early and late returns".<sup>12</sup>

The present study involved only the responses obtained from the initial mailing with no subsequent appeals. In order to approximate the test concerning the relationship between alienation and response to a mailed questionnaire, the questionnaires were numbered according to the week they were returned by the respondents from week 1 to week 5.

No statistically significant difference was found between the powerlessness and normlessness scores and the rate of return. However, there was a statistically significant difference with the social isolation scores. Table 2:6 represents the return and indicates that those high in social isolation tended to delay the return of the completed questionnaire.

Seeman described such delay in return in terms of the "behavioural avoidance hypothesis".<sup>13</sup> He predicted that "those who were high in powerlessness would delay in returning"<sup>14</sup> control-relevant information. He found only "suggestive"<sup>15</sup> evidence to prove this hypothesis.

Although the present test does not take control-relevant information into account, behavioural avoidance was exhibited by those high in social isolation; whereas, it was not with respect to the powerlessness and normlessness dimensions. This would suggest certain independent characteristics

TABLE 2:6 - RETURN

SOCIAL ISOLATION	RETURN					TOTAL
	WEEK 1	WEEK 2	WEEK 3	WEEK 4	WEEK 5	
LOW	41 (62.1%)	20 (30.3%)	2 (3.0%)	3 (4.5%)	0 (0.0%)	66 (100.0%)
HIGH	38 (44.2%)	25 (29.1%)	15 (77.4%)	5 (5.8%)	3 (3.5%)	86 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 11.68131 d.f. = 4 Sig. = (.025)						CRAMER'S V = .27722 CONT. COEFF. = .26714

exhibited by those who are high in the degree of feelings of social isolation.

This finding leads to the first task of the study.- the intercorrelation of the dimensions to further clarify their meanings.

FOOTNOTES

1. Cited in Delbert C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, New York: David McKay, 1970, pp. 318-320.

2. Albert J. Reiss, "Rural-Urban and Status Differences in Interpersonal Contact", American Journal of Sociology, 65:182-195, 1959.

3. Frederick Herzberg et.al., The Motivation to Work, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.

4. Melvin Seeman, "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis", American Sociological Review, 29:225, 1964.
5. Melvin Seeman, "Powerlessness and Knowledge: A Comparative Study of Alienation and Learning", Sociometry, 30:105-123, 1967.
6. Melvin Seeman, "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis", op.cit., p.220.
7. Ibid., p.220.
8. Melvin Seeman, "Powerlessness and Knowledge: A Comparative Study of Alienation and Learning", op.cit., p.114.
9. Melvin Seeman, "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis", op.cit., p.220.
10. Robert Ferber, "The Problem of Bias in Mail Returns: A Solution", Public Opinion Quarterly, 12:669-676, 1948-49.
11. Cited in Melvin Seeman, "Organization and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis", op.cit., p.220.
12. Ibid., p.220.
13. Melvin Seeman, "Powerlessness and Knowledge: A Comparative Study of Alienation and Learning", op.cit., p.119.
14. Ibid., p.118.
15. Ibid., p.119.

## CHAPTER 3

### A STUDY OF THE SCALES

Dean tested his scale and found "the correlation-coefficients between the sub-scales were ... considerably above the .01 level of significance"<sup>1</sup>. This, he concluded made it feasible to consider the dimensions of powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation as belonging "to the same general concept"<sup>2</sup> of alienation.

Seeman, on the other hand, after defining five independent dimensions of alienation, concentrated his efforts into clarifying and extending the concept of powerlessness. Empirical evidence, derived from subsequent studies, hinted at powerlessness being the central concept related to the much discussed consequences of alienation<sup>3</sup>. He also expressed doubt as to the "unity or coherence of a syndrome of alienations"<sup>4</sup>.

This leads to the first task of our study, to test for intercorrelations among the sub-scales while seeking evidence as to the possibility of a central dimension which, in fact, influences or dominates the other dimensions.

Tables 3:1, 3:2, and 3:3 represent cross-tabulations of the scores of the three dimensions. Strong relationships exist between them with the strongest relationship between powerlessness and normlessness ( $\phi = .51518$ ). Social isolation appears to exhibit the most independent characteristics, both with powerlessness ( $\phi = .28389$ ) and with normlessness ( $\phi = .20939$ ).



**TABLE 3:3 NORMLESSNESS AND SOCIAL ISOLATION DISTRIBUTION**

NORMLESSNESS	SOCIAL ISOLATION	
	LOW	HIGH
LOW	42 (27.6%)	35 (23.0%)
HIGH	24 (15.8%)	51 (33.6%)
CHI-SQUARE = 6.96996		Phi = 0.21414
d.f. = 1		CONTINGENCY COEFF. = .20939
Sig. = (.001)		PEARSON CORR. = .2274
		Sig. = (.002)

N = 152(100%)

These findings corroborate the independence manifested by social isolation in the rate of return. It was the only dimension which demonstrated a significant difference with those high in social isolation delaying the return of the completed questionnaire. (See Table 1:1)

The three dimensions were then cross-tabulated against the total-alienation scores (combination of 3 sub-scales) for each respondent in order to test for the influence each dimension exhibited on the total scores. Tables 3:4, 3:5, and 3:6 are representations of these cross-tabulations. Powerlessness exhibits the strongest relationship with the scores of the total scale (phi = .72619) closely followed by normlessness (phi = .64467). Social isolation again displays the greatest independence (phi = .50618).







FOOTNOTES

1. Dwight Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement", American Sociological Review, 26:753-3, 1961.

2. Ibid., p.756.

3. Melvin Seeman, "The Urban Alienations: Some Dubious Theses from Marx to Marcuse", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol 19, No.2:139, 1971.

4. Ibid.

## CHAPTER 4

### CONDITIONS GOVERNING THE DIMENSIONS OF ALIENATION

A further understanding of alienation can be attained by an examination of some basic social-structural conditions of the sample to determine what attitudinal affects they might have on the workers. In other words, how are the respective dimensions of alienation effected by structural conditions such as sex, age, education, marital status, skill level and seniority. Seeman felt an "account of social structure"<sup>1</sup> was essential for an empirical theory of alienation.

These structural conditions will be tested for each dimension in order to further clarify and define the concepts. If the conditions effect the dimensions in different ways, it would provide a more positive argument for the findings in Chapter 3 concerning the degree of independence between the dimensions.

#### RESULTS

##### SEX

The relationships between the sex of the respondents and the respective dimensions is presented in Tables 4:1, 4:2, and 4:3. No relationship appears to exist between these factors. In each dimension, there is little or no difference between the males and females with almost identical percentages falling in the low and high categories.

The distribution for sex and the total alienation scores

TABLE 4:1 SEX AND POWERLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION:

SEX	POWERLESSNESS		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
MALE	62 (47.7%)	68 (52.3%)	130 (100.0%)
FEMALE	9 (47.4%)	10 (52.6%)	19 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 0.04817 d.f. = 1 Not Sig.			Phi. = 0.01798 CONT. COEFF. = 0.01798

TABLE 4:2 SEX AND NORMLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION

SEX	NORMLESSNESS		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
MALE	66 (50.8%)	64 (49.2%)	130 (100.0%)
FEMALE	10 (52.6%)	9 (47.4%)	19 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = .00883 d.f. = 1 Not Sig.			Phi. = 0.00770 CONT. COEFF. = 0.00770

TABLE 4:3 SEX AND SOCIAL ISOLATION DISTRIBUTION

SEX	SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
MALE	57 (43.8%)	73 (56.2%)	130 (100.0%)
FEMALE	8 (42.1%)	11 (57.9%)	19 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 0.01096 d.f. = 1 Not Sig.			Phi. = 0.00858 CONT. COEFF. = 0.00858

presented in Table 4:4 confirm this finding. Although there is some variation, it is hardly conclusive enough to confirm any difference.

TABLE 4:4 SEX AND TOTAL ALIENATION DISTRIBUTION

SEX	TOTAL ALIENATION		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
MALE	68 (52.3%)	62 (47.7%)	130 (100.0%)
FEMALE	9 (47.4%)	10 (52.6%)	19 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 0.02455		Phi = 0.01284	
d.f. = 1		CONT. COEFF. = 0.01284	
Not Sig.			

Perhaps this finding is due to the small number of women in the sample (19) or perhaps there is no actual difference in the degree of the respective dimensions of alienation between men and women working in a factory. The little variation in distribution there is does give an indication as to what dimensions are most effected. The degree of relationship is highest for powerlessness (phi = .01798) followed by social isolation (phi = .00858) then normlessness. (phi = .00770) However, the relationship is so weak as to contribute little evidence to further understanding.

AGE

Age appears to be a more significant factor in the determination of the degree of alienation. Tables 4:5, 4:6, and 4:7 represent the distribution, by age group, for each dimension. The younger workers, in the under 30 category, exhibit the

TABLE 4:5 AGE AND POWERLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION

AGE	POWERLESSNESS		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
UNDER 30	21 (35.6%)	38 (64.4%)	59 (100.0%)
30 OR MORE	50 (55.6%)	40 (44.4%)	90 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 4.92098 d.f. = 1 Sig. (.05)			Phi = 0.18173 CONT. COEFF. = 0.17880

TABLE 4:6 AGE AND NORMLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION

AGE	NORMLESSNESS		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
UNDER 30	25 (42.4%)	34 (57.6%)	59 (100.0%)
30 OR MORE	51 (56.7%)	39 (43.3%)	90 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 2.36975 d.f. = 1 Not Sig.			Phi = 0.12611 CONT. COEFF. = 0.12512

TABLE 4:7 AGE AND SOCIAL ISOLATION DISTRIBUTION

AGE	SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
UNDER 30	20 (33.9%)	39 (66.1%)	59 (100.0%)
30 OR MORE	45 (50.0%)	45 (50.0%)	90 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 3.13072 d.f. = 1 Sig. (.10)			Phi = 0.14495 CONT COEFF. = 0.14345

highest degree of powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation. The relationship is significant at the .05 level for powerlessness but not for normlessness or social isolation. This provides further evidence as to the independence of the scales.

The inter-correlation of the scales presented in Chapter 3 demonstrated the strongest relationship with powerlessness as it provided the highest correlation with the total alienation scores. Table 4:8 represents the distribution, by age groups, for those low and high on the total alienation scale. This relationship is significant at the .025 level with a phi of .19196. Powerlessness was the only dimension to offer a significant relationship with age. It again appears to be the most influential factor in determining the total alienation scores.

TABLE 4:8 AGE AND TOTAL ALIENATION DISTRIBUTION

AGE	TOTAL ALIENATION		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
UNDER 30	23 (39.0%)	36 (61.0%)	59 (100.0%)
30 OR MORE	54 (60.0%)	36 (40.0%)	90 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 5.49018 d.f. = 1 Sig. (.025)			Phi = 0.19196 CONT. COEFF. = 0.18851

MARITAL STATUS

Tables 4:9 to 4:12 present the distributions, by marital status, for those low and high on each of the dimensions. Marital status appears as an important factor in the determination of the degree of alienation as it demonstrates a significant relationship



TABLE 4:9 MARITAL STATUS AND POWERLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION

MARITAL STATUS	POWERLESSNESS		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
SINGLE	6 (24.0%)	19 (76.0%)	25 (100.0%)
MARRIED	62 (54.9%)	51 (45.1%)	113 (100.0%)
WIDOWED	0 (0.0%)	1 (100.0%)	1 (100.0%)
DIVORCED	2 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100.0%)
SEPARATED	1 (14.3%)	6 (85.7%)	7 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 14.18228 d.f. = 4 Sig. (.01)			CRAMER'S V = .30956 CONT. COEFF. = .29571

TABLE 4:10 MARITAL STATUS AND NORMLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION

MARITAL STATUS	NORMLESSNESS		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
SINGLE	9 (36.0%)	16 (64.0%)	25 (100.0%)
MARRIED	64 (56.6%)	49 (43.4%)	113 (100.0%)
WIDOWED	0 (0.0%)	1 (100.0%)	1 (100.0%)
DIVORCED	2 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100.0%)
SEPARATED	0 (0.0%)	7 (100.0%)	7 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 13.92666 d.f. = 4 Sig. (.01)			CRAMER'S V = .30676 CONT. COEFF. = .29327

TABLE 4:11 MARITAL STATUS AND SOCIAL ISOLATION DISTRIBUTION

MARITAL STATUS	SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
SINGLE	7 (28.0%)	18 (72.0%)	25 (100.0%)
MARRIED	55 (48.7%)	58 (51.3%)	113 (100.0%)
WIDOWED	0 (0.0%)	1 (100.0%)	1 (100.0%)
DIVORCED	2 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100.0%)
SEPARATED	1 (14.3%)	6 (85.7%)	7 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 9.44154 d.f. = 4 Sig. (.05)		CRAMER'S V = .25257 CONT. COEFF. = .24488	

TABLE 4:12 MARITAL STATUS AND TOTAL ALIENATION DISTRIBUTION

MARITAL STATUS	TOTAL ALIENATION		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
SINGLE	8 (32.0%)	17 (68.0%)	25 (100.0%)
MARRIED	66 (58.4%)	47 (41.6%)	113 (100.0%)
WIDOWED	0 (0.0%)	1 (100.0%)	1 (100.0%)
DIVORCED	2 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100.0%)
SEPARATED	1 (14.3%)	6 (85.7%)	7 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 12.78389 d.f. = 4 Sig. (.025)		CRAMER'S V = .29390 CONT. COEFF. = .28197	

throughout. The single workers exhibit the highest degrees of alienation, the married the lowest. Although the numbers are small, the widowed and separated consistently fall in the high alienation categories and the divorced in the low. It would appear that the unattached workers are more likely to feel powerless, normless and socially isolated.

As with the intercorrelation of the dimensions, powerlessness exhibits the strongest relationship (Cramer's  $V = .30676$ ). Social isolation exhibits the greatest independence (Cramer's  $V = .25257$ ). The distribution for total alienation does not present any evidence as to a closer affinity with any one of the subscales.

#### EDUCATION

The distributions for alienation by educational level presented in Tables 4:13 to 4:16, although not significant, demonstrates that those workers with a higher education are less prone to feelings of powerlessness and normlessness but not of social isolation.

Focusing in on those who have at least some college education, 77% fall in the low powerlessness and normlessness categories. With social isolation, only 33% fall into this category. Perhaps those who have at least some college education perceive themselves as isolated from the work environment of the factory.

On examining the degree of relationship, powerlessness (Cramer's  $V = .22102$ ) and normlessness (Cramer's  $V = .24996$ ) again appear to be the most influenced with social isolation (Cramer's  $V = .20364$ ) exhibiting the greatest independence.

TABLE 4:13 EDUCATION AND POWERLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION

EDUCATION	POWERLESSNESS		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
LESS THAN GRADE 6	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	2 (100.0%)
GRADES 6 & 7	6 (60.0%)	4 (40.0%)	10 (100.0%)
GRADE 8	10 (40.0%)	15 (60.0%)	25 (100.0%)
SOME HIGH SCHOOL	26 (48.1%)	28 (51.9%)	54 (100.0%)
HIGH SCHOOL GRAD.	16 (48.5%)	17 (51.5%)	33 (100.0%)
SOME COLLEGE	2 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100.0%)
COLLEGE GRAD.	2 (50.0%)	2 (50.0%)	4 (100.0%)
POST-GRAD.	1 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (100.0%)
VOCATIONAL	2 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 6.49722		GRAMER'S V = .22102	
d.f. = 8		CONT. COEFF. = .21581	
Not Sig.			

TABLE 4:14 EDUCATION AND NORMLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION

EDUCATION	NORMLESSNESS		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
LESS THAN GRADE 6	0 (0.0%)	2 (100.0%)	2 (100.0%)
GRADES 6 & 7	4 (40.0%)	6 (60.0%)	10 (100.0%)
GRADE 8	12 (48.0%)	13 (52.0%)	25 (100.0%)
SOME HIGH SCHOOL	31 (57.4%)	23 (42.6%)	54 (100.0%)
HIGH SCHOOL GRAD.	16 (48.5%)	17 (51.5%)	33 (100.0%)
SOME COLLEGE	2 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100.0%)
COLLEGE GRAD.	2 (50.0%)	2 (50.0%)	4 (100.0%)
POST-GRAD.	1 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (100.0%)
VOCATIONAL	2 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 8.31007		CRAMER'S V = .24996	
d.f. = 8		CONT. COEFF. = .24250	
Not Sig.			

**TABLE 4:15 EDUCATION AND SOCIAL ISOLATION DISTRIBUTION**

EDUCATION	SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
LESS THAN GRADE 6	2 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100.0%)
GRADES 6 & 7	4 (40.0%)	6 (60.0%)	10 (100.0%)
GRADE 8	12 (48.0%)	13 (52.0%)	25 (100.0%)
SOME HIGH SCHOOL	21 (38.9%)	33 (61.1%)	54 (100.0%)
HIGH SCHOOL GRAD.	17 (51.5%)	16 (48.5%)	33 (100.0%)
SOME COLLEGE	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	2 (100.0%)
COLLEGE GRAD.	1 (25.0%)	3 (75.0%)	4 (100.0%)
POST-GRAD	0 (0.0%)	1 (100.0%)	1 (100.0%)
VOCATIONAL	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	2 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 5.51538		GRAMER'S V = .20364	
d.f. = 8		CONT. COEFF. = .19954	
Not Sig.			

**TABLE 4:16 EDUCATION AND TOTAL ALIENATION DISTRIBUTION**

EDUCATION	TOTAL ALIENATION		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
LESS THAN GRADE 6	2 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100.0%)
GRADES 6 & 7	5 (50.0%)	5 (50.0%)	10 (100.0%)
GRADE 8	11 (44.0%)	14 (56.0%)	25 (100.0%)
SOME HIGH SCHOOL	27 (50.0%)	27 (50.0%)	54 (100.0%)
HIGH SCHOOL GRAD.	19 (57.6%)	14 (42.4%)	33 (100.0%)
SOME COLLEGE	2 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100.0%)
COLLEGE GRAD	2 (50.0%)	2 (50.0%)	4 (100.0%)
POST-GRAD	1 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (100.0%)
VOCATIONAL	2 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 7.54309		GRAMER'S V = .23815	
d.f. = 8		CONT COEFF. = .23167	
Not. Sig.			

**SKILL LEVEL**

The distributions for skill level and the respective dimensions of alienation are presented in Tables 4:17 to 4:20. Again there is no significant relationship. However, the skilled workers are more highly represented in the low categories for each dimension. (52.5%, 56.5%, and 52.2% respectively).

As to the degree of relationship in the distributions, there is a direct reversal. Social isolation is the most highly influenced ( $\phi = .03795$ ) followed by normlessness. ( $\phi = .02946$ )

**TABLE 4:17 SKILL LEVEL AND POWERLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION**

SKILL LEVEL	POWERLESSNESS		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
SKILLED	12 (52.2%)	11 (47.8%)	23 (100.0%)
NON-SKILLED	53 (48.2%)	57 (51.8%)	110 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = .01416                      Phi = .01032 d.f. = 1                                      CONT. COEFF. = .01032 Not Sig.			

**TABLE 4:18 SKILL LEVEL AND NORMLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION**

SKILL LEVEL	NORMLESSNESS		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
SKILLED	13 (56.5%)	10 (43.5%)	23 (100.0%)
NON-SKILLED	55 (50.0%)	55 (50.0%)	110 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = .11539                      Phi = .02946 d.f. = 1                                      CONT. COEFF. = .02944 Not Sig.			



TABLE 4:19 SKILL LEVEL AND SOCIAL ISOLATION DISTRIBUTION

SKILL LEVEL	SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
SKILLED	12 (52.2%)	11 (47.8%)	23 (100.0%)
NON-SKILLED	49 (44.5%)	61 (55.5%)	110 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = .19154 d.f. = 1 Not Sig.			Phi = .03795 CONT. COEFF. = .03792

TABLE 4:20 SKILL LEVEL AND TOTAL ALIENATION DISTRIBUTION

SKILL LEVEL	TOTAL ALIENATION		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
SKILLED	14 (60.9%)	9 (39.1%)	23 (100.0%)
NON-SKILLED	57 (51.8%)	53 (48.2%)	110 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = .31535 d.f. = 1 Not SIG.			Phi = .04869 CONT. COEFF. = .04864

The greatest independence is shown by powerlessness ( $\text{phi} = .01032$ ). The distribution for total alienation is also not significant but does exhibit the highest degree of relationship ( $\text{phi} = .04869$ ). In this case, it has acted the most independently from the dimension of powerlessness.

SENIORITY

The distributions for seniority and the dimensions of alienation are presented in Tables 4:21 to 4:24. The relationships,

TABLE 4:21 SENIORITY AND POWERLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION

SENIORITY	POWERLESSNESS		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
LESS THAN 6 MONTHS	2 (25.0%)	6 (75.0%)	8 (100.0%)
6 MONTHS TO ONE YEAR	3 (42.9%)	4 (57.1%)	7 (100.0%)
ONE TO THREE YEARS	10 (40.0%)	15 (60.0%)	25 (100.0%)
THREE TO FIVE YEARS	6 (35.3%)	11 (64.7%)	17 (100.0%)
FIVE TO TEN YEARS	17 (54.8%)	14 (45.2%)	31 (100.0%)
TEN TO TWENTY YEARS	15 (51.7%)	14 (48.3%)	29 (100.0%)
20 YEARS OR MORE	13 (61.9%)	8 (38.1%)	21 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 5.87696 d.f. = 6 Not Sig.		CRAMER'S V = .20640 Cont. Coeff. = .20214	

TABLE 4:22 SENIORITY AND NORMLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION

SENIORITY	NORMLESSNESS		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
LESS THAN 6 MONTHS	3 (37.5%)	5 (62.5%)	8 (100.0%)
6 MONTHS TO ONE YEAR	3 (42.9%)	4 (57.1%)	7 (100.0%)
ONE TO THREE YEARS	13 (52.0%)	12 (48.0%)	25 (100.0%)
THREE TO FIVE YEARS	5 (29.4%)	12 (70.6%)	17 (100.0%)
FIVE TO TEN YEARS	17 (54.8%)	14 (45.2%)	31 (100.0%)
TEN TO TWENTY YEARS	18 (62.1%)	11 (37.9%)	29 (100.0%)
20 YEARS OR MORE	12 (57.1%)	9 (42.9%)	21 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 5.86274 d.f. = 6 Not Sig.		CRAMER'S V = .20612 CONT. COEFF. = .20187	

TABLE 4:23 SENIORITY AND SOCIAL ISOLATION DISTRIBUTION

SENIORITY	SOCIAL ISOLATION		
	LOW	HIGH	TOTAL
LESS THAN 6 MONTHS	2 (25.0%)	6 (75.0%)	8 (100.0%)
6 MONTHS TO ONE YEAR	2 (28.6%)	5 (71.4%)	7 (100.0%)
ONE TO THREE YEARS	11 (44.0%)	14 (56.0%)	25 (100.0%)
THREE TO FIVE YEARS	5 (29.4%)	12 (70.6%)	17 (100.0%)
FIVE TO TEN YEARS	12 (38.7%)	19 (61.3%)	31 (100.0%)
TEN TO TWENTY YEARS	19 (65.5%)	10 (34.5%)	29 (100.0%)
20 YEARS OR MORE	11 (52.4%)	10 (47.6%)	21 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 9.62823 d.f. = 6 Not Sig.		CRAMER'S V = .26414 CONT. COEFF. = .25588	

TABLE 4:24 SENIORITY AND TOTAL ALIENATION DISTRIBUTION

SENIORITY	TOTAL ALIENATION		
	LOW	HIGH	TOTAL
LESS THAN 6 MONTHS	3 (37.5%)	5 (62.5%)	8 (100.0%)
6 MONTHS TO ONE YEAR	3 (42.9%)	4 (57.1%)	7 (100.0%)
ONE TO THREE YEARS	11 (44.0%)	14 (56.0%)	25 (100.0%)
THREE TO FIVE YEARS	7 (41.2%)	10 (58.8%)	17 (100.0%)
FIVE TO TEN YEARS	15 (48.4%)	16 (51.6%)	31 (100.0%)
TEN TO TWENTY YEARS	18 (62.1%)	11 (37.9%)	29 (100.0%)
20 YEARS OR MORE	15 (71.4%)	6 (28.6%)	21 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 6.86342 d.f. = 6 Not Sig.		CRAMER'S V = .22301 CONT. COEFF. = .21767	

although not significant, do indicate that those who have the most seniority are less prone to feelings of alienation. Of the workers with at least 10 years seniority, 56.0% fall in the low powerlessness category; 60.0% in the low normlessness category and 60% in the low social isolation category.

As with skill level, seniority demonstrates its strongest relationship with the dimension of social isolation. (Cramer's  $V = .26414$ ) Powerlessness and normlessness follow and are almost identical. (Cramer's  $V = .20640$  and  $.20612$  respectively). The distribution for total alienation is also not significant and offers little evidence to further clarify the relationships.

#### SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The only social structural conditions which exhibited any significant relationship were age and marital status. With age, this only occurred with the dimension of powerlessness. Normlessness and social isolation demonstrated definite variations in their distributions but not enough to be significant.

As for marital status, the relationships were highly significant with all three dimensions. As a group, single people exhibited a higher degree of alienation than married people. However, in Table 2:2, it was shown that 39.7% of the workers under 30 years old were single compared to only 2.3% of the workers 30 and over. This relationship proved highly significant.

To clarify this point, distributions for age and marital status controlling for the three dimensions of alienation were tested. The low powerlessness and social isolation groups demonstrated no significance. The results for normlessness were highly significant

for both the low and high groups. These results suggest that although age and marital status are highly related, they do operate somewhat independently as preconditions in determining the degree of alienation.

All the relationships demonstrated above, whether significant or not, appear to follow a pattern. This pattern can be best explained according to Durkheim's conception of anomie, or "the condition in which the social pressures making for self-discipline are rendered impotent".<sup>2</sup>

The workers who indicated the highest degree of alienation were the young (Table 4:8), the single (Table 4:12), the less educated (Table 4:16), the non-skilled (Table 4:20), and those with the least seniority (Table 4:24). All of these results indicate that those workers who are least subjected to social pressures exhibit the highest degree of alienation.

To further clarify the concepts, perhaps the most interesting results concern the degree of relationship exhibited by the social structural conditions and the dimensions of alienation.

The only significance demonstrated were with the variables of age and marital status. Powerlessness exhibited the strongest relationship in both cases. The conditions concerned primarily with the work place suggest contrary results. Social isolation demonstrates a stronger relationship with skill level and seniority than either powerlessness or normlessness. These results further corroborate the evidence presented in Chapter 3 concerning the independence of the dimensions. However, they would have to be

qualified by the fact that neither skill level nor seniority show significant relationships.

The next step in the study will involve testing the dimensions of alienation for behavioural consequences in the form of choice political ideology.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. Melvin Seeman, "Alienation, Membership and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1966:353-367, p.354.

2. Cited in Harry Alpert, Emile Durkheim and His Sociology, New York: Russell and Russell, 1961, p.206.

## CHAPTER 5

### POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF ALIENATION

The political consequences of alienation has been a much discussed topic among social researchers.

Rosenberg<sup>1</sup> saw powerlessness leading to political apathy as "politics is avoided because of feelings of psychological inadequacies or weakness".<sup>2</sup>

Lazarsfeld<sup>3</sup> related "the phenomenon of conflict (a sub-type of our anomie) with non-voting"<sup>4</sup> as "the easy way out of an uncomfortable situation is simply to discount its importance and to give up the conflict as not worth the bother"<sup>5</sup>. He also pointed to a possible relationship between social isolation and political apathy. He suggested that "personal contacts can get a voter to the polls without affecting at all his comprehension of the issues". In other words, personal acquaintances rather than an understanding of the issues, often determines if a person votes.

Seeman<sup>6</sup> demonstrated a negative relationship between the degree of powerlessness and the learning of political knowledge. He defined this knowledge as control relevant information dealing with national "politics and international affairs"<sup>7</sup>.

This study seeks a relationship between the degree of powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation and how the industrial workers place themselves on a political scale from extreme left to extreme right. In other words, does alienation

bring about extremist attitudes in workers and if so, in which direction does this extremism tend to go?

Table 5:1 gives the distribution for powerlessness with the political scale. Little variation is indicated in the table.

TABLE 5:1 POLITICAL SCALE AND POWERLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION.

POLITICAL SCALE	POWERLESSNESS	
	LOW	HIGH
EXTREME LEFT	5 (10.2%)	7 (14.6%)
LEFT MODERATE	17 (34.7%)	14 (29.2%)
RIGHT MODERATE	17 (34.7%)	20 (41.7%)
EXTREME RIGHT	10 (20.4%)	7 (14.6%)
TOTAL	48 (100.0%)	49 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE=1.38615    CRAMER'S V=.11954 d.f.=3                    CONT. COEFF.=.11870 Not Sig.		

Of those low in powerlessness, 44.9% identify themselves with the left. This compares to 43.8% of those high in powerlessness. The only real difference occurs with the extremes of the low powerlessness group as 20.4% identify with the extreme right while only 10.2% identify with the extreme left. The majority of both groups fall in the moderate categories (69.4% for the low, and 70.9% for the high).

The results concerning normlessness are almost identical as those of powerlessness. 41.7% of the low group identify with the left as compared to 47.0% of the high group. This does suggest a tendency to the left for the high group. The extremes for the low group again seem to favour the right (20.8% as compared



to 10.4% for the left. The majority of the low group 68.8%, and

**TABLE 5:2 POLITICAL SCALE AND NORMLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION.**

POLITICAL SCALE	NORMLESSNESS	
	LOW	HIGH
EXTREME LEFT	5 (10.4%)	7 (14.3%)
LEFT MODERATE	15 (31.3%)	16 (32.7%)
RIGHT MODERATE	18 (37.5%)	19 (38.8%)
EXTREME RIGHT	10 (20.8%)	7 (14.3%)
TOTAL	48 (100.0%)	49 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE=.91182 CRAMER'S V=.09695 d.f.= 3 CONT. COEFF.=.12873 Not Sig.		

the majority of the high group, 70.5%, fall in the moderate categories.

The findings for social isolation, presented in Table 5:3, offer little variation. As with normlessness, the distribution

**TABLE 5:3 POLITICAL SCALE AND SOCIAL ISOLATION DISTRIBUTION.**

POLITICAL SCALE	SOCIAL ISOLATION	
	LOW	HIGH
EXTREME LEFT	6 (14.3%)	6 (10.9%)
LEFT MODERATE	11 (26.2%)	20 (36.4%)
RIGHT MODERATE	16 (38.1%)	21 (38.2%)
EXTREME RIGHT	9 (21.4%)	8 (14.5%)
TOTAL	42 (100.0%)	55 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE=1.63449 CRAMER'S V=.12981 d.f.= 3 CONT. COEFF.=.12873 Not Sig.		

suggests a tendency to the left for those who exhibit high degrees of social isolation. (47.3% as compared to 40.5% for the low group). In the low group, those who stand at extremes tend to choose the right (21.4%) rather than the left (14.3%). There is also a slight tendency to do this in the high group as 14.5% indicate extreme right, while only 10.9% indicate extreme left. As with the other dimensions, the majority of the low group, 64.1%, as well as the high group, 74.6%, select the moderate categories.

The distribution for the political scale and the total alienation scores substantiate the findings for the dimension. (See Table 5:4) There is a tendency to the left among those high in alienation and to the right for those low in alienation. The

TABLE 5:4 POLITICAL SCALE AND TOTAL ALIENATION DISTRIBUTION

POLITICAL SCALE	TOTAL ALIENATION	
	LOW	HIGH
EXTREME LEFT	5 (10.2%)	7 (14.6%)
LEFT MODERATE	15 (30.6%)	16 (33.3%)
RIGHT MODERATE	18 (36.7%)	19 (39.6%)
EXTREME RIGHT	11 (22.4%)	6 (12.5%)
TOTAL	49 (100.0%)	48 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE=1.85309 CRAMER'S V=.13822 d.f.= 3 CONT. COEFF.=.13692 Not Sig.		

majority of the workers both low in alienation (67.3%) and high in alienation (72.9%) see themselves as moderate.

The distributions discussed so far are not strong and only suggest relationships. The conditions which had some effect on

the alienation scores were then applied in an effort to increase the significance and to clarify the findings. Although age and marital status were the conditions which most influenced the dimensions, controls for skill level provided the most interesting results. Tables 5:5, 5:6 and 5:7 give the distributions for the dimensions and the political scale controlling for skill level.

For the skilled workers, 87.5% of those high in powerlessness place themselves on the right of the political scale. This also applies for normlessness (87.5%) and social isolation (75.0%). Those low in each of the dimensions were approximately evenly split between left and right.

For the non-skilled workers, 53.1% of those high in powerlessness place themselves on the left of the political scale. This again applies to normlessness (55.6%) and social isolation (52.6%). The non-skilled, low in each dimension, react

**TABLE 5:5 POLITICAL SCALE AND POWERLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION CONTROLLING FOR SKILL LEVEL**

POLITICAL SCALE	SKILLED		NON-SKILLED	
	POWERLESSNESS		POWERLESSNESS	
	LOW	HIGH	LOW	HIGH
EXTREME LEFT	1 (11.1%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (11.1%)	5 (15.6%)
LEFT MODERATE	4 (44.4%)	1 (12.5%)	12 (33.3%)	12 (37.5%)
RIGHT MODERATE	3 (33.3%)	5 (62.5%)	12 (33.3%)	13 (40.6%)
EXTREME RIGHT	1 (11.1%)	2 (25.0%)	8 (22.2%)	2 (6.3%)
TOTAL	9 (100.0%)	8 (100.0%)	36 (100.0%)	32 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE =	3.58692		CHI-SQUARE =	3.52802
d.f. =	3		d.f. =	3
Not Sig.			Not Sig.	
CRAMER'S V =	.45934		CRAMER'S V =	.22778
CONT. COEFF. =	.41741		CONT. COEFF. =	.22209

**TABLE 5:6 POLITICAL SCALE AND NORMLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION CONTROLLING FOR SKILL LEVEL**

POLITICAL SCALE	SKILLED		NON-SKILLED	
	NORMLESSNESS		NORMLESSNESS	
	LOW	HIGH	LOW	HIGH
EXTREME LEFT	1 (11.1%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (9.4%)	6 (16.7%)
LEFT MODERATE	4 (44.4%)	1 (12.5%)	10 (31.3%)	14 (38.9%)
RIGHT MODERATE	2 (22.3%)	6 (75.0%)	13 (40.6%)	12 (33.3%)
EXTREME RIGHT	2 (22.2%)	1 (12.5%)	6 (18.8%)	4 (11.1%)
TOTAL	9 (100.0%)	8 (100.0%)	32 (100.0%)	36 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 5.09212 d.f. = 3 Not Sig.		CHI-SQUARE = 1.87787 d.f. = 3 Not Sig.		
CRAMER'S V = .54730		CRAMER'S V = .17085		
CONT. COEFF. = .48010		CONT. COEFF. = .16841		

**TABLE 5:7 POLITICAL SCALE AND SOCIAL ISOLATION DISTRIBUTION CONTROLLING FOR SKILL LEVEL**

POLITICAL SCALE	SKILLED		NON-SKILLED	
	NORMLESSNESS		NORMLESSNESS	
	LOW	HIGH	LOW	HIGH
EXTREME LEFT	1 (11.1%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (16.7%)	4 (10.5%)
LEFT MODERATE	3 (33.3%)	2 (25.0%)	8 (26.7%)	16 (42.1%)
RIGHT MODERATE	3 (33.3%)	5 (62.5%)	11 (36.7%)	14 (36.8%)
EXTREME RIGHT	2 (22.2%)	1 (12.5%)	6 (20.0%)	4 (10.5%)
TOTAL	9 (100.0%)	8 (100.0%)	30 (100.0%)	38 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 1.98136 d.f. = 3 Not Sig.		CHI-SQUARE = 2.63304 d.f. = 3 Not Sig.		
CRAMER'S V = .34140		CRAMER'S V = .19678		
CONT. COEFF. = .32309		CONT. COEFF. = .19307		

in the opposite direction and tend to the right. (55.5%, 59.4% and 56.7% respectively).

The findings for total alienation presented in Table 5:8 confirm these results. The highly alienated skilled workers demonstrates opposite reactions to the highly alienated non-skilled workers. There is a definite indication that the skilled workers adopt rightist tendencies while the non-skilled workers tend to the left. It would appear that those who occupy the most secure status (and hence have most to lose), such as the skilled workers, place themselves in a more conservative political position.

**TABLE 5:8** POLITICAL SCALE AND TOTAL ALIENATION DISTRIBUTION CONTROLLING FOR SKILL LEVEL

POLITICAL SCALE	SKILLED		NON-SKILLED	
	TOTAL ALIENATION		TOTAL ALIENATION	
	LOW	HIGH	LOW	HIGH
EXTREME LEFT	1 (10.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (11.4%)	5 (15.2%)
LEFT MODERATE	4 (40.0%)	1 (14.3%)	10 (28.6%)	14 (42.4%)
RIGHT MODERATE	3 (30.0%)	5 (71.4%)	13 (37.1%)	12 (36.4%)
EXTREME RIGHT	2 (20.0%)	1 (14.3%)	8 (22.9%)	2 (6.1%)
TOTAL	10 (100.0%)	7 (100.0%)	35 (100.0%)	33 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 3.20369		CHI-SQUARE = 4.36273		
d.f. = 3		d.f. = 3		
Not Sig.		Not Sig.		
CRAMER'S V = .43411		CRAMER'S V = .25329		
CONT. COEFF. = .39821		CONT. COEFF. = .24554		

Further evidence for this tendency is given when controls for age, marital status, and education were applied. As with the skilled workers, the older age group, the married, and the more highly educated exhibited lower degrees of alienation. (See Chapter 4

However, the majority among these groups who exhibited higher degrees of alienation placed themselves to the right as did the skilled workers. (Tables not presented).

As with the non-skilled workers, the younger age group, the single, and those with less education, who were highly alienated, exhibited a more balanced position with tendencies to the left.

These results again have to be qualified by the fact that the majority of the workers described as either left or right do place themselves in the moderate categories with very few choosing the extremes.

#### BEHAVIOURAL AVOIDANCE

One question which did arise with the application of the political scale was the high rate of non-response. The behavioural avoidance hypothesis has already been discussed and shown significant with social isolation and the rate of return.

Seeman<sup>8</sup> had demonstrated a negative relationship between the degree of powerlessness and the learning of political knowledge. It will be assumed that the high rate of non-response on the political-scale can be attributed to behavioural avoidance because of the poor learning of control relevant information in the form of political knowledge. If the behavioural avoidance hypothesis holds true, those high in the dimensions of alienation will have a higher rate of non-response.

Table 5:9 gives the rates of response on the political scale for those who are low and high on the dimensions of alienation. The only dimension which exhibits a relationship is powerlessness

TABLE 5:9 RATES OF RESPONSE ON POLITICAL SCALE

	P		N		SI		TA	
	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H
RESPONSE	69.1%	59.2%	62.3%	65.3%	63.7%	63.9%	63.7%	64.0%
NON-RESPONSE	30.9%	40.8%	37.7%	34.7%	36.3%	36.1%	36.3%	36.0%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

where 40.8% of the high group did not respond compared to 30.9% of the low group. Although the relationship is not significant, it does indicate some support for Seeman's contention concerning behavioural avoidance with control-relevant information for people who have a high degree of powerlessness.

It also provides further evidence as to the independence of the dimensions. Social isolation demonstrated a significant difference in the rate of return whereas, in this case, it demonstrated no difference in the rate of response to the political scale. The opposite reaction occurred with powerlessness.

#### SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

As with the description of the conditions, the relationships of the dimensions with political consequences appear to follow a pattern. (See Table 5:8) Those who occupy more secure statuses such as the older workers, the married, the more highly educated and the skilled tend to develop rightist tendencies if they are highly alienated.

In contrast, the statuses described by Durkheim, "in which the social pressures making for self-discipline"<sup>9</sup> are the weakest, have definite tendencies to a leftist political position.

Perhaps, in these findings, lies an essential factor in understanding social change. The highly alienated workers occupy the polar positions with respect to political ideology.

Those who occupy more secure statuses, with respect to the social order, develop rightist tendencies when confronted with feelings of alienation. Perhaps, because of these feelings, they perceive their positions endangered or threatened, and thereby develop political stances which they believe will offer a certain degree of protection against any one person or group which might challenge these positions.

On the other hand, the highly alienated workers in the least secure positions, the young, the single, the less educated, and the non-skilled, have less to lose and more to gain by pursuing a leftist ideology and change within the system.

The results do not apply to those workers low in alienation. (See Table 5:8) In fact, 60.0% of the non-skilled workers low in alienation demonstrate tendencies to the right. This provides a contradiction to Marx's notion that the class struggle is the essence of revolution.<sup>10</sup> Rather than distinct class struggle, the present findings suggest that a potential struggle is much more complicated. It involves not only the worker's respective status within the system, but also his individual perception of this status and how he reacts to it ie. whether he feels powerless, normless or socially isolated.



The study, to this point, has examined three dimensions of alienation as to their intercorrelations, their antecedent conditions, and their behavioural consequences. A certain degree of coherence is evident by the fact that there is a high correlation between the sub-scales.

However, this coherence is misleading as relationships with the dimensions vary repeatedly:

1. Social isolation was the only dimension which demonstrated a significant relationship with the rate of return.

2. Powerlessness appeared as the dominant dimension in the inter-correlation of the sub-scales.

3. Powerlessness was the only dimension which exhibited a significant relationship with age, while it exhibited the strongest relationship with marital status.

4. Powerlessness was the only dimension which suggested behavioural avoidance in the response to the political scale.

Powerlessness appears as the dominant dimension in that it correlates most consistently with structural conditions and behavioural consequences. However, evidence to prove this claim is far from conclusive.

The next step in the study is to suggest methods which could be applied to modify the social structural conditions which bring about feelings of alienation.

The dimensions will be treated independently to determine the effect of the structural conditions on each of them.

FOOTNOTES

1. Morris Rosenberg, "The Meaning of Politics in Mass Society", Public Opinion Quarterly, 15:5-15, 1951.
2. Cited in Dean, "Alienation and Political Apathy," Social Forces, 38:186, 1960.
3. Paul F. Lazarsfeld et.al., The People's Choice, New York: Durell, Sloan and Pearce, 1944.
4. Cited in Dean, op.cit., p.187.
5. Ibid.
6. Melvin Seeman, "Alienation, Membership and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1966:353-367.
7. Ibid., p.358.
8. Ibid.
9. Cited in Harry Alpert, Emile Durkheim and His Sociology, New York: Russell and Russell, 1961, p.206.
10. Cited in T.B. Bottomore, (translator), Karl Marx: Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy, New York: McGraw Hill, 1964, pp.231-233.

## CHAPTER 6

### A TEST OF THE MEDIATION THESIS

As stated earlier, a major focus of this study was to seek methods which could be applied to modify the social structural conditions which lead to alienation among factory workers.

One such method forms the basis for the test of the first hypothesis. It was derived primarily from Melvin Seeman<sup>1</sup> and Leonard Pearlin<sup>2</sup> and their work upon the mediation hypothesis. It states that a high degree of participation in the informal work group, in union meetings, and in union social functions will decrease feelings of alienation.

William Kornhauser<sup>3</sup> demonstrated that when such mediating organizations do not exist between elites and non-elites, "mass-society is psychologically vulnerable to the appeals of mass movements,"<sup>4</sup> such as the one which developed in Nazi Germany.

Participation in the informal work group, in union meetings, and in union social functions will be examined separately to determine their respective effects upon the dimensions of alienation.

### RESULTS

The variable of age was used as a control throughout this chapter. It was felt to be a central factor in determining alienation, since it demonstrated a strong correlation with the other primary conditions of marital status, education, skill level and seniority.

### Informal Work Group

Table 6:1 gives the distribution for the degree of participation in the informal work group with powerlessness. Increased participation has little influence on the workers under 30 years old. For the workers who are at least 30 years old, increased participation demonstrates a positive effect by decreasing feelings of powerlessness. As participation increases, the percentage of workers in the low category climbs from 54.5 to 64.3.

The distribution for normlessness presented in Table 6:2 demonstrates that as participation increases, feelings of normlessness decrease for both age groups. However, for the younger workers, this influence is only observable in the "once a month or more" category.

The results for social isolation in Table 6:3 indicate an opposite reaction. For the young workers, the highest percentage falling in the low category are those that participate "once a month or more" and those that do not participate at all. For the older workers, as participation increases, the percentage of workers who exhibit low social isolation decreases (from 54.5% to 42.9%).

These findings suggest that the degree of informal work group participation does influence alienation. However, the control for age indicates that this influence is selective and effects lower feelings of powerlessness only in the older workers. Perhaps the most striking finding concerns the fact that as increased participation decreases feelings of powerlessness and normlessness for the older workers, it also increases feelings

**TABLE 6:1 INFORMAL WORK GROUP PARTICIPATION AND POWERLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION CONTROLLING FOR AGE**

POWER-LESSNESS	UNDER 30			OVER 30		
	INFORMAL WORK GROUP PARTICIPATION NOT AT ALL	ONCE A YEAR OR LESS	2 TO 10 TIMES A YEAR OR MORE	INFORMAL WORK GROUP PARTICIPATION NOT AT ALL	ONCE A YEAR OR LESS	2 TO 10 TIMES A YEAR OR MORE
LOW	5 (31.3%)	3 (30.0%)	8 (44.4%)	12 (54.5%)	11 (55.0%)	16 (50.0%)
HIGH	11 (68.0%)	7 (70.0%)	10 (55.6%)	10 (45.5%)	9 (45.0%)	16 (50.0%)
TOTAL	16 (100.0%)	10 (100.0%)	18 (100.0%)	22 (100.0%)	20 (100.0%)	32 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = .86729 CONT. COEFF. = .12138 d.f. = 3 CRAMER'S V = .12228 CHI-SQUARE = .80405 CONT. COEFF. = .09515 d.f. = 3 CRAMER'S V = .09559 Not. Sig.						

**TABLE 6:2 INFORMAL WORK GROUP PARTICIPATION AND NORMLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION CONTROLLING FOR AGE**

NORM-LESSNESS	UNDER 30			OVER 30		
	INFORMAL WORK GROUP PARTICIPATION NOT AT ALL	ONCE A YEAR OR LESS	2 TO 10 TIMES A YEAR OR MORE	INFORMAL WORK GROUP PARTICIPATION NOT AT ALL	ONCE A YEAR OR LESS	2 TO 10 TIMES A YEAR OR MORE
LOW	5 (31.3%)	3 (30.0%)	7 (38.9%)	10 (45.5%)	10 (50.0%)	19 (59.4%)
HIGH	11 (68.8%)	7 (70.0%)	11 (61.1%)	12 (54.5%)	10 (50.0%)	13 (40.6%)
TOTAL	16 (100.0%)	10 (100.0%)	18 (100.0%)	22 (100.0%)	20 (100.0%)	32 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = 6.32724 CONT. COEFF. = .31362 d.f. = 3 CRAMER'S V = .33029 CHI-SQUARE = 2.77775 CONT. COEFF. = .17493 d.f. = 3 CRAMER'S V = .17767 Not. Sig.						

TABLE 6:3 INFORMAL WORK GROUP PARTICIPATION AND SOCIAL ISOLATION DISTRIBUTION CONTROLLING FOR AGE

SOCIAL ISOLATION	UNDER 30			OVER 30		
	INFORMAL WORK GROUP PARTICIPATION NOT AT ALL	ONCE A YEAR OR LESS	2 TO 10 TIMES A YEAR	INFORMAL WORK GROUP PARTICIPATION NOT AT ALL	ONCE A YEAR OR LESS	2 TO 10 TIMES A YEAR
LOW	7 (43.8%)	1 (10.0%)	5 (27.8%)	12 (54.5%)	11 (55.0%)	16 (50.0%)
HIGH	9 (56.3%)	9 (90.0%)	13 (72.2%)	10 (45.5%)	9 (45.0%)	16 (50.0%)
TOTAL	16 (100.0%)	10 (100.0%)	18 (100.0%)	22 (100.0%)	20 (100.0%)	32 (100.0%)

CHI-SQUARE = 5.11167 CONT. COEFF. = .28459  
 d.f. = 3 CRAMER'S V = .29687  
 CONT. COEFF. = .62240  
 CRAMER'S V = .08380  
 Not Sig.

TABLE 6:4 ATTENDANCE AT UNION MEETINGS AND POWERLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION CONTROLLING FOR AGE

POWER-LESSNESS	UNDER 30			OVER 30		
	ATTENDANCE NOT AT ALL	ONCE A YEAR OR LESS	2 TO 10 TIMES A YEAR	ATTENDANCE NOT AT ALL	ONCE A YEAR OR LESS	2 TO 10 TIMES A YEAR
LOW	5 (35.7%)	3 (42.9%)	8 (33.3%)	5 (50.0%)	11 (68.8%)	25 (53.2%)
HIGH	9 (64.3%)	4 (57.1%)	16 (66.7%)	5 (50.0%)	5 (31.3%)	22 (46.8%)
TOTAL	14 (100.0%)	7 (100.0%)	24 (100.0%)	10 (100.0%)	16 (100.0%)	47 (100.0%)

CHI-SQUARE = .24991 CONT. COEFF. = .06550  
 d.f. = 3 CRAMER'S V = .06564  
 CONT. COEFF. = 1.50542  
 CRAMER'S V = .13192  
 Not Sig.

of social isolation. This provides further demonstration as to the independence of the dimensions. It appears that participation in an informal work group, composed of workers belonging to a union, has its greatest influence on older workers.

The hypothesis, as it stands, will have to be rejected with respect to the influence of the informal work group on powerlessness and social isolation as age proves to be an important factor in determining the relative effects on these dimensions.

The hypothesis can be accepted with regard to normlessness as high participation does appear to influence lower feelings of normlessness in both age groups, although the direct influence is primarily observable with the older workers.

In the questionnaire, the respondents were also asked to indicate how often they socially visited with relatives and with neighbours and friends. It was felt that the relationships between time spent with people from outside the work place and alienation might help to measure the relative influence of the work group on alienation.

The findings closely followed those for work associates as participation with relatives had its greatest influence on powerlessness and normlessness with the older workers. There was no such influence on the young workers.

Time spent with friends did produce lower feelings of normlessness among both the younger and older workers. It also decreased feelings of social isolation among the younger workers. It had little effect on either the young or old with respect to

powerlessness.

These results suggest that, for the older worker, the work group and relatives both provide the highest mediating influences with respect to powerlessness and normlessness, while for the younger worker the influence is not so clear cut.

#### Union Meetings

Tables 6:4, 6:5 and 6:6 present the distributions for attendance at union meetings with respective dimensions of alienation. None of the dimensions are significantly influenced by the participation of the members.

As participation increases, there is a slight increase in the percentage of older workers, who fall in the low powerlessness category. The largest increase occurs with those who attend "once a year or less" for both young and old (42.9% and 68.8% respectively). Perhaps it is enough to reduce feelings of powerlessness for these workers if they just keep an occasional contact with the union.

Normlessness also appears to be slightly influenced by attendance as the percentage of workers exhibiting low normlessness increase as participation increases for both the young and old.

Social isolation again exhibits results contrary to the hypothesis. For the older workers, the largest percentage in the low category do not attend union meetings. For the younger workers, there is not enough variation to indicate a relationship.

Of the three dimensions, only normlessness suggests a confirmation to the hypothesis that a high degree of participation



TABLE 6:5 ATTENDANCE AT UNION MEETINGS AND NORMLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION CONTROLLING FOR AGE

NORM-LESSNESS	UNDER 30			OVER 30				
	NOT AT ALL	ATTENDANCE ONCE A YEAR OR LESS	2 TO 10 TIMES A YEAR	ONCE A MONTH OR MORE	NOT AT ALL	ATTENDANCE ONCE A YEAR OR LESS	2 TO 10 TIMES A YEAR	ONCE A MONTH OR MORE
LOW	5 (35.7%)	3 (42.9%)	12 (50.0%)	5 (38.5%)	6 (60.0%)	10 (62.5%)	25 (53.2%)	8 (66.7%)
HIGH	9 (64.3%)	4 (57.1%)	12 (50.0%)	8 (61.5%)	4 (40.0%)	6 (37.5%)	22 (46.8%)	4 (33.3%)
TOTAL	14 (100.0%)	7 (100.0%)	24 (100.0%)	13 (100.0%)	10 (100.0%)	16 (100.0%)	47 (100.0%)	12 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = .89153 CONT. COEFF. = .12304 d.f. = 3 CRAMER'S V = .12398 CHI-SQUARE = .95902 CONT. COEFF. = .10563 d.f. = 3 CRAMER'S V = .10622 Not. Sig.								

TABLE 6:6 ATTENDANCE AT UNION MEETINGS AND SOCIAL ISOLATION DISTRIBUTION CONTROLLING FOR AGE

SOCIAL ISOLATION	UNDER 30			OVER 30				
	NOT AT ALL	ATTENDANCE ONCE A YEAR OR LESS	2 TO 10 TIMES A YEAR	ONCE A MONTH OR MORE	NOT AT ALL	ATTENDANCE ONCE A YEAR OR LESS	2 TO 10 TIMES A YEAR	ONCE A MONTH OR MORE
LOW	5 (35.7%)	2 (28.6%)	9 (37.5%)	4 (30.8%)	6 (60.0%)	8 (50.0%)	23 (48.9%)	6 (50.0%)
HIGH	9 (64.3%)	5 (71.4%)	15 (62.5%)	9 (69.2%)	4 (40.0%)	8 (50.0%)	24 (51.1%)	6 (50.0%)
TOTAL	14 (100.0%)	7 (100.0%)	24 (100.0%)	13 (100.0%)	10 (100.0%)	16 (100.0%)	47 (100.0%)	12 (100.0%)
CHI-SQUARE = .29373 CONT. COEFF. = .07098 d.f. = 3 CRAMER'S V = .07116 CHI-SQUARE = .40957 CONT. COEFF. = .06925 d.f. = 3 CRAMER'S V = .06942 Not. Sig.								

in union meetings will lower feelings of alienation. However, this relationship is very weak.

As with the work group, attendance at union meetings appears to effect the older worker the most with respect to powerlessness.

#### Union Social Functions

Attendance at union social functions offers little evidence to support the hypothesis. Table 6:7 presents the distribution for union social functions and the total alienation scores by age groups.

As attendance increases, for both young and old, alienation increases. The one exception is again the "once a year or less" category. It provides the highest percentage with low alienation for both young and old. (45.5% and 76.9% respectively).

This exception was further investigated in an effort to determine a cause. When the distribution was controlled for skill level, it was discovered that 29.2% of the workers whose attendance was "once a year or less" were skilled. The sample, as a whole, only contained 20.9% skilled workers. This could explain some of the variation. For that reason, the hypothesis, as with attendance at union meetings has to be rejected.

#### SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The results have demonstrated that a high degree of participation in the informal work group, union meetings and union social functions do not significantly decrease feelings of alienation. Support for the hypothesis was derived from the relatively strong

TABLE 6:7 ATTENDANCE AT UNION SOCIAL FUNCTIONS AND TOTAL ALIENATION DISTRIBUTION CONTROLLING FOR AGE

TOTAL ALIENATION	UNDER 30 ATTENDANCE			30 AND OVER ATTENDANCE		
	NOT AT ALL	ONCE A YEAR OR LESS	2 TO 10 TIMES A YEAR	ONCE A YEAR OR LESS	2 TO 10 TIMES A YEAR	ONCE A MONTH OR MORE
LOW	13 (41.9%)	5 (45.5%)	2 (33.3%)	27 (61.4%)	10 (76.9%)	4 (50.0%)
HIGH	18 (58.1%)	6 (54.5%)	4 (66.7%)	17 (38.6%)	3 (23.1%)	4 (50.0%)
TOTAL	31 (100.0%)	11 (100.0%)	6 (100.0%)	44 (100.0%)	13 (100.0%)	8 (100.0%)

CHI-SQUARE = .45829 CONT. COEFF. = .08931  
d.f. = 3  
Not Sig.

CHI-SQUARE = 2.34513 CONT. COEFF. = .16480  
d.f. = 3  
Not Sig.

relationships between normlessness and participation in the informal work group and union meetings. However, the strongest confirmations did occur with the older workers.

Powerlessness also appeared to be lowered by increased participation in the informal work group and in union meetings, but again primarily with the older workers.

The findings, which demonstrated a decrease in the percentage of older workers who fell in the low social isolation category as participation increased with the informal work group and at union meetings, again demonstrated the independence of the dimensions and the need to define and treat them separately, and not as a syndrome.

These results concerning participation contradict those presented by both Pearlin<sup>5</sup> and Seeman<sup>6</sup>. Pearlin, in a study of nursing personnel, demonstrated that powerlessness "occurs less among those who have established extra-work friendship relations with fellow workers".<sup>7</sup>

This study of factory workers demonstrated that powerlessness and social isolation did not occur less among those who had established extra-work friendship relations; however, normlessness did.

Perhaps the best explanation for this contradiction is the difference in the samples. Pearlin's sample involved nurses who were ranked "each differing in formally prescribed responsibilities, authorities and rewards".<sup>8</sup> The hospital in which they worked was established to "meet community needs and alleviate human suffering"<sup>9</sup> and it employs those "who possess

the talents and training thought to be instrumental to these ends".<sup>10</sup>

The nursing personnel differ greatly from the factory workers who have little or no chance for advancement, for use of authority, or for individual rewards. The factory was not established to alleviate human suffering, nor does it employ on the basis of talent or training (with the possible exception of skilled workers.)

With regard to participation in the industrial union, a work based organization, Seeman demonstrated that "involvement in the life of the organization ... produces low alienation."<sup>12</sup> Attendance at meetings correlated significantly with powerlessness for manual workers.<sup>13</sup>

The present study of manual workers demonstrates no relationship between participation in a work based organization and alienation. In fact, social isolation increases as participation increases. (This relationship approaches significance with union social functions). However, as with Pearlin's study, the contradiction in the findings for powerlessness may be best explained by a difference in the sample.

Seeman's study was conducted "with a sample of the male work force in Malmo",<sup>14</sup> Sweden. The socialist political and economic system in Sweden may provide more opportunities and rewards for participation in a work based organization. Also, Malmo has a "concentration of commercial and seaport occupations".<sup>15</sup>

This study, utilized a Canadian sample of factory workers, largely involved in the automobile assembly and supply areas.

These are definitely different types of work environments. Blauner<sup>16</sup> realized the necessity for examining them separately as they "result in large variations in the form and the intensity of alienation".<sup>17</sup> In fact, he demonstrated that "the job attitudes of automobile workers reveal greater alienation than those in any other industry".<sup>18</sup>

The results obtained in this study, when compared to those of Pearlin and Seeman, demonstrate Blauner's point and the dangers and misconceptions involved in generalizing from one sample to include an entire population. Also, as mentioned earlier, Seeman's work concentrated on testing powerlessness. The independent findings concerning normlessness and social isolation demonstrate the need for further research into these dimensions as separate elements.

The mediation hypothesis having been rejected, the next step in the study is to test the Marxian<sup>19</sup> notion of intrinsic satisfaction in the work place and its effect on the degree of the dimensions of alienation.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. Melvin Seeman, "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis", American Sociological Review, 29:216-226; and "Alienation, Membership and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1966:353-367.

2. Leonard Pearlin, "Alienation from Work: A Study of Nursing Personnell", American Sociological Review, 27:314-326, 1962.

3. William Kornhauser, The Politics of Mass Society, New York: The Free Press, 1959, p.113.

4. Ibid.

5. Leonard Pearlman, op.cit.

6. Melvin Seeman, "Alienation, Membership and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study", op.cit.

7. Leonard Pearlman, op.cit., p.325.

8. Ibid., p.315.

9. Ibid., p.321.

10. Ibid., p.321.

11. Melvin Seeman, op.cit.

12. Ibid., p.360.

13. Ibid., p.361.

14. Ibid., p.357.

15. Ibid., p.357.

16. Robert Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

17. Ibid., p.4.

18. Ibid., p.5.

19. Cited in Shlomo Avineri, The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx, Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1970, p.106.

## CHAPTER 7

### A TEST FOR INTRINSIC SATISFACTION AND ITS EFFECT ON THE DIMENSION OF ALIENATION

Marx saw Capitalist labour as "not the satisfaction of a need, but only a means for satisfying other needs".<sup>1</sup> He felt this to be the essence of alienation.

Blauner tested this notion with respect to self-estrangement<sup>2</sup> and demonstrated that "in non-alienated activity the rewards are in the activity itself; in alienated states they are largely extrinsic".<sup>3</sup>

These theorists form the basis for the second hypothesis which was tested on the same sample of factory workers as the mediation hypothesis. It states that intrinsic satisfaction in work will be related to a low degree of alienation.

Whereas Blauner's thesis concerned self-estrangement, this study will test the dimensions of powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation.

#### RESULTS

Table 7:1 gives the distribution for worker satisfactions, i.e. the good points the workers realize about their jobs, and alienation.

60.9% of the workers who felt "independence or responsibility" to be good points about their jobs, and 62.8% of those who saw their work as "satisfying or interesting" fell in the low alienation categories.



**TABLE 7:1 SATISFACTION AND TOTAL ALIENATION DISTRIBUTION**

GOOD POINTS	TOTAL ALIENATION		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
INDEPENDENCE, RESPONSIBILITY	13 (60.9%)	8 (39.1%)	21 (100.0%)
SATISFYING, INTERESTING	22 (62.8%)	13 (37.2%)	35 (100.0%)
WORKING ASSOCIATES	5 (45.5%)	6 (54.5%)	11 (100.0%)
WORKING CONDITIONS	19 (55.8%)	15 (44.2%)	34 (100.0%)
PAY & FRINGE BENEFITS	26 (59.1%)	18 (40.9%)	44 (100.0%)
OPPORTUNITY FOR ADVANCEMENT	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	2 (100.0%)
SECURITY	11 (52.4%)	10 (47.6%)	21 (100.0%)
OTHER	7 (53.8%)	6 (46.2%)	13 (100.0%)
NONE	2 (18.2%)	9 (81.8%)	11 (100.0%)

There were only 2 workers who mentioned "opportunity for advancement" as good points. This, no doubt, demonstrates the lack of opportunities for advancement within the factory structure as the workers do not even appear to recognize it as a possibility.

In order to clarify the relationship between satisfaction and alienation, the categories of the types of satisfaction were grouped into intrinsic and extrinsic according to the classification system derived from Herzberg.<sup>5</sup> Intrinsic satisfaction is indicated by a response of: 1) independence,

responsibility; 2) satisfying, interesting; 3) opportunity for advancement. Extrinsic satisfaction is indicated by a response of: 1) working associates; 2) work conditions; 3) pay and fringe benefits; 4) security; and 5) any other type of extrinsic satisfaction.

Table 7:2 presents the distribution for the two types of satisfaction and alienation. It does support the hypothesis that intrinsic satisfaction in work is related to low alienation as 62.1% of the intrinsic responses as compared to only 55.3% of the extrinsic responses were given by the low group.

TABLE 7:2 INTRINSIC-EXTRINSIC SATISFACTION AND ALIENATION DISTRIBUTION

SATISFACTION	ALIENATION		TOTAL
	LOW	HIGH	
INTRINSIC	36 (62.1%)	22 (37.9%)	58 (100.0%)
EXTRINSIC	68 (55.3%)	55 (44.7%)	123 (100.0%)

To extend the study, the variable of skill level was introduced. Seeman had demonstrated that "those who emphasize intrinsic values are actually engaged in less alienative work".<sup>6</sup> If Seeman's thesis holds, skilled workers, who utilize a specific trade on their jobs, should emphasize intrinsic values to a greater degree than non-skilled workers.

Table 7:3 presents the distribution for satisfaction with skill level. Seeman's thesis does hold as 48.5% of the

responses of the skilled workers emphasize intrinsic satisfactions compared to only 29.3% of the responses of the non-skilled workers.

**TABLE 7:3 SKILL LEVEL AND SATISFACTION DISTRIBUTION**

SATISFACTION	SKILL LEVEL	
	SKILLED	NON-SKILLED
INTRINSIC	16 (48.5%)	42 (29.3%)
EXTRINSIC	17 (51.5%)	101 (70.7%)
TOTAL	33 (100.0%)	143 (100.0%)

Based on these findings, skill level was utilized as a control variable to further test the hypothesis.

Tables 7:4, 7:5 and 7:6 give the distributions for worker satisfactions with the respective dimensions of alienation controlling for skill level.

**TABLE 7:4 INTRINSIC-EXTRINSIC SATISFACTION AND POWERLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION CONTROLLING FOR SKILL LEVEL**

POWER- LESSNESS	SKILLED		NON-SKILLED	
	SATISFACTION		SATISFACTION	
	INTRINSIC	EXTRINSIC	INTRINSIC	EXTRINSIC
LOW	13 (81.3%)	9 (52.9%)	22 (52.4%)	54 (53.5%)
HIGH	3 (18.7%)	8 (47.1%)	20 (47.6%)	47 (46.5%)
TOTAL	16 (100.0%)	17 (100.0%)	42 (100.0%)	101 (100.0%)

**TABLE 7:5 INTRINSIC-EXTRINSIC SATISFACTION AND NORMLESSNESS DISTRIBUTION CONTROLLING FOR SKILL LEVEL**

NORM- LESSNESS	SKILLED		NON-SKILLED	
	SATISFACTION		SATISFACTION	
	INTRINSIC	EXTRINSIC	INTRINSIC	EXTRINSIC
LOW	12 (75.0%)	9 (52.9%)	22 (52.4%)	58 (57.4%)
HIGH	4 (25.0%)	8 (47.1%)	20 (47.6%)	43 (42.6%)
TOTAL	16 (100.0%)	17 (100.0%)	42 (100.0%)	101 (100.0%)

**TABLE 7:6 SATISFACTION AND SOCIAL ISOLATION DISTRIBUTION CONTROLLING FOR SKILL LEVEL**

SOCIAL ISOLATION	SKILLED		NON-SKILLED	
	SATISFACTION		SATISFACTION	
	INTRINSIC	EXTRINSIC	INTRINSIC	EXTRINSIC
LOW	10 (62.5%)	11 (64.7%)	20 (47.6%)	48 (47.5%)
HIGH	6 (37.5%)	6 (35.3%)	22 (52.4%)	53 (52.5%)
TOTAL	16 (100.0%)	17 (100.0%)	42 (100.0%)	101 (100.0%)

The predicted differences in powerlessness and normlessness are clearly demonstrated with the skilled workers.

Powerlessness appears to be the most influenced as 81.3% of the responses which emphasize intrinsic satisfaction fall in the low powerlessness group compared to 52.9% of the responses which emphasize extrinsic satisfaction.

The percentage of intrinsic responses which fall in the low normlessness category (75.0%) is also greater than the percentage of extrinsic responses (52.9%).

No relationship is evident with social isolation. The percentage of intrinsic responses in the low category is actually smaller than the percentage of extrinsic responses. (62.5% and 64.7% respectively).

The predicted differences in powerlessness, normlessness and social isolation are not demonstrated with the non-skilled workers. Although the differences are slight, they do indicate that the percentages of responses from the low alienation groups which state extrinsic satisfactions are higher than those which state intrinsic satisfactions.

#### SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The hypothesis is rejected with respect to social isolation, and, as it stands, cannot be accepted for either of the other two dimensions. The relationships which were demonstrated with powerlessness and normlessness occurred only with skilled workers. As Seeman had postulated, "those who emphasize intrinsic values are actually engaged in less alienated work".<sup>8</sup>

In other words, intrinsic satisfaction appears as only an intervening variable. The distributions indicate that skilled work provides the intrinsic satisfaction which in turn reduces

feelings of powerlessness and normlessness.

Seeman's thesis on intrinsic satisfaction was tested against self-estrangement<sup>9</sup> which was defined in terms of Marx's notion of alienated labour. The present study has expanded this thesis to include the dimensions of powerlessness and normlessness. Social isolation again appears to act independently. It was not influenced as were the other dimensions.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. Cited in Shlomo Avineri, The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx, Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1970, p.106.

2. Robert Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964, pp.26-32.

3. Ibid., p.27.

4. Ibid.

5. Frederick Herzberg, et.al., The Motivation to Work, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.

6. Melvin Seeman, "On the Personal Consequences of Alienation in Work", American Sociological Review, 32:273-285, 1967, p.283.

7. Ibid., p.283.

8. Ibid.

## CHAPTER 8

### CONCLUSION

This study sought to accomplish two tasks: to further clarify the concept of alienation by a study of its dimensions; and to test for the presence of alienation in a sample of industrial workers with the aim of defining possible methods to effect change in the structural conditions which give rise to it.

With respect to the first task, social isolation, although highly correlated with the other dimensions, consistently exhibited independent results. Dean defined the dimension as "the perception of losing effective contact from significant and supporting groups".<sup>1</sup> However, it would appear, according to the findings presented in Chapter 6, that increased participation with the informal work group, with relatives and friends, in union meetings and union social functions, have little or no influence on this perception of "losing effective contact".<sup>2</sup> In fact, there is evidence to suggest that increased participation actually increases feelings of social isolation. (See Tables 6:3 and 6:6).

A possible explanation would be Seeman's postulation that "it is not the lost community (ie. the absence of sentiments of social solidarity) that is the urban problem, but the sense of lost control (ie. powerlessness).<sup>3</sup> Future research might confirm the fact that social isolation is actually a psychological or social consequence of a deep-rooted sense of powerlessness within the individual. However, the present study demonstrates

that these dimensions consistently exhibit independent characteristics.

An explanation which appears to come close to the actual findings is one proposed by Erich Fromm.<sup>4</sup> He views this "aloneness" as a condition of Capitalist society and bureaucratic structure which demand that the individual stay "close to the herd, ... not being different in thought, feeling or action".<sup>5</sup> Men are needed "who co-operate smoothly and in large numbers."<sup>6</sup> It is necessary for efficient functioning that they "fit into the social machine without friction."<sup>7</sup>

Yet, what happens when the individual attempts to conform to this pattern of behaviour.

While everybody tries to be as close as possible to the rest, everybody remains utterly alone, pre-empted by the deep sense of insecurity, anxiety and guilt which always results when human separateness cannot be overcome.<sup>8</sup>

In other words, increased participation would only heighten feelings of "insecurity, anxiety and guilt"<sup>9</sup> as the worker realizes that his "human separateness cannot be overcome".<sup>10</sup>

As mentioned earlier, this is only a possible explanation. Further research is needed to clarify the concept, its causes and its behavioural consequences.

The second task of the study was to define possible methods to effect change in the structural conditions which give rise to alienation.

The mediation hypothesis was tested. Participation in the informal work group, in union meetings and in social functions appeared to effect lower feelings of powerlessness among the



older workers, but not the younger workers.

It has been demonstrated in Chapter 4 that the older workers were significantly less powerless than the younger workers (See Table 4:2). This would suggest that the mediation hypothesis might be re-termed the alleviation hypothesis as it influences only those workers who have, perhaps, reached the age of acceptance of their work status and economic position. Arthur Kornhauser<sup>11</sup> made such an observation on industrial workers from Detroit. He demonstrated mental health differences between young and middle aged workers and stated:

With only a touch of cynicism, one may surmise that many of the young men destined to spend their years in routine jobs will also 'adapt' and win better mental health assessments by the time they reach middle age.<sup>12</sup>

Perhaps, the key to an understanding is 'adapt'. The older workers have adapted themselves to their job status and have learned to accept it. However, only the future will tell if the younger workers will adapt and obtain refuge and alleviation from their feelings of powerlessness within the work organizations and work groups. Maybe they are different, with different goals, different needs, and different life styles. Perhaps they will challenge the present system or perhaps simply not get seriously involved in it. The point is that presently work organizations do not serve the same needs for the younger workers as they do for the older workers. If their needs are not served, rejection of the work-based organizations is a definite possibility.

The findings do suggest that the only way to reduce alienation in the work place is to provide work that is intrinsically satisfying. This work would have to involve responsibility,

a certain degree of independence, and also be interesting. Perhaps, in an automated society this is an impossibility. However, the workers themselves realize this. When asked what were the bad points about their jobs, 19.7% of the responses of the younger workers and 12.5% of the older workers cited a lack of responsibility or independence. Another 15.2% of the responses of the younger workers and 16.6% of the older cited uninteresting and unsatisfying work as bad points. Pay and fringe benefits were only mentioned in 13.6% of the responses of the younger workers and 6.3% of the older. None of the younger workers, despite their relatively insecure economic status, mentioned a lack of security and only 3.1% of the responses of the older workers emphasized it.

The highest percentage of responses, for both younger (36.3%) and older (38.5%) workers, cited working conditions as bad points. Perhaps the workers feel that if they have to work at a dull, routine job, it would be best for the work conditions to be as comfortable as possible. However, according to Harrington<sup>13</sup> work that is not intrinsically fulfilling and is carried out where "working conditions are sensational"<sup>14</sup> can have ill-effects. It only leads to further alienation as one can get "a feeling of being in limbo. More than ever one feels - ungratefully - over protected"<sup>15</sup>. In other words, it makes the worker become more and more "dependent on the managers of the great economic empires"<sup>16</sup>.

The implications for future research are many. Besides a clarification of the dimension of social isolation, the structural conditions which give rise to it, and its behavioural consequences,

further tests are needed in order to gain a better understanding of all the dimensions of alienation and their relationships to the lives of working men. How can the type of work and the work place be changed or modified in order to permit a fuller sense of satisfaction? The possibility was raised that the industrial union no longer served the same mediating function as it once did. How do the workers feel about the future of the union and what its purposes and goals should be? Above all, the findings suggest that there is differences between older and younger workers and the effects of participation in the union and the informal work group. Further clarification of differences and what they constitute is needed to gain a better understanding of present and future developments in the composition and direction of the industrial work force and the labour union.

This study does not offer an optimistic, easily-accessible solution to the problem of alienation in the work place. What it does demonstrate is the need to further define the concept. If alienation is not clearly defined, attempts to gain understanding and possible solutions will likely be misdirected and lead to ineffective results.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. Dwight Dean, "Alienation and Political Apathy", Social Forces, 38:186, 1960.

2. Ibid.

3. Melvin Seeman, "The Urban Alienation: Some Dubious Theses from Marx to Marcuse", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol 19, No.2:135-143, 1971, p.140.

4. Erich Fromm, The Art of Loving, New York: Bantam Books, 1963.
5. Ibid. .p.72.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Arthur Kornhauser, Mental Health of the Industrial Worker, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965.
12. Ibid., p.134.
13. Alan Harrington, "Life in the Crystal Palace", in E. & M. Josephon (eds.), Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society, New York: Dell Press, 1967, pp.133-143.
14. Ibid., P.135.
15. Ibid., p.143
16. Erich Fromm, op.cit., p.71

APPENDIX A  
QUESTIONNAIRE





Please answer the following questions in the space provided.

25. What is your present job? Describe briefly what you do?

---

---

---

26. How long have you worked there?

- |         |                       |         |                         |
|---------|-----------------------|---------|-------------------------|
| 0 _____ | No answer             | 4 _____ | three years or more but |
| 1 _____ | less than 6 months    | 5 _____ | less than 5 years       |
| 2 _____ | 6 months to one year  | 6 _____ | five years or more but  |
| 3 _____ | more than one year    | 7 _____ | less than 10 years      |
|         | but less than 3 years |         | ten years or more but   |
|         |                       |         | less than 20 years      |
|         |                       |         | 20 years or more        |

27. What would you say are the good points about this job?

---

---

---

---

28. What would you say are the bad points about this job?

---

---

---

---



Please indicate by a check mark how often you have socially visited with each of the following people.

29.	1 Not At All	2 Once A Year Or Less	3 2 to 10 Times A Year	4 Once a Month or More
A. Relatives				
B. Neighbours & friends				
C. Work Associates				

30. I have attended

	1 Not At All	2 Once a Year or Less	3 2 to 10 Times A Year	4 Once a Month or More
A. Union Meetings				
B. Other union social func- tions such as dances, banc- quets, parties, bowling leagues, etc.				

31. What is your age?

- |                       |                  |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| 0 _____ No answer     | 4 _____ 40 to 49 |
| 1 _____ 24 or younger | 5 _____ 50 to 59 |
| 2 _____ 25 to 29      | 6 _____ 60 to 64 |
| 3 _____ 30 to 39      |                  |

32. What is your sex?

- 0 \_\_\_\_\_ No Answer  
1 \_\_\_\_\_ Male  
2 \_\_\_\_\_ Female

33. What is your marital status?

- |                   |                   |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| 0 _____ No Answer | 3 _____ Widowed   |
| 1 _____ Single    | 4 _____ Divorced  |
| 2 _____ Married   | 5 _____ Separated |

34. What is your religion?

0 \_\_\_\_\_ No answer  
1 \_\_\_\_\_ Catholic  
2 \_\_\_\_\_ Protestant

3 \_\_\_\_\_ Jewish  
4 \_\_\_\_\_ Other (specify)

5 \_\_\_\_\_ None

35. How would you rate yourself on the following political scale?  
(Circle one of the numbers)

LEFT 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ RIGHT

36. What is the last grade that you successfully completed in school?  
(Please write in space below)

37. What country did your father's family come from? (Please write  
in space below)

---

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alpert, Harry, Emile Durkheim and His Sociology, New York: Russell & Russell, 1961.
- Avineri, Shlomo, The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx, Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Blauner, Robert, Alienation and Freedom, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Bottomore, T.B., (translator), Karl Marx: Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy, New York: McGraw Hill, 1964.
- Cohen, Albert, Deviance & Control, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1966.
- Dean, Dwight, "Alienation and Political Apathy", Social Forces, 38:185-189, 1960.
- "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement", American Sociological Review, 26:753-4, 1961.
- DeGrazia, Sebastian, The Political Community: A Study of Anomie, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1948.
- Durkheim, Emile, The Division of Labour in Society, New York: The Free Press, 1968.
- Professional Ethics and Civic Morals, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958.
- Ferber, Robert, "The Problem of Bias in Mail Returns: A Solution", Public Opinion Quarterly, 12:669-676, 1948-49.
- Fromm, Erich, The Art of Loving, New York: Bantam Books, 1963.
- Gerth, H.H., & Mills, C.W., From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, New York: Oxford, 1946.
- Harrington, Alan, "Life in the Crystal Palace", in E. & M. Josephson (eds.), Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society, New York: Dell Press, 1967.
- Herzberg, Frederick, et.al., The Motivation to Work, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967.
- Horney, Karen, "Culture Neurosis", in Psychological Analysis, edited by Logan Wilson & William Kolb, New York: Harcourt Brace, 1949.

Josephson, E. & M., (eds.), Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society, New York:Dell Press, 1967.

Kornhauser, Arthur, Mental Health of the Industrial Worker, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965.

Kornhauser, William, The Politics of Mass Society, New York: The Free Press, 1959.

Kris, Ernst & Leites, Nathan, "Trends in Twentieth Century Propaganda", Reader in Public Opinion and Communication, edited by Berrelson & Morris Janowitz, Glencoe:The Free Press, 1950.

Lazarzfeld, Paul F., et.al., The People's Choice, New York: Durell, Sloan & Pearce, 1944.

MacIver, Robert, The Ramparts We Guard, New York:MacMillan, 1950.

Merton, R.K., Social Theory and Social Structure, Glencoe, Ill: The Free Press, 1957.

Miller, Delbert C., Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, New York:David McKay, 1970.

Mills, C.W., White Collar, New York:Oxford University Press, 1961.

"The Mass Society", in E. & M. Josephson (eds.), Man Alone:Alienation in Modern Society, New York: Dell Publishing, 1962.

Neal & Rettig, "Dimensions of Alienation Among Manual and Non-Manual Workers", American Sociological Review, 28:599-608, 1963.

Pearlin, Leonard, "Alienation From Work: A Study of Nursing Personnel", American Sociological Review, 27:314-326, 1962.

Reiss, Albert J., "Rural - Urban and Status Differences in Interpersonal Contact", American Journal of Sociology, 65:182-195, 1959.

Rosenberg, Morris, "The Meaning of Politics in Mass Society", Public Opinion Quarterly, 15:5-15, 1951.

Schact, Richard, Alienation, Garden City: Doubleday, 1970.

Seeman, Melvin "On the Meaning of Alienation", American Sociological Review, 24:783-791, 1959.

"Alienation and Social Learning in a Reformatory", American Journal of Sociology, 69:270-284, 1963.

Seeman, Melvin, "Organization and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis", American Sociological Review, 29:216-226, 1964.

"Alienation, Membership and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1966: 353-367.

"On the Personal Consequences of Alienation in Work", American Sociological Review, 32:273-285, 1967.

"Powerlessness and Knowledge: A Comparative Study of Alienation and Learning", Sociometry, 30:105-123, 1967.

"The Urban Alienation: Some Dubious Theses from Marx to Marcuse", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol 19, No.2:135-143, 1971.

Seeman, Melvin, and Evans, John, "Alienation and Learning in a Hospital Setting", American Sociological Review, 27:772-782, 1962.

