

1989

# Alienation and the novice university student a replication of Seeman's dimensions of alienation.

Susan Patricia. Beasley-Tapak  
*University of Windsor*

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

---

## Recommended Citation

Beasley-Tapak, Susan Patricia., "Alienation and the novice university student a replication of Seeman's dimensions of alienation." (1989). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 931.

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.



National Library  
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada  
K1A 0N4

## NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

## AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

ALIENATION AND THE NOVICE UNIVERSITY STUDENT:  
A REPLICATION OF SEEMAN'S DIMENSIONS OF ALIENATION

by



SUSAN PATRICIA BEASLEY-TAPAK

A Thesis  
submitted to the  
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research  
through the department of  
Sociology in Partial Fulfillment  
of the requirements for the Degree  
of Master of Arts at  
the University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

1989



National Library  
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service    Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada  
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-54516-X

Canada

(c) Susan Patricia Beasley-Tapak 1989  
All Rights Reserved

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| ABSTRACT                                 | v   |
| DEDICATION                               | vi  |
| ACKNOWLEDGTEMENTS                        | vii |
| LIST OF TABLES                           | ix  |
| LIST OF APPENDICES                       | xii |
| <br>                                     |     |
| CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION                  | 1   |
| <br>                                     |     |
| CHAPTER II: THEORETICAL OVERVIEW         | 10  |
| <br>                                     |     |
| CHAPTER III: REVIEW OF RESEARCH FINDINGS | 21  |
| <br>                                     |     |
| CHAPTER IV: METHODOLOGY                  | 39  |
| 4.1 Introduction                         |     |
| 4.2 Data Collection                      |     |
| <br>                                     |     |
| CHAPTER V: SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHICS            | 43  |
| 5.1 Introduction                         |     |
| 5.2 Respondent Profile                   |     |
| 5.3 Dependent Measures                   |     |
| 5.4 "Q" Factor Analysis                  |     |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| CHAPTER VI: WHAT EFFECTS THE DIMENSIONS<br>OF ALIENATION? | 61  |
| 6.1 Introduction  |     |
| 6.2 Powerlessness   |     |
| 6.3 Normlessness  |     |
| 6.4 Social Isolation                                      |     |
| CHAPTER VII: ALIENATION                                   | 100 |
| 7.1 Introduction  |     |
| CHAPTER VIII: CONCLUSIONS                                 | 119 |
| 8.1 Findings and Discussion                               |     |
| 8.2 Implications for Further Research                     |     |
| APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE                                 | 127 |
| APPENDIX B: CORRELATIONS                                  | 133 |
| REFERENCES  | 135 |
| VITA AUCTORIS   | 140 |

## ABSTRACT

### ALIENATION AND THE NOVICE UNIVERSITY STUDENT: A REPLICATION OF SEEMAN'S DIMENSIONS OF ALIENATION

by

Susan Patricia Beasley-Tapak

This exploratory research measured powerlessness, normlessness and social isolation as dimensions of alienation. Two hundred and sixty-eight respondents at the University of Windsor were administered a questionnaire which included the Dean alienation scale. The results strongly suggested that alienation was a dimensional, situation-bound concept. This study found that the entire sample experienced a sense of alienation from university life. Females experienced alienation as a general, pervasive phenomenon, while males experienced alienation, in the powerlessness sense, within the context of specific independent measures, namely, confidence in academic goals and expected grade average. This research added validity to the convictions of previous researchers that alienation was highly discriminating for male respondents, yet did not support this conviction for females.



To Dana and Brad:  
the world is  
yours' to savour

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A very special thanks is extended to Dr. J. Ferguson, for his continuous support and encouragement. His guidance has made this project a much lighter burden. To Don Stewart goes much appreciation, and to Dr. S. Towson sincere gratitude. Each has contributed a uniqueness that has enhanced this project. To each of you my heartfelt thanks.

To Dr. D. Booth for his kindness and interest, much thanks.

To Connie Hopkins for her help and support sincere thanks. Your friendship has enriched my life.

To Ann Neydon, for all her acceptance and support, much gratitude. There were many days and nights when you listened, dear friend, and I was richer for your insight.

To Mame Kenny, for her initial encouragement, much thanks. Without her faith in me I would never have become a student again.

To my friend Wayne, who often "lent an ear" and made suggestions, I extend my heartfelt thanks.

To my sister Kathy and her family, I am deeply grateful for your love and understanding. Many times you provided me with a safe refuge, where I could just be me.

To my sister Karen, who showed me the way, my profound thanks. You rewarded me when I wouldn't do it for myself, and always kept me on course.

To my parents, for all their help, encouragement, patience and support, much gratitude, thanks and love. They have repeatedly helped to make my dream a reality.

To my children, Dana and Brad, for all their love and acceptance, I am genuinely thankful. They have sacrificed immeasurably for me, and been patient and supportive throughout my academic experience. They understood, each in their own unique way, the void that had to be fulfilled.

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE |  | PAGE |
|-------|--|------|
| 1     | MARITAL STATUS   | 44   |
| 2     | AGE  | 44   |
| 3     | FATHER'S OCCUPATION  | 46   |
| 4     | MOTHER'S OCCUPATION  | 47   |
| 5     | FACULTY  | 48   |
| 6     | HIGH SCHOOL AVERAGE  | 50   |
| 7     | EXPECTED GRADE AVERAGE   | 51   |
| 8     | POWERLESSNESS  | 53   |
| 9     | NORMLESSNESS   | 54   |
| 10    | SOCIAL ISOLATION   | 54   |
| 11    | ALIENATION   | 55   |
| 12    | EIGENVALUE AND CUMULATIVE PERCENT<br>OF VARIANCE FOR THE SEVEN FACTORS | 56   |
| 13    | ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX  | 57   |
| 14    | POWERLESSNESS BY COUNTRY BORN  | 64   |
| 15    | POWERLESSNESS BY GENDER AND COUNTRY BORN                               | 64   |
| 16    | POWERLESSNESS BY RESIDENCY   | 66   |
| 17    | POWERLESSNESS BY SATISFIED SOCIAL LIFE                                 | 67   |
| 18    | POWERLESSNESS BY CONFIDENT OF GOALS                                    | 68   |
| 19    | POWERLESSNESS BY GENDER AND CONFIDENCE<br>IN ACADEMIC GOALS            | 69   |

LIST OF TABLES CONTINUED

| TABLE |  | PAGE |
|-------|--|------|
| 20    | POWERLESSNESS BY COUNTRY BORN AND<br>CONFIDENCE IN ACADEMIC GOALS          | 70   |
| 21    | POWERLESSNESS BY EXPECTED AVERAGE  | 71   |
| 22    | POWERLESSNESS BY GENDER AND<br>EXPECTED AVERAGE                            | 72   |
| 23    | POWERLESSNESS BY COUNTRY BORN AND<br>EXPECTED AVERAGE                      | 73   |
| 24    | NORMLESSNESS BY COUNTRY BORN   | 76   |
| 25    | NORMLESSNESS BY GENDER AND COUNTRY BORN                                    | 77   |
| 26    | NORMLESSNESS BY CONFIDENCE IN<br>LARGE CLASSES                             | 78   |
| 27    | NORMLESSNESS BY COUNTRY BORN AND<br>CONFIDENCE IN LARGE CLASSES            | 79   |
| 28    | NORMLESSNESS BY LIVING ARRANGEMENTS  | 80   |
| 29    | NORMLESSNESS BY COUNTRY BORN AND<br>LIVING ARRANGEMENTS                    | 81   |
| 30    | NORMLESSNESS BY FRIEND HERE  | 82   |
| 31    | NORMLESSNESS BY SATISFYING SOCIAL LIFE                                     | 84   |
| 32    | NORMLESSNESS BY EXAMS PREFER   | 86   |
| 33    | SOCIAL ISOLATION BY GENDER   | 88   |
| 34    | SOCIAL ISOLATION BY COUNTRY BORN AND<br>GENDER                             | 89   |
| 35    | SOCIAL ISOLATION BY SATISFYING RESIDENCY                                   | 90   |
| 36    | SOCIAL ISOLATION BY GENDER AND SATISFIED<br>WITH LIVING ARRANGEMENTS       | 91   |
| 37    | SOCIAL ISOLATION BY COUNTRY BORN AND<br>SATISFIED WITH LIVING ARRANGEMENTS | 92   |

LIST OF TABLES CONTINUED

| TABLE |  | PAGE |
|-------|--|------|
| 38    | SOCIAL ISOLATION BY SATISFYING SOCIAL LIFE                     | 93   |
| 39    | SOCIAL ISOLATION AND HOW ATTEND                                | 94   |
| 40    | SOCIAL ISOLATION BY COUNTRY BORN AND HOW ATTEND                | 95   |
| 41    | SOCIAL ISOLATION BY CONFIDENCE IN GOALS                        | 96   |
| 42    | SOCIAL ISOLATION BY CONFIDENCE IN LARGE CLASSES                | 98   |
| 43    | MEASURES   | 102  |
| 44    | ALIENATION BY GENDER   | 103  |
| 45    | ALIENATION BY COUNTRY BORN                                     | 104  |
| 46    | ALIENATION BY COUNTRY BORN AND GENDER                          | 105  |
| 47    | ALIENATION BY CONFIDENCE IN GOALS                              | 106  |
| 48    | ALIENATION BY GENDER AND CONFIDENCE IN ACADEMIC GOALS          | 107  |
| 49    | ALIENATION BY COUNTRY BORN AND CONFIDENCE IN ACADEMIC GOALS    | 108  |
| 50    | ALIENATION BY EXPECTED AVERAGE                                 | 109  |
| 51    | ALIENATION BY GENDER AND EXPECTED AVERAGE                      | 110  |
| 52    | ALIENATION BY CONFIDENCE IN THE LARGE CLASSES                  | 111  |
| 53    | ALIENATION BY GENDER AND CONFIDENCE IN THE LARGE CLASSES       | 112  |
| 54    | ALIENATION BY COUNTRY BORN AND CONFIDENCE IN THE LARGE CLASSES | 113  |
| 55    | ALIENATION BY SATISFYING SOCIAL LIFE                           | 114  |

LIST OF APPENDICES

| APPENDIX |               | PAGE |
|----------|---------------|------|
| A        | QUESTIONNAIRE | 127  |
| B        | CORRELATIONS  | 133  |

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

This research, exploratory in nature, deals with student alienation. My experience teaching introductory students sparked an interest in this population. Students who come to labs only to write quizzes and never take advantage of the available help or lectures seemed an enigma to me. Did something within the university structure cause a portion of the students to feel a sense of helplessness and/or apartness? It is to those students who quietly remain passive and who do little to facilitate their academic goals that this project is directed.

To this end, students in three introductory sociology classes were asked to fill out a questionnaire during the last week of November, 1988. The 268 respondents were in both day and evening classes, because I was interested in including older, part-time students. The questionnaire was designed with "university life" as its focus. Opinions



were solicited regarding the large classes, residence, extra-curricular activities, type of exams preferred and choice of major. The Dean (1961) scale of alienation was utilized in order to determine which aspects of university life create a sense of powerlessness, normlessness and/or social isolation.

Alienation has many meanings, or what will be referred to in this research as "dimensions." The categorization used in the present study is based upon the research of Melvin Seeman (1959). However, before attempting a closure to these dimensions it is necessary to examine the dimensions of alienation which have been developed by other researchers.

John Clark (1959) postulates alienation to be an individual's sense of powerlessness to achieve a deserved role. To Clark, powerlessness underlies all other forms of alienation; it is a subjective feeling of distance from what is perceived to be a worthy position. Amitai Etzioni (1968) uses a definition which reflects basic human needs. He classifies a society as alienating when both the symbolic front and the structure of society are unresponsive to individual needs. Etzioni makes no allowances for the individual's response -- he sees the individual as a passive recipient of cultural conditions.

McClosky and Schaar (1965) claim that a large amount

of the research rests on the assumption that individuals find it difficult to function under conditions of normative uncertainty. They contend, however, that alienation, in the anomic sense, is a function of both social conditions and personality factors. These researchers conceptualize alienation as a "cluster of attitudes, beliefs and feelings in the minds of individuals" (p.19). Alienation, according to them, is not caused by a single social force, but rather by a variety of psychological states that distort one's perception. The alienated individual fails to assimilate social values accurately, resulting in feelings of confusion and emptiness. Thus, these researchers assert both social and personal forces are at work to produce alienation.

Claude Fischer (1976) claims that "there are a number of divisions in the study of alienation" (p.35). One division lies between Durkheimians, for whom man is alienated from society, and Marxists, for whom society is alienated from man. Another division lies between what he calls "subjectivists," for whom alienation is a state of mind, a personality characteristic and "objectivists," for whom alienation is a social condition, where social forces act upon the passive individual. He posited a definition of alienation as "the state in which the actor fails to

perceive a positive interdependence between himself and social relationships or other objectifications" (p.43). He claims this definition will bridge both cleavages, since "it is alienation from something" (p.44) and it is broad enough to encompass the "consequences of structural circumstances and the causes of individual behaviour" (p.45). Fischer further claims that the alienation concept gains little or no content when generalized to "alienated person" or "alienated society" (p.47).

Robert Travis (1986) claims that "ambiguity threatens the usage of alienation" (p.61). Along with Fischer, he contends that indiscriminate generalizations are too frequently implied. According to Travis, two common practices lead to confusion. First is the operationalization of alienation so that it exists as fact, without prior knowledge of its actuality, the presumption being that unsettling forces that induce alienation are everywhere in society. The second is the attempt to measure alienation with a remiss referent. In his research he found that powerlessness and meaninglessness were inversely related. This led him to conclude that any attempt to measure alienation as a unidimensional concept is likely to result in error.

Rabindra Kanungo (1979) claims that the obverse to alienation is involvement and maintains that these terms

have been used so frequently and in such diverse contexts that "they have acquired an aura of equivocality" (p.119). He postulates that the language used creates greater "conceptual fuzziness" rather than understanding. He suggests that researchers have become more concerned with the identification of states of alienation within social systems than with the recognition of conditions for social involvement and growth. He further asserts that "most sociological approaches see the presence of individual autonomy, control, and power over the environment as basic preconditions for removing the state of alienation" (p.125). The psychological approach, on the other hand, is based on motivation theories and emphasizes the need-satisfying qualities of the environment. To Kanungo, the confusion arises when the concept of alienation is applied to individuals and then to groups, or when it is referred to as an objective social condition and then as a subjective psychological state. He further questions researchers who fail to distinguish between the antecedent conditions of alienation and the consequent states of alienation, or when the state of alienation is treated by some as a cognitive state and by others as an affective state.

With such diversity and discrepancy of meanings, does one conclude that "anything goes," or does one delve

deeper into the literature? Unfortunately, it seems that if we trace alienation back to Hegel, Jean-Paul Sartre, Paul Tillich, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, we become submerged in a history of rhetoric. Even when clear definitions are given, they frequently differ; one is still left wondering how they relate to each other. The notion of estrangement has been applied historically to lack of ownership, to God, to humankind, to unsatisfactory relationships, to one's mental powers, to one's essential nature, to the use of one's own power, to one's liberty and to the phenomenal world.

Finding a definition of alienation that can be operationalized with consistent validity and reliability is problematic. Researchers use varying instruments, Calabrese (1987) counted 14 measures while reviewing 24 studies. The outcome is inconsistent and often contradictory results. For example, Burbach (1972) claimed that blacks are more alienated than whites, while Wenz (1953) claimed that whites are more alienated than blacks. Alienation by gender and country of origin produces a similar state of contradiction.

As a result of this quandary, the comprehensive concept of alienation formulated by Melvin Seeman (1959) will be used. These dimensions of powerlessness, normlessness, meaninglessness, social isolation and self-

estrangement are a distillation of the varying connotations of alienation. They are not necessarily meant to be related in any fashion.

Seeman's (1959) conception of alienation is social-psychological and the research task becomes the exploration of what social conditions produce these five variants of alienation. His first variant, powerlessness, is defined as "the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements he seeks" (p.784). This variant does not take into account the control an individual desires or expects, nor does it concern itself with the objective conditions in society. The focus is on the individual's expectations for control. A second usage of the concept is meaninglessness which Seeman defines as "a low expectancy that satisfactory predictions about future outcomes of behaviour can be made" (p.786). This dimension concerns the understanding of events when the individual is unclear what to believe. There is ambiguity surrounding this variant, Seeman claims it is the individual who is unclear, and then he claims it is a sensed inability to predict behaviour outcomes. The third dimension, normlessness, is defined by Seeman as "a high expectancy that socially unapproved behaviours are required to achieve given goals" (p.788). For example,

students may feel it is necessary to cheat or plagiarize in order to pass. Social isolation is the fourth variant and is defined as the experience of those who "assign low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in a given society" (p.789). This dimension entails the notion of "apartness from society" from reigning goals and standards. The final dimension gleaned from Seeman's review of the literature is self-estrangement and is defined as "the degree of dependence of the given behaviour upon anticipated future rewards, that is, upon rewards that lie outside the activity itself" (p.790). This dimension depicts the loss of intrinsic meaning, or pride in accomplishment for its own sake. It portrays those individuals who are insecure and given to appearances as self-estranged. There is also discussion by Seeman (1959) and Fromm (1955) that this final variant could be a result of the other four, where individuals are estranged from each other, where each tries to make an "instrument of the other, and in time a full circle is made: one makes an instrument of himself" (Seeman, 1959, p.789). The individual is unable to experience self as rewarding. Thus, Seeman has brought some "order out of the chaos" (Dean, 1961, p.754) and conceptualized alienation as the composite of these variants.

Dwight Dean's (1961) scale has been used extensively by sociologists: it wisely eliminates the ambiguous dimensions of meaninglessness and self-estrangement, enhancing its validity and reliability. Dean advocates treating the variants as somewhat discrete, even though there is significant statistical evidence to consider the sub-scales as belonging to the same general concept. This dimensioning allows researchers to analyze responses as both individual and situational phenomena, in either a unidimensional, or multidimensional manner. For example, a student may feel powerlessness with regard to his goals, but not feel socially isolated with peers. It is for these reasons that I decided to use this instrument for my research.

As a consequence of the surrounding ambiguity, my research is exploratory in nature, and will treat alienation as a situation-relevant variable. I will consider each variant separately and then appraise alienation as a general concept. Alienation will be treated as an attribute of the individual within the context of specified relationships. Since alienation has been found by researchers to be discriminating and situation specific, I will ask: What conditions produce powerlessness, normlessness, social isolation and then alienation?



## CHAPTER II

### THEORETICAL OVERVIEW

The theories regarding alienation are as varied as their meanings. For that reason it is necessary to explore the major theories.

Even though Hegel coined the term "alienation," the very notion of alienation is so closely tied with the work of Karl Marx, that one is almost compelled to begin with his theoretical perspective. Tucker's translation of Marx (1978) postulates that human beings are made for work, yet in Marx's dialectical fashion, humans are shaped by work, molded by it. To Marx, our humanness evolves in response to the nature of work. Humans gather the materials of nature and fashion them into objects, and the true nature of humankind is reflected in the objects produced. Work of that type is necessary for humans to fulfill their true nature, their true humanness. The energy and skill spent

on the object allows the person to see self -- to know self by the things produced. According to Marx, the person and the object produced are the same entity.

However, three developments disturbed this natural order. First, there was the notion of private property, which separated the worker from the objects produced--the creator and the created were no longer one entity. Second, there evolved the complex division of labour, where the worker applied a fraction of his/her knowledge to the task of production. Workers lost a sense of the productive sequence. One could no longer claim, "I made that!" The final development came when labour became a commodity. Workers no longer produced for their own consumption or for intrinsic satisfaction; they worked for money. Now, their experience and knowledge were sold at market prices, thus becoming commodities themselves. Alienation, according to Marx, was this disconnection and separation from the natural order by unnatural work arrangements. Workers were diminished in spirit, became more and more incomplete and no longer experienced work as a meaningful act of creation; instead work became a means to an end. Marx claimed that the methods devised by capitalism to increase production degraded the worker; the economic structure created alienated workers.

For Marxists, the key sources of worker alienation

in modern society are those structures that subdivide labour into narrower specialties, those positions where the workers never own the object produced, and those structures that limit the amount of control the worker can exercise over the work performed.

A contrasting major theory embodies Durkheim's concept of anomie, or normlessness. According to Emile Durkheim (1951), societies undergo sudden transitions, economic disasters and abrupt growths of power and wealth. These sudden changes leave the society in a state of transition where "the scale is upset" (p.253). Social regulation is lacking for the individual, limits are indeterminate, a sense of justice is lost, there is no restraint on aspirations and individuals are disoriented. Social influence is lost, society can no longer control individuals through the moral power of the social environment. Society's common ideas, beliefs, customs and traditions no longer serve to influence the individual; the person experiences the self in a state of disillusionment, where society is causing a sense of "irritated disgust with life," which according to Durkheim finds its end in suicide, which "results from man's activity's lacking regulation and his consequent suffering" (p.258). Social anomie filters down to subjective anomia, where the focus is on society's

inadequate presence for the individual. There are implicit in Durkheim's theory two sources of normative regulation. First, there are rules which have been internalized by individuals, and second, rules applied to the individual from an external source of authority, which when in conflict, alienate the individual from society and from self.

According to Robert Merton's perspective (1968), anomie arises from blocked means toward desired goals. Society defines legitimate goals, purposes and interests for its members and arranges them according to their value in a hierarchy. To the individual these goals become the things "worth striving for" (p.187). Society similarly defines and regulates the acceptable means of achieving these goals; it defines the acceptable procedures. Thus, the choice of means is limited by social norms, and often goals are highly emphasized by society but not the means to achieve them. Prescribed aspirations and socially structured avenues to these aspirations are out of harmony for many people. When society does not offer adequate or equal methods to achieve these valued goals, any means to an end becomes acceptable. "But cultural exaggeration of the success-goal leads men to withdraw emotional support for the rules" (p.190).

When the society shifts from the intrinsic value of

competition and goal attainment to almost exclusive concern for the outcome, the result is a breakdown in the structure. Uncoordinated goals-and-means lead to anomie, which for Merton, results in predictable behaviour patterns.

A fourth major theoretical focus deals with a more psychological form of alienation. Erich Fromm (1955) deals with alienation from a subjective point of view where the individual "does not experience himself as the center of his world, as the creator of his own acts" (p.120). He claims that alienation extends to one's work, to the things one consumes, to the state, to humankind, and turns back onto oneself. The alienated person is out of touch with self, and as a consequence,

his life forces have flown into a 'thing', and this thing...is not experienced as a result of his own productive effort, but as something apart from himself, over and against him...to which he submits. (p.121)

His argument is analogous to that of Marx in tracing the source of alienation to the socio-economic structure, contending that it is a "socially patterned effect" -- an "effect of capitalism on personality" (p.120). He, like Marx, postulates that with the invention of tools humankind gained mastery over nature, thus separating from it more and more. Conversely, nonalienated individuals

experience themselves as the active possessors of their own powers; they are not dependent on powers outside themselves. For Fromm, the overcoming of alienation does not involve a sense of autonomy of self through less conformity and more spontaneous activity; rather, he advocates "humanistic communitarianism," where one's use of another must end, where the economy becomes the servant for humankind, where capital must serve labour and where things must serve life. Thus, the "productive orientation must be the goal which all social arrangements serve" (p.361).

The perspective of symbolic interactionism, a fifth theoretical approach, provides three basic tenets, which offer perception into the process a student undergoes in a new environment. The first premise is that humans act toward things in a manner which reflects the meanings the things hold for them. Second, the meanings are derived from social interaction with others. The third tenet is that meanings are taken in and modified through an interpretive process. According to Blumer (1969), symbolic interactionism does not see meaning arising out of psychological elements in the person; rather meaning arises out of interaction -- as a social product, "as creations that are formed in and through the defining activities of people as they interact" (p.5).

Interpretation then becomes a matter of handling meanings: the actor selects, checks, regroups and adjusts the meaning in light of the situation -- a procedure of self-interaction.

To have a self is to have the capacity to observe, respond to, and direct one's own behaviour. One can behave toward oneself as one can towards any other social object, in the context of interaction -- a reflective interpretive outgrowth. Thus, the self is a process, where self is observing and responding, adjusting and directing, in a constant state of transformation. The self is also an organization of shared attitudes, a cognitive creature; it is the means whereby social control becomes self-control. To have a self is to internalize the values of society; this internalization controls one's behaviour by way of these prevailing social attitudes. Mead (1934) explained social control as the dominance of the "me" over the "I," whereby the individual conforms to society's expectations.

Thus, the self is the result of a social process--early socialization along with continuing interaction. Mead (1934) postulated "there is a social process out of which selves arise and within which further differentiation, further evolution, further organization take place" (p.164). Through shared meanings, individuals develop role-taking, a sense of the generalized other, the

foundation from which all adult interaction proceeds. Interaction necessitates taking each other's roles. In order to indicate to another what is expected, one has to make the expression from the other person's perspective. Correspondingly, the listener must see the expression from the other's point of reference in order to understand the intention or subsequent action. An example may serve to illustrate this point. A professor in an introductory class must make the students understand the examination procedure that is expected of them. In order for this to occur, the professor must take the role of the student, realizing that these students have never taken an exam at university before, and have no idea what is expected. A sequential, complete explanation is necessary which would probably entail an explanation of the course material to be covered, the use of computer sheets or exam booklets, along with a description of the seating arrangements at the Human Kinetics building. The student, on the other hand, must look at the perspective of the professor in order to understand what to study, what is expected at exam time, where to go and even where to sit to take the exam. The participants have the common task of constructing their acts by interpreting and defining the acts of the other.

The individual's view of self is gained through the



image each perceives the other to have of him/her. Role-taking is related to the development of the self, the mind, the generalized other, and the capacity for social interaction. It is the process of imaginatively constructing the attitudes of the other so as to anticipate the behaviour of the other and also in order to identify with the other.

Once a person has acquired a sense of the generalized other, reference groups become a means for self evaluations. For the novice student, the university would be a "normative reference group," establishing and enforcing standards for the student. The student body, on the other hand, would be a "comparative reference group," through which the novice student would make evaluations of self and others. From the former reference group, students learn appropriate registration procedures, proper procedure in the library, or when exams are scheduled. The latter reference group illustrates to the student the appropriate dress, where to gather when not in class, norms for conduct in class and at university. Students in this process use the reference groups, gain a notion of the generalized other, and thus derive a sense of self, thereby responding to the university milieu in a unique and appropriate fashion.

Reference groups become a significant part of the

self-concept individuals develop -- they become socialized by them. From this one learns the role of the university student, from which appropriate behaviour derives and reciprocal role-playing is inherent. Thus, the student learns definitions of situations.

Another major concept which is only alluded to by Marx and Durkheim is power. Seeman (1959) strongly linked his notion of powerlessness to Rotter's theory of locus of control. Locus of control, using a social learning perspective, is the generalized expectancy pertaining to the connection between personal characteristics and/or actions and previously experienced outcomes. Some individuals, through past experience and present stimuli, come to believe that their outcomes are generally contingent upon the amount of work performed, so that they are more apt to exert themselves when engaged in meaningful assignments. On the other hand, some individuals through past experience and/or present stimuli fail to perceive any connection between effort and outcomes. Perhaps they have worked hard in the past and not received the rewards they wanted. Consequently these individuals associate success with nepotism, luck, chance, or a benevolent God. Thus, their efforts may be spent on gambling or praying rather than on instrumental acts that could help them achieve their desired goals.

Locus of control, then, concerns the beliefs that individuals hold regarding the relationship between actions and outcomes.

Seeman saw the dimension of powerlessness as a generalized expectation of external control, where outcomes cannot be determined by one's personal efforts. In general, persons who hold expectations for external control appear to behave, according to Rotter (1966), DeMan (1987) and Seeman (1962, 1963, 1966b), in ways that are congruent with powerlessness. They are less likely to be active in the pursuit of information related to the state of their own well-being and are less likely to use information, even if it is readily available. External locus of control subjects are also more prone to role inversion, where their impulses are turned inward and cooled off, preventing their release. Consequently, they are withdrawn or prone to eruptions of violent behaviour. From this theoretical perspective, and based on a large body of research, one could conclude that external locus of control is equivalent to the state of powerlessness.

## CHAPTER III

### REVIEW OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

A review of the current literature, on alienation, illustrates the diversity of findings. Researchers have studied alienation in various contexts, and correlated this concept with many diverse variables, ranging from personality traits to social structure, the assumption always being that the individual's inability to deal with life circumstances results in the sense of alienation.

Many researchers have claimed that if any work on alienation is to be done so that new insights can be forthcoming, the studies must be done within specific situations. One such researcher, Clark (1959), claimed that:

A measure of alienation must be a measure of the discrepancy between the power man believes he has and what he believes he should have -- his estrangement from his rightful role (p.849).

With this claim in mind, the review will focus primarily on situational studies of alienation. Clark (1959) studied members of an agricultural cooperative, as a social system, randomly sampling 361 of its 3000 members. His conclusion was that alienation was highly related to satisfaction with the organization, but had no relationship to a member's age, size of farm, or years of membership in the cooperative. There was an inverse relationship between alienation and the number of members who were known to the respondent, and the number of visits by the organization's officials. These findings indicated that the more powerless members felt, the more dissatisfied they were with the organization. Even though individuals felt they deserved a position with some control, many felt they had little significant input. This research, suggested that simply being a participating member and obtaining knowledge about an organization is not sufficient to dispel the feelings of alienation.

Goswick and Jones (1982) studied 192 college undergraduates. Their feelings of loneliness were correlated with alienation, with loneliness defined as the respondents' preference for being alone, feeling different from their peers, and the perception of being misunderstood by their friends. Their findings indicated that the college students who felt most alone were those

who felt their parents were not interested in them, or those who had disruptions in relationships with significant others. Respondents who felt the highest alienation were those who had to make changes in their relationships, as would students moving from a high school to a university environment, often without their best friends.

In a study conducted by Heaven and Bester (1986), cognitive and personality factors were correlated. Their sample included 90 undergraduate students from an Australian university and 95 from a white South African university. The cultural differences were minimal; the alienated students in both samples were anxious and had negative attitudes toward authority. Also, the women sampled were inclined to be more alienated than the men. The most significant finding, however, was the negative correlation between alienation and self-esteem. This study also served to link the concept of alienation with the dimension of social isolation that Seeman postulated, where more alienated respondents had a more negative attitude toward authority or less respect for socially approved behaviours.

Holian (1972) distributed 280 questionnaires to introductory sociology classes. He found a close relationship between feelings of alienation from the

university situation and the more distant spheres of government in the larger society. His results illustrated that alienated students held strong expectancies that they would not be able to control what happened to them while at university, that students as well as professors engaged in unethical practices, that undergraduate days were filled with loneliness and impersonality, and that one "cashes in" on an education only after graduation. He also discovered a positive generalized relationship between the kinds of alienation, in this case alienation from school and alienation from the larger society, and a lack of awareness of one's social environment. Those students then, had a low expectancy for control over their outcomes, viewed socially unapproved means as necessary for goal attainment, saw campus events as unpredictable, felt loneliness and impersonality, and emphasized the extrinsic reward value of an education. These attitudes were, in turn, related to poor learning about campus affairs and world politics. He claimed "that the causal sequence may be reciprocal, with both alienation and learning affecting each other" (p.124).

Further, Li-Chen Ma (1985) conducted a study of 708 American students in introductory sociology and psychology, at the National Taiwan University. She compared her findings with the results gathered by Holian

(1972) and found that, for American students, mother's education was more influential than father's education on students' alienation. The research illustrated that mother's education correlated negatively with social isolation, and that country of origin, for the native Taiwanese students, related positively to measures of powerlessness. This study served to illustrate that these two independent variables were not related to the same variants of alienation.

Calabrese and Anderson (1986) correlated the Alienation Scale of Dean with the Beasley Stress Scale, and concluded that among the 76 teachers sampled, the younger, less experienced female teachers were more alienation than those who were more practiced. Overall, stress was not related to alienation.

Calabrese, Miller, and Dooley (April, 1987) conducted an additional study comparing levels of student and parent alienation. Their sample included 49 parents and 50 students in a Midwestern school district in the U.S.A. From this study it was concluded that parental alienation was associated with their child's gender, number of perceived friends, number of natural parents at home, and the working status of the parent. Thus, high levels of parental alienation were experienced by single, unemployed females, with female children who had few



perceived friends. The strong correlation found between levels of parent and child alienation indicated that the children of alienated parents became the recipients of this passive behaviour, but more so if the child was female. It seems that female children were dealt with more passively and more fatalistically than male children, who were expected to rise above the socio-economic status of the parents.

Calabrese and Seldin (July, 1987) conducted a further study of public school teachers, college students, and high school students. These 404 subjects were given the Dean Alienation Scale, with the results indicating that college students were significantly less alienated than high school students, yet were significantly more alienated than teachers, in terms of powerlessness and normlessness. These areas related directly to the amount of control the organization exercised over the subjects. This study defined alienation as a personal and situational phenomenon, whereby subjects felt alienated at school, yet at the same time, felt no alienation at home or with friends.

Calabrese (Winter, 1987) then elaborated his research to include a synthesis that clarified the nature of adolescent alienation by developing a composite of the alienated adolescent. He concluded that those respondents

who were low achievers, who had low involvement, who had difficulty conforming to norms, and who had a negative self-image or sense of inferiority were at greater risk of incurring high levels of alienation. The researcher concluded that these students were at high risk to get involved in deviant behaviour, since they rejected the norms of society and developed their own values, based on self-gratification.

Calabrese's four antecedents to alienation could be conceptualized using symbolic interactionism constructs. The subjects derived meanings from social interaction with others -- these meanings were taken in and modified. Their interpretation, a process of self-interaction, did not yield a healthy sense of self. Perhaps self is observing, adjusting and responding, and finds self inadequate, and can not experience shared meanings. Thus, a sense of the generalized other is impaired. Role-taking becomes problematic and the individual's view of self as inadequate is gained through a distorted view of the images of others. Thus, impaired internalization results in an inaccurate view of social norms, so that conformity becomes impossible.

DeMan conducted a series of three studies. His first study (January, 1982) included 96 subjects from families with various degrees of parental control. He correlated

levels of control within the family structure with the children's self-esteem. The findings indicated that the younger the respondents, the higher their self-esteem when coming from an authoritarian family structure. However, this pattern reversed itself for the older students, aged 20 to 24. These students experienced lower levels of self-esteem when they came from controlling families.

DeMan (July, 1982) conducted a study of 36 young adults and 60 university students. His results indicated that subjects coming from families where the control was either intermediate or low were less alienated than those from highly controlled family situations. Alienation increased as child rearing became more controlling; for females, control at the intermediate level can yield alienation, whereas for males the control must be more extensive in order to have this alienating effect.

DeMan and Devisse (1987) integrated these findings in a study of 50 undergraduate students in order to determine the relationship among the variables of locus of control, mental ability, self-esteem and alienation. The results suggested that high alienation was associated with low self-esteem and external locus of control. Locus of control emerged as the best predictor of powerlessness, with greater externality correlating with a greater sense of powerlessness. The best predictor of normlessness was

self-esteem; those subjects with low self-esteem appeared to lack intrinsic norms, or have conflicting norms. Similarly, self-esteem was identified as the best predictor of social isolation; those low in self-esteem felt a stronger sense of separation from society.

Cumulatively, DeMan's studies seem to indicate that locus of control, self-esteem and alienation are related. Self-esteem and alienation are, in turn, related to child rearing practices and the normal transition from adolescence to adulthood.

Individuals who feel powerless to control their destiny abandon their sense of mastery and come to believe that some external force will shape their future. They view self and life as unmanageable; perhaps they experience failure or rejection, so that their self-image suffers. Yet, in their attempt at self-justification, they abdicate responsibility for the directionality of their lives. A sense of alienation results.

Two studies related alienation to the high school climate or the bureaucracy. Anderson (1973) sampled 164 students from various schools to determine the dimensions of bureaucracy which contributed to student alienation. The variables of sex, socio-economic status, membership in school-oriented groups, and degree of past academic success were controlled. His findings indicated that

bureaucratic structures characterized by status maintenance and formal, impersonal relationships between students and teachers were positively and strongly correlated with greater feelings of alienation; in other words, the effect of school structure seemed to be stronger than the personal characteristics of the student.

Avi-Itzhak's (1987) research concurred with that of Anderson. She used alienation as the dependent variable, with school climate as her independent measure. Her questionnaire was circulated to 1250 Arab students, 233 teachers and 36 principals. The findings indicated that schools headed by principals with teaching experience were less likely to promote feelings of powerlessness; schools which were headed by principals with at least a B.A. were less likely to have school climates that were conducive to feelings of normlessness. Alienation from school was inclined to be related to situational factors independent of student characteristics.

Dean (1961) also saw alienation as a "situation-relevant variable" (p.755). He studied 384 subjects from four census tracts in Ohio and reported a negative relationship between "increase in status" (p.756) and alienation. He did not find alienation related to age or community background. This work illustrated the assumption held by many sociologists that alienation is "out there"

and that social forces are at work to create this response, often with a negative impact for the individual.

Wenz (1953) found that alienation, as defined by Seeman and Dean, was characterized by the patterns of respondents' relationships rather than by personality characteristics. His research involved 200 subjects from a telephone-caller distress line and a list of subjects who had attempted suicide and were treated in an emergency medical facility. Race was found to be significant; white adolescents who attempted suicide were found to register high on alienation, while non-whites scored low on alienation. Where alienation was found to correlate with suicide, broken homes, conflict with parents, social contact with peers, broken romances, both parents working outside the home, and truancy from school were also related. He strongly suspected that respondents withdrew into themselves to avoid potential conflict; consequently, further social contact became inhibited, thereby enhancing their sense of alienation. This circular process could begin to explain the total sense of alienation felt by those who attempt suicide.

Furthermore, Albas, Albas, and McCluskey (1978) circulated 163 questionnaires to senior high school students in Manitoba. Their results indicated that drinking and the incidence of drunkenness were directly

related to anomie, or normlessness. They found a strong positive correlation between "the amount of alcohol consumed and the degree of anomie" (p.912).

Dean and Lewis (1978) also conducted a study which depicted alienation as a determinant of behaviour. They administered the Alienation Scale along with the Emotional Maturity Scale to 119 introductory sociology students. They found a strong correlation between alienation and emotional immaturity. Their results suggested that alienation may be an immature way of meeting one's problems.

Bickford and Neal (1969) conducted a study of all the students enrolled in a *Vocational Training Program* in Windsor, Ontario. All subjects were given a "Training Newsletter" drafted by the researchers, to give the subjects information about the training program. Shortly afterward, questionnaires were distributed to the subjects to determine their retention of the newsletter information, along with other demographic information. The researchs found that the scores on meaninglessness, social isolation and powerlessness were significantly higher for those subjects who were single and young. They also found that those high in alienation were more dissatisfied with the training program. Similarly, there was a strong negative relationship between alienation and

interest in the training program, and the learning of control-relevant information, knowledge which was concerned with the long-range planning of one's career and short-range information, material which was concerned with the training program itself. Hence, it was concluded by the researchers that high alienation inhibited the learning of control-relevant information, and similarly, that low alienation facilitated the receptiveness and retention of control-relevant information.

Thus, the literature indicates much diversity regarding the nature of alienation and its consequences. Many researchers claim it is situational, while others claim it is more personal; yet all agree that alienation moves beyond feelings to behaviours. It is likely that both factors are at work: individuals who experience the same social circumstances within a given society do not all react in the same manner. Seeman's conception of alienation seems congruent with this contention. His research is extensive and varied, dealing mainly with alienation via expectancies and reward value. Although most of his work is focused on powerlessness and mass society theory, it is nonetheless insightful. Furthermore, all of his work uses a structure-alienation-behaviour sequence that accounts for both structural and personal determinants.



Seeman and Evan (1962) conducted a study in a hospital setting where they tested Seeman's hypothesis that differences in alienation are associated with differential learning of behaviour-relevant information. His contention was that patients' sense of personal control influenced their learning about tuberculosis. His results indicated that alienation, as measured by powerlessness, served as an intervening variable between the individuals' social circumstance, in this case, confinement in a hospital for tuberculosis, and their social learning. Those patients who scored high on powerlessness did not learn about their illness, nor were they interested in what they could do to facilitate healing.

Seeman (1963) tested his hypothesis that a person's expectation for control over events was a crucial factor in the learning process, using measures of different types of knowledge: knowledge concerning the immediate situation, knowledge about the foreseeable future, and knowledge about long-range opportunities. This study took place in a reformatory; thus, Seeman had the advantage of a controlled setting. He administered questionnaires after the inmates were exposed to the three types of knowledge. Social class, criminal experience, and intelligence were controlled in this project. The results indicated that

powerlessness made a difference when learning about parole matters. Learning was selective and took into account personal control implications of what there was to be learned.

Seeman's third study, with Neal (1964), mailed questionnaires to four census tracts in Ohio. They obtained 609 respondents from whom they gathered data concerning work-related organizations, union membership, measures of powerlessness, mobility ideology, and mobility history. It was hypothesized that those workers who had a support organization to speak on their behalf would feel less powerless than those who were not represented by any support group. In all comparisons, the unorganized manual workers scored higher in powerlessness than did those manual workers who were organized. This finding also held true for white-collar workers, which affirmed their hypothesis.

Seeman (1966a) elaborated on this research with a study of 558 Swedish men, where attention was given to knowledge which was not as specialized as it was in the studies conducted in hospital or reformatory settings. The results of this study indicated that high powerlessness and low political knowledge was found among unorganized workers. This research served to reinforce the notion that those subjects who scored low on powerlessness were more

involved in the organizations they belonged to, and consequently possessed greater amounts of knowledge that could affect their life circumstances. There was a consistently negative relationship between involvement in the organization and powerlessness.

Seeman (1966b) then studied 343 students to replicate his previous findings. He found that the individual's level of alienation correlated negatively with control-relevant information, but not with all information. He further concluded that the concept of alienation, used the way it had been in these studies, emerged as a feature of the person that can be understood only as a problem-solving, situation-bound characteristic.

In Seeman's 1967 study of the same 558 Swedish workers, however, he found that worker alienation was not consistently and significantly related to negative attitudes toward ethnic minorities, knowledge about political matters, interest in socio-political events, status seeking, or anomie. He attributed these findings to the Swedish social structure, which was much more organized, stable, and economically advanced than structures studied elsewhere. Yet, when these same measures were applied to the United States and France, he reported the same negative results. Thus, his findings relating to powerlessness cannot be generalized beyond

worker alienation; rather they remain situational in nature, and the individuals in his samples typically reveal a rather discriminating alienation.

Seeman's (1972) work in France, just before the 1968 student rebellion, produced interesting findings. Powerlessness was the only dimension of alienation which correlated with political variables, while a sense of mastery also correlated with the same political variables. Mastery and powerlessness were juxtaposed in this unique situation; alienation was selective and channeled to the political situation, attuned to attitudes, action, and knowledge. In this case, powerlessness was negatively related to the attainment of control-relevant information. This high sense of powerlessness contributed to the desire to rebel, to gain control.

This work by Seeman suggests that feelings of powerlessness over the outcome of events are associated with less objective information about managing one's life. Powerless tuberculosis patients knew less about health matters; powerless prison inmates knew less about parole matters; Swedish workers knew less about political information; Swedish students knew less about nuclear warfare. In sum, then, the low expectancy for personal mastery was associated with poor learning of control-relevant material -- knowledge that could impact on the

circumstances. It seems that if one is powerless in a given situation, knowledge which could help apparently "falls on deaf ears."

This review implies that alienated individuals experience impaired interaction. The reflective interpretive process results in a perception of self as inadequate; when observing others, perhaps the individual sees self as inferior. In turn, the individual responds to self as inferior, and perceives that others see him/her similarly. Therefore, distance between self and others is created.

The self is also a cognitive structure; when this structure is distorted, shared attitudes become impossible. Shared meanings, role-taking, and a sense of the generalized other are necessary components for adult interaction. However, when these are somehow distorted or impaired, adulthood becomes obstructed, and alienation is a feasible consequence.

## CHAPTER IV

### METHODOLOGY

#### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

In order to collect the data for this research, self-administered questionnaires were distributed in three introductory sociology classes, and 268 students responded. With the permission of the professors, data collection took place during regular class time, the last week of November 1988.

The questionnaire included twenty-two questions, ten asking for demographic information, while eleven of the questions, such as, "Do you feel comfortable and confident in the large classes?" were asked to further examine Seeman's dimensions of alienation (1959). (see Appendix A). Some of these questions were open-ended and asked the respondents to "Please explain," so that reasons for answers could be obtained.

The basic scale developed by Dean (1961), was also

included in the questionnaire. It contained three components of the concept of alienation, and each will be examined separately so as not to aggregate the dimensions in one summary score. The scale contained nine statements, measuring powerlessness; nine statements measuring social isolation; and six statements indicating normlessness. The three subscales were combined, by Dean into the alienation scale, which thus, consisted of twenty four forced-choice items. Dean (1961) reported the reliability of the scales to be: powerlessness = .78, normlessness = .73, social isolation = .83, and alienation = .78 (p.756).

A question regarding confidence in future goals was asked to elaborate the concept of meaninglessness, included in Seeman's concept of alienation, but not measured in Dean's scale. A contingency question, "Would you still be satisfied with your expected grade average, if your friends did much better than you?" was designed to clarify the concept of self-estrangement, where rewards were external, not intrinsic.

The occupational scale used in coding was based on the 1971 Canadian Classification and Dictionary of Occupations. This scale was based upon sixteen categories used by Census Canada. Initially this was employed in conjunction with country of birth to obtain a rough SES category. However, too few students answered

the question regarding father's occupation to make it useable in that form.

Prior to conducting the actual research, a pre-test was conducted in a sociology lab. The thirty-five students who participated were instructed not to fill in the questionnaire a second time in the lectures. Special attention was paid to this, both in the lab and at the time of the administration so that contamination of the actual research was avoided. The pre-test respondents encountered no apparent difficulties with the questionnaire; therefore, the questionnaire was not changed any further.

#### 4.2 DATA COLLECTION

The research involved a convenience sample of introductory sociology students at the University of Windsor. The reasons for using this particular sample were: 1) the introductory classes consisted of students from various faculties, 2) significant differences for students from other faculties was not suspected, 3) it was believed that a relatively high proportion of students in these classes would be in their first year so that respondents would be relatively naive regarding the research process.

With the permission of the professors, the



questionnaire was administered to three introductory classes during the last week of November, 1988. The students were asked to complete the questionnaire during class and were given as much time as necessary; on the average, questionnaire completion took approximately fifteen minutes. This procedure produced a sample of 268 respondents. Parenthetically, some of the students asked whether this scale was measuring suicidal tendencies or depression; I got the impression that the students thought this was an eccentric kind of scale for them to be asked to fill out. Their queries were answered mostly by a nod and a smile, but when asked directly, I explained the questionnaire was just looking at attitudes. With the exception of high absenteeism, accounting for the relatively small sample, no problems were encountered in the data collection.

## CHAPTER V

### SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHICS

#### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter will introduce the demographic information of the student population sampled. A "Q" type factor analysis will then add insight into the distribution of attitudes among the students.

#### 5.2 RESPONDENT PROFILE

The frequency distribution indicated that, of the 268 students sampled, 176 (65.7%) were female and 92 (34.3%) were male.

The majority of the respondents were single while the second largest proportion were married. The remaining students were fairly equally distributed between separated and divorced. The following table indicates these results.

Table 1:

MARITAL STATUS

|           | <u>Frequency</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|----------------|
| SINGLE    | 223              | 83.2           |
| MARRIED   | 31               | 11.6           |
| SEPARATED | 6                | 2.2            |
| DIVORCED  | 7                | 2.6            |
| OTHER     | 1                | .4             |
|           | <hr/>            | <hr/>          |
| Total     | 268              | 100.0          |

The largest proportion of respondents was between the ages of fifteen and twenty, with the next largest age group between twenty-one and twenty-five years of age. The number of students in each age category decreased monotonically as the ages increased. The only exception to this trend was the 36-40 age group. The following table illustrates this frequency distribution.

Table 2:

AGE

|             | <u>Frequency</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|-------------|------------------|----------------|
| 15-20 YEARS | 168              | 62.9           |
| 21-25 YEARS | 48               | 18.0           |
| 26-30 YEARS | 19               | 7.1            |
| 31-35 YEARS | 12               | 4.5            |
| 36-40 YEARS | 3                | 1.1            |
| 41-45 YEARS | 8                | 3.0            |
| 46-50 YEARS | 5                | 1.9            |
| 51-55 YEARS | 4                | 1.5            |
|             | <hr/>            | <hr/>          |
| Total       | 267              | 100.0          |

Moreover, 237 (88.4%) of the respondents were born in Canada and the United States, while 30 (11.2%) were born elsewhere.

Additionally, the greater part of the sample lived with their families (148, 55.2%), while 59 (22.0%) lived in residence, 17 (6.3%) lived in their own place, and 39 (14.6%) shared a place off campus, with the remaining 5 (1.9%) living in their own arrangements, mostly boarding with relatives.

Although, 212 (79.1%) of the students were satisfied with their living arrangements, 56 (20.9%) were discontented. Most of the dissatisfied students complained about having no control over interruptions and noise in the residence environment, or the lack of autonomy granted to them by their parents.

The largest proportion 16.5% of the respondents had fathers in middle management positions, while fathers in semi-skilled manual work ranked second with 15%; 10.9% of the students' fathers were employed professionals. While 10.5% of the fathers were skilled crafts and tradesmen, 4.5% of the respondents had fathers working in semi-skilled clerical-sales-service situations, and 4.1% of the fathers were supervisors. The remaining distribution is illustrated in the following table.

Table 3:                      FATHER'S OCCUPATION

|                          | <u>Frequency</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| SELF EMPLOYED PROF       | 4                | 1.5            |
| EMPLOYED PROF            | 29               | 10.9           |
| HIGH MANAGEMENT          | 3                | 1.1            |
| SEMI-PROF                | 2                | .7             |
| TECHNICIAN               | 4                | 1.5            |
| MIDDLE MANAGEMENT        | 44               | 16.5           |
| SUPERVISOR               | 11               | 4.1            |
| FOREMEN                  | 6                | 2.2            |
| SKILLED CLERICAL--SALES  | 9                | 3.4            |
| SKILLED CRAFTS & TRADE   | 28               | 10.5           |
| FARMER                   | 7                | 2.6            |
| SEMI-SKILLED CLERICAL    | 12               | 4.5            |
| SEMI-SKILLED MANUAL      | 40               | 15.0           |
| UNSKILLED CLERICAL-SALES | 2                | .7             |
| UNSKILLED MANUAL         | 10               | 3.7            |
| NON RESPONSE             | 57               | 20.6           |
|                          | <hr/>            | <hr/>          |
| Total                    | 268              | 100.0          |

The largest proportion of mothers, 31%, worked in unskilled manual situations, yet this figure could be ambiguous since the category included both workers inside the home and workers in comparable occupations outside the home. Among the working mothers, 14.6% earned their living in semi-skilled manual positions, while 9.3% worked in skilled clerical-sales-service, 9% were semi-professionals and 5.2% were in middle management situations. These results are illustrated in the following table.

Table 4: MOTHER'S OCCUPATION

|                          | <u>Frequency</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| SELF EMPLOYED PROF       | 2                | .7             |
| EMPLOYED PROF            | 15               | 5.6            |
| HIGH MANAGEMENT          | 1                | .4             |
| SEMI-PROF                | 24               | 9.0            |
| TECHNICIAN               | 3                | 1.1            |
| MIDDLE MANAGEMENT        | 14               | 5.2            |
| SUPERVISOR               | 5                | 1.9            |
| SKILLED CLERICAL-SALES   | 25               | 9.3            |
| SKILLED CRAFTS & TRADES  | 2                | .7             |
| FARMER                   | 1                | .4             |
| SEMI-SKILLED CLERICAL    | 39               | 14.6           |
| SEMI-SKILLED MANUAL      | 10               | 3.7            |
| UNSKILLED CLERICAL-SALES | 2                | .7             |
| UNSKILLED MANUAL         | 83               | 31.0           |
| NON RESPONSES            | 42               | 15.7           |
| Total                    | <u>268</u>       | <u>100.0</u>   |

Most of the respondents (210, 78.4%) were in their first year of university, while 33 (12.3%) were in their second year. Of the respondents sampled, 15 (5.6%) were in their third year and 6 (2.2%) in their fourth year of study. The sample was, therefore, mostly first-year students.

Faculty of enrollment was diverse with 45.1% of the respondents majoring in psychology and sociology, 13.8% majoring in nursing, 6% majoring in the natural sciences, and 5.6% majoring in human kinetics. Business majors accounted for 3.4% of the population, while 2.2%

were majoring in communication studies. Notably, 7.5% of the students were undecided as to their major, and an even larger proportion 8.6% were non-responses. Since the questionnaire simply asked, "What faculty are you majoring in?" (see Appendix A) many of the non-responses could indeed be undecided students, thus, this is an incomplete view of the undecided students. The sample is thus, over-representative of psychology and sociology students.

Table 5: FACULTY

|                   | <u>Frequency</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------|
| PSYCH & SOC       | 121              | 45.1           |
| NURSING           | 37               | 13.8           |
| NATURAL SCIENCES  | 16               | 6.0            |
| HUMAN KINETICS    | 15               | 5.6            |
| BUSINESS          | 9                | 3.4            |
| COMM STUDIES      | 6                | 2.2            |
| SOCIAL WORK       | 5                | 1.9            |
| ENGLISH           | 3                | 1.1            |
| POLITICAL SCIENCE | 2                | .7             |
| RELIGIOUS STUDIES | 2                | .7             |
| ECONOMICS         | 2                | .7             |
| HOME ECONOMICS    | 1                | .4             |
| FINE ARTS         | 1                | .4             |
| LANGUAGES         | 1                | .4             |
| GEOGRAPHY         | 1                | .4             |
| UNDECIDED         | 20               | 7.5            |
| NON RESPONSE      | 23               | 8.6            |
| Total             | 268              | 100.0          |

The majority of the students (237, 88.4%) selected their major alone, while 11 (4.1%) made the decision jointly with their parents. Of the remaining 20 respondents, 3 (1.1%) students had their parents making the decision for them, while 17 (6.3%) were non responses.

Most students (155, 57.8%), preferred objective examination procedures. The remaining 89 (33.2%) preferred subjective testing methods, while 23 (8.6%) claimed the preference depended upon the type of subject matter under review.

Moreover, the majority of respondents (221, 82.5%) felt confident in the large classes, while 45 (16.8%) felt that the large classes undermined their confidence. Parenthetically, some students when asked to explain, stated that they had become accustomed to these classes now, but initially were intimidated.

In order to provide a standardized system for student responses to questions regarding past academic achievement, students were given both grade values and its corresponding letter values, based, not on the system used at university but rather, on the scale used in the high schools (see Appendix A). This was an attempt by the researcher to make the grading scheme familiar to the students, so that errors in their



responses could be avoided.

Table 6:                    HIGH SCHOOL AVERAGE

|            | <u>Frequency</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|------------|------------------|----------------|
| 96-100, A+ | 2                | .8             |
| 91-95, A   | 20               | 8.2            |
| 86-90, A-  | 9                | 3.7            |
| 81-85, B+  | 32               | 13.2           |
| 76-80, B   | 71               | 29.2           |
| 71-75, C+  | 45               | 18.5           |
| 66-70, C   | 50               | 20.6           |
| 60-65, D   | 11               | 4.5            |
|            | <hr/>            | <hr/>          |
| Total      | 240              | 100.0*         |

\* missing cases = 28

Respondents were also asked to give their expected grade average while here at university. Once again they were given the same scale used in the high schools. These results were congruent with the averages they received in high school, with the majority expecting to acquire a B (76-80). The following table shows these frequencies.

Table 7:

EXPECTED AVERAGE

|            | <u>Frequency</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|------------|------------------|----------------|
| 96-100, A+ | 1                | .4             |
| 91-95, A   | 14               | 5.3            |
| 86-90, A-  | 26               | 9.9            |
| 81-85, B+  | 60               | 22.8           |
| 76-80, B   | 94               | 35.7           |
| 71-75, C+  | 43               | 16.3           |
| 66-70, C   | 17               | 6.5            |
| 65-60, D   | 0                | 0              |
| Total      | <u>255</u>       | <u>100.0*</u>  |

\* missing cases = 13

Additionally, 197 (73.5%) of the respondents stated that if they achieved this expected average at university, they would be satisfied, while 68 (25.4%) said they would not be happy with this average.

More than three-quarters 214 (79.9%) of the respondents felt confident they would be able to attain the academic goals they had set for themselves, while 51 (19.0%) indicated a lack of confidence.

The majority of students sampled (193, 72.0%) did not have their best friend here with them at university, whereas a smaller percentage of the students 72 (26.9%) did.

Furthermore, 166 (61.9%) of the students would be content with their average even if their friends

exceeded them. Of those students sampled, 12 (4.5%) said they would become dissatisfied if their friends achievements exceeded their own. Since this was the one contingency question, which excluded all the students who would not be satisfied with their expected grade average, (see Appendix A) there were 90 missing cases.

The majority of students (155, 57.8%) were not involved in extra-curricular activities, nor are they planning to be in the future. Most cited part-time jobs and work load as the reasons for this lack of involvement. However, 112 (41.8%) of the respondents were interested in these activities and planned to become involved, or were already dedicated to some particular interest.

Furthermore, 188 (70.1%) of the students were satisfied with their social life, whereas 78 (29.1%) of the students were dissatisfied. Of those students who were dissatisfied, many claimed they were too busy to see their friends on a regular basis, since many cited part time jobs as a financial necessity, in order to support their education.

### 5.3 DEPENDENT MEASURES

The response pattern to the items in each of the

three alienation measures on a four-point Likert scale format is as follows: strongly agree (0), agree (1), disagree (2), strongly disagree (3). Reverse items scored in the opposite direction; "0" designated low alienation and "3" designated high alienation. For each scale item scores were summed.

Of the 268 students sampled, 10 were missing cases; of the 258 remaining cases, 27.8% ranked low, on the quartile range, in powerlessness, 23.3% were moderately low, 21.7% were moderately high and 21.2% ranged high in powerlessness. The largest group were low, while the second largest percentage ranked high, as indicated below.

Table 8:                      POWERLESSNESS

|                 | <u>Frequency</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| LOW             | 77               | 29.8           |
| MODERATELY LOW  | 60               | 23.3           |
| MODERATELY HIGH | 56               | 21.7           |
| HIGH            | 65               | 25.2           |
|                 | <hr/>            | <hr/>          |
| Total           | 258              | 100.0          |

In calculating normlessness, 17 were missing cases; of the 251 remaining cases, 6.4% ranked moderately low on the quartile range. The largest group, 33.1%, scored

moderately high, while 27.2% scored in the high range.

Table 9: NORMLESSNESS

|                 | <u>Frequency</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| LOW             | 16               | 6.4            |
| MODERATELY LOW  | 79               | 31.5           |
| MODERATELY HIGH | 83               | 33.1           |
| HIGH            | 73               | 29.0           |
|                 | <hr/>            | <hr/>          |
| Total           | 251              | 100.0          |

In tabulating social isolation, 14 cases were missing, thus yielding 254 valid responses. The largest percentage, 35.0%, were students whose scores ranged moderately low, whereas 12.6% ranked low.

Table 10:

SOCIAL ISOLATION

|                 | <u>Frequency</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| LOW             | 32               | 12.6           |
| MODERATELY LOW  | 89               | 35.0           |
| MODERATELY HIGH | 68               | 26.8           |
| HIGH            | 65               | 25.6           |
|                 | <hr/>            | <hr/>          |
| Total           | 254              | 100.0          |

An index of these three dimensions was computed for a score of alienation, and there were 33 missing cases. These frequencies were equally distributed, with 25.1% scoring low alienation, 26.0% ranking moderately low, 23.0% scoring moderately high and 26.0% ranking high on the scale of alienation, as shown in the following table.

Table 11:                      ALIENATION

|                 | <u>Frequency</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| LOW             | 59               | 25.1           |
| MODERATELY LOW  | 61               | 26.0           |
| MODERATELY HIGH | 54               | 23.0           |
| HIGH            | 61               | 26.0           |
|                 | <hr/>            | <hr/>          |
| Total           | 235              | 100.0          |

#### 5.4 " Q " FACTOR ANALYSIS

In my attempt to identify a small number of dimensions which could be used to represent correlations among the many variables, I performed a factor analysis. The default on SPSSX/PC was such that only those factors in which the eigenvalues were greater than 1 were retained.

The data resulted in seven factors with an eigenvalue of more than 1, the criterion of statistical significance. These seven factors accounted for 66.2% of the total variance. The subsequent table indicates this variance.

Table 12: EIGENVALUE AND CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF VARIANCE FOR THE SEVEN FACTORS

| FACTOR | EIGENVALUE | CUMULATIVE % OF VARIANCE |
|--------|------------|--------------------------|
| 1      | 2.02535    | 13.5%                    |
| 2      | 1.75590    | 25.2%                    |
| 3      | 1.51493    | 35.3%                    |
| 4      | 1.40462    | 44.7%                    |
| 5      | 1.22148    | 52.8%                    |
| 6      | 1.01130    | 59.6%                    |
| 7      | 1.00234    | 66.2%                    |

Using the varimax method the seven retained factors were rotated. The subsequent table exhibits the loading of the variables on the seven factors in the rotated factor pattern.

Table 13:

## ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

| VARIABLES | FACTORS |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|-----------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|           | 1       | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    |
| POWERL    | .85     | .00  | .08  | -.07 | .08  | .05  | .01  |
| NORML     | .84     | .06  | -.04 | -.01 | -.03 | .15  | -.12 |
| SOCIS     | .45     | -.14 | .11  | .39  | .02  | -.05 | .14  |
| GENDER    | .07     | -.08 | .07  | .01  | .80  | -.08 | -.02 |
| YRIN      | .07     | .11  | .16  | -.05 | -.38 | .25  | .16  |
| SATLIV    | -.04    | .11  | .33  | .67  | .10  | .21  | -.12 |
| EXPAV     | .23     | .28  | .01  | .21  | -.25 | -.34 | .56  |
| SATGR     | -.02    | .87  | -.03 | -.09 | -.06 | -.00 | -.05 |
| SATFHI    | .01     | .88  | .02  | .09  | -.02 | -.02 | .03  |
| CONFGOL   | .08     | .21  | .12  | .31  | .54  | .28  | .28  |
| CONFLGCL  | .05     | -.04 | -.07 | .01  | -.11 | .85  | .08  |
| FRHERE    | -.14    | -.12 | -.04 | -.09 | .04  | .21  | .78  |
| EXTACTS   | .01     | -.03 | .84  | -.17 | .17  | -.08 | .14  |
| SATSOC    | .08     | .00  | .82  | .17  | -.13 | .00  | -.15 |
| AGE       | .02     | .04  | .28  | .71  | -.06 | .15  | -.03 |

The first rotated factor included three variables that loaded substantially (beyond .30), these were the three variants of the scale. Both powerlessness and normlessness were primary factors, while social isolation was a secondary loading. These three indexes appeared to be independent of the other variables. Since these are the variants of the scale, the underlying element was presumably "alienated students".

The second rotated factor had two primary loadings: students who were dissatisfied with their grades and those who would not be satisfied with their grades if their friends' grades were higher. These students were



not satisfied with themselves, and seem to be more dissatisfied with themselves in comparison to their peers. This factor could possibly be indicate a sense of self-estrangement, one of the dimensions to Seeman's alienation. Because it seems to involve a discontentment with self, it could be called the "disgruntled students".

The third factor in the pattern, contained the primary loadings of persons dissatisfied with their social life and not involved in extra-curricular activities. None of these variables are correlated with any of the dimensions of alienation. These loadings are the result of some unknown entity, perhaps a job, whereby students do not have the freedom to be involved in extra-curricular activities, and yet are dissatisfied with the social ramifications. These are possibly students with other priorities, or "diverted students".

The fourth rotated factor seems to involve a feeling of transformation or progress. Age is the only variable which loads strongly, while satisfaction with living arrangements and social isolation also loaded heavily. This factor involves students who are young, dissatisfied with their living arrangements, and feel detached from society. Thus, there seems to be a feeling of displeasure, restlessness, unfocused rebellion, perhaps the "rebellious students".

The fifth rotated factor combines three variables; females, first year students, and reservations concerning academic goals. This doubt intercorrelates more highly in this factor than in factor four, though being female and a first year students are also primary loadings. These dimensions seem to have an underlying sense of low self-assurance, and could be called the "ambivalent students".

The sixth rotated factor involves the notion of "go-getters", high achievers. One variables loaded significantly; lack of confidence in large classes. The expectation of achieving a high average, also loaded substantially. These students expect to achieve high grades, and feel that the large classes undermine this objective.

The seventh and final rotated factor loaded very significantly on best friend not here, and expect a low average here at university. Yet, this did not load with either powerlessness or social isolation, thus the respondents did not attribute their low marks to factors beyond their control, nor do they express any dissatisfaction with their low grades. Thus, these respondents seem to be the "unmotivated students".

Accordingly, the clustering from this analysis indicated that the students sampled were basically of seven general varieties. Some students were

unmotivated, while others were go-getters, yet others were ambivalent, while some were diverted with other priorities. Then there were the students who were alienated, disgruntled or rebellious. The "disgruntled", "diverted", and "rebellious" students would appear to be more homogeneous groups.

## CHAPTER VI

### WHAT AFFECTS THE DIMENSIONS OF ALIENATION?

#### 6.1 INTRODUCTION

The Dean scale (1961) used in this research consists of three variants of the concept of alienation: powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation. Each of the three variants were dealt with separately, in order to better understand what each was measuring, and whether it measured the concept proposed by Seeman.

Struening and Richardson (1965) claimed that:

If the advancement of theory depends on connections among concepts inferred from relations among measured variables, then theoretical advance is severely limited by measurement models that ... conceal several dimensions under one summary score (p.769).

In keeping with this general premise, the dependent measures are dealt with individually not only to capture the dynamics of the situation, but also to enhance the understanding of the concept, alienation.

Mean scores on powerlessness, normlessness, and

social isolation ranged from 0 to 3, for each measure; the scores were divided into quartile ranges. The low range for normlessness had scores from .17 through .83, the moderately low range included scores with a range of .83 through 1.17, the moderately high category was ascribed to scores from 1.17 through 2.78, while the high range included scores 1.50 through 2.78. Powerlessness was similarly recoded to ranges with the low category assigned to scores between .30 and 1.20, and the moderately low range for scores between 1.20 and 1.40, the moderately high was 1.40 through 1.60, with the high category from 1.60 through 2.70. Furthermore, social isolation was recoded in a like manner, with .78 through 1.33 ascribed to the low range, and 1.33 through 1.56 the moderately low range. The moderately high range was for scores between 1.56 and 1.78, and the high range contained scores from 1.78 through 2.78. These ranges were calculated from the distribution of responses, in order to keep the frequency of responses within the ranges as equal as possible.

The significant findings of the three variants will be presented in this chapter. The chapter progresses from a testing of the association between the variables through an explanation of the relevant associations to determine the nature of the relationships.

## 6.2 POWERLESSNESS

Powerlessness is the "expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements, he seeks" (Seeman, 1959,784).

### Powerlessness and Country of Birth

In order to determine if there was a correlation between powerlessness and country of birth I crosstabulated these two variables. Although 227 (88.3%) of the respondents were born in either Canada or the U.S.A., there appeared to be an association. Kendall's Tau-c was .09726 ( $p=.0150$ ). The  $t$  value was -2.19 ( $p=.035$ ); the mean was 2.8667 for foreign born students and 2.3612 for Canadian and American born respondents. Therefore, those respondents who were Canadian and American by birth felt less powerless than those who were born elsewhere. The following table illustrates this relationship.

Table 14:

POWERLESSNESS

| <u>COUNTRY BORN</u> | LOW        | MOD. LOW   | MOD. HI    | HI         | Row Total    |
|---------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| CANADA & U.S.A.     | 70<br>30.8 | 58<br>25.6 | 46<br>20.3 | 53<br>23.3 | 227<br>88.3% |
| OTHER               | 7<br>23.3  | 2<br>6.7   | 9<br>30.0  | 12<br>40.0 | 30<br>11.7%  |
| Column Total        | 77<br>30.0 | 60<br>23.3 | 55<br>21.4 | 65<br>25.3 | 257<br>100.0 |

Effects of Gender

In my attempt to understand this relationship more fully a test factor was interjected. The following table will look at the relationship between powerlessness, country of birth and gender.

Table 15: POWERLESSNESS BY GENDER AND COUNTRY BORN

|           | MALE          |            |            |            |           | FEMALE        |            |            |            |            |
|-----------|---------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
|           | POWERLESSNESS |            |            |            |           | POWERLESSNESS |            |            |            |            |
|           | LO            | MOD LO     | MOD HI     | HI         | TOTAL     | LO            | MOD LO     | MOD HI     | HI         | TOTAL      |
| CAN& U.S. | 29<br>36.7    | 15<br>19.0 | 15<br>19.0 | 20<br>25.3 | 79<br>100 | 41<br>27.7    | 43<br>29.0 | 31<br>20.9 | 33<br>22.4 | 148<br>100 |
| OTHER     | 4<br>36.4     | 2<br>18.2  | 2<br>18.2  | 3<br>27.2  | 11<br>100 | 3<br>15.8     | 0<br>0.0   | 7<br>36.8  | 9<br>47.4  | 19<br>100  |

Kendall's Tau-c for male students was .00642 ( $p=.4467$ ) and .11862 ( $p=.0024$ ) for the female respondents. Thus, the relationship gained strength for females and disappeared for male students. Confidence that the relationship was real for females increased, yet this confidence dissipated for males; country of birth influenced powerlessness for females and had no influence on the relationship for males.

#### Powerlessness and Living Arrangements

Powerlessness was contrasted with living arrangements to determine if there was an association between these two variables. Chi-square was 17.14746 ( $p=.1441$ ). Thus, there was no significant dependency between powerlessness and residency. In an effort to understand these results, the  $t$  value for the respondents' satisfaction with their living arrangements was  $-.06$  ( $p=.951$ ); the mean for the satisfied group was 2.4203 and for the dissatisfied group was 2.4314. Thus, those who were dissatisfied with their living arrangements and those who were content did not differ significantly, in powerlessness.



Table 16:

POWERLESSNESS

| <u>RESIDENCY</u> | LOW        | MOD.LOW    | MOD.HI     | HI         | Row Total    |
|------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| WITH FAMILY      | 35<br>24.6 | 38<br>26.8 | 34<br>23.9 | 35<br>24.6 | 142<br>55.0% |
| IN RESIDENCE     | 17<br>30.4 | 12<br>21.4 | 10<br>17.9 | 17<br>30.4 | 56<br>21.7%  |
| OWN PLACE        | 6<br>35.3  | 4<br>23.5  | 3<br>17.6  | 4<br>23.5  | 17<br>6.6%   |
| SHARE PLACE      | 14<br>36.8 | 6<br>15.8  | 9<br>23.7  | 9<br>23.7  | 38<br>14.7%  |
| OTHER            | 5<br>100.0 | 0<br>0.0   | 0<br>0.0   | 0<br>0.0   | 5<br>1.9%    |
| Column Total     | 77<br>29.8 | 60<br>23.3 | 56<br>21.7 | 65<br>25.2 | 257<br>100.0 |

Powerlessness and Satisfactory Social Life

Powerlessness was contrasted with satisfactory social life to determine if there was a correlation. Kendall's Tau-c was .24426 ( $p=.0001$ ). The statistic indicated that there was a strong significant relationship between respondents' satisfaction with their social life and their sense of powerlessness. The  $t$  value was -4.00 ( $p<.001$ ), with the means for the satisfied group 2.2418 and for the dissatisfied group 2.8649. Therefore, those students who were satisfied with their social life felt significantly less powerless than those who were unhappy with their social life.

Table 17:

POWERLESSNESS

| <u>SATISFIED<br/>SOCIAL LIFE</u> | LOW        | MOD. LOW   | MOD. HI    | HI         | Row<br>Total |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| YES                              | 64<br>35.2 | 46<br>25.3 | 36<br>19.8 | 36<br>19.8 | 182<br>71.1% |
| NO                               | 13<br>17.6 | 13<br>17.6 | 19<br>25.7 | 29<br>39.2 | 74<br>28.9%  |
| Column<br>Total                  | 77<br>30.1 | 59<br>23.0 | 55<br>21.5 | 65<br>25.4 | 256<br>100.0 |

Antecedents of Powerlessness

In my quest to understand the relationship between powerlessness and satisfaction with social life I used gender as the test factor. Kendall's Tau-c for the male students was .20630 ( $p=.0045$ ), and .16730 ( $p=.0025$ ) for the female students. Hence, the relationship between powerlessness and satisfaction with social life remained. Social satisfaction had an influence on powerlessness for both sexes.

Similarly, the test factor, country of birth, was introduced to the relationship between powerlessness and satisfaction with social life in order to add a clearer understanding of this relationship. Kendall's Tau-c was .35556 ( $p=.0369$ ) for those students born elsewhere and .16406 ( $p=.0005$ ) for students born in North America. Thus, the relationship for both groups increased. Since

the relationship remained, satisfaction with social life had an influence on powerlessness for the population sampled.

Powerlessness and Confidence in Academic Goals

Powerlessness was tabulated with confidence in academic goals to see if there was a correlation. Kendall's Tau-c was .07958 ( $p=.0275$ ). Therefore, there was a significantly strong relationship between powerlessness and academic confidence. The  $t$  value was -1.94 ( $p=.057$ ). The mean for the confident group was 2.3478, and was 2.7292 for those insecure about reaching their goals. Thus, the group that was confident in reaching their goals felt less powerless than the dubious group. The relationship is indicated in the subsequent table.

Table 18:                      POWERLESSNESS

| <u>CONFIDENT<br/>OF GOALS</u> | LOW        | MOD. LOW   | MOD. HI    | HI         | Row<br>Total |
|-------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| YES                           | 63<br>30.4 | 54<br>26.1 | 45<br>21.7 | 45<br>21.7 | 207<br>80.5% |
| NO                            | 13<br>27.1 | 6<br>12.5  | 10<br>20.8 | 19<br>39.6 | 48<br>18.7%  |
| Column<br>Total               | 76<br>30.0 | 60<br>23.3 | 55<br>21.4 | 64<br>25.3 | 255<br>100.0 |

Effects of Gender and Country of Birth

While endeavoring to discern the relationship between powerlessness and confidence in academic goals, the test factor, gender, was introduced. The following table shows this relationship.

Table 19: POWERLESSNESS BY GENDER AND CONFIDENCE IN ACADEMIC GOALS

|     | MALE          |        |        |      |       | FEMALE        |        |        |      |       |
|-----|---------------|--------|--------|------|-------|---------------|--------|--------|------|-------|
|     | POWERLESSNESS |        |        |      |       | POWERLESSNESS |        |        |      |       |
|     | LO            | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL | LO            | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL |
| YES | 32            | 17     | 17     | 18   | 84    | 31            | 37     | 28     | 27   | 123   |
|     | 38.2          | 20.2   | 20.2   | 21.4 | 100   | 25.2          | 30.1   | 22.8   | 21.9 | 100   |
| NO  | 1             | 0      | 0      | 5    | 6     | 13            | 6      | 10     | 15   | 44    |
|     | 16.7          | 0.0    | 0.0    | 83.3 | 100   | 29.5          | 13.6   | 22.7   | 34.2 | 100   |

Kendall's Tau-c was .13728 ( $p=.0096$ ) for male respondents, and for female students .05899 ( $p=.1525$ ); the relationship gained strength for males, yet was not maintained for females. Hence, there was no relationship between powerlessness and academic confidence for females, but confidence in academic goals influenced powerlessness for male students.

Similarly, in my effort to understand the

relationship between powerlessness and confidence in academic goals, the test factor, country of birth, was introduced.

Table 20: POWERLESSNESS BY COUNTRY BORN AND CONFIDENCE IN ACADEMIC GOALS

|     | CAN & U.S.A.  |        |        |      |       | ELSEWHERE     |        |        |      |       |
|-----|---------------|--------|--------|------|-------|---------------|--------|--------|------|-------|
|     | POWERLESSNESS |        |        |      |       | POWERLESSNESS |        |        |      |       |
|     | LO            | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL | LO            | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL |
| YES | 58            | 52     | 37     | 34   | 181   | 5             | 2      | 7      | 11   | 25    |
|     | 32.0          | 28.7   | 20.4   | 18.9 | 100   | 20.0          | 8.0    | 28.0   | 44.0 | 100   |
| NO  | 12            | 6      | 9      | 19   | 46    | 2             | 0      | 1      | 1    | 4     |
|     | 26.1          | 13.0   | 19.6   | 41.3 | 100   | 50.0          | 0.0    | 25.0   | 25.0 | 100   |

Kendall's Tau-c was .14928 ( $p=.0062$ ) for those students born in North America, and  $-.11000$  ( $p=.1668$ ) for those born elsewhere. Thus, the relationship gained strength for North American born students and disappeared for foreign born students. Confidence in academic goals had an influence on powerlessness for North American born students and had no influence for those born elsewhere.

Powerlessness and Expected Average at University

Powerlessness was tabulated with expected average at university to determine if there was a correlation. Pearson's  $r$  was .13124 ( $p=.0201$ ). There was a significant correlation between powerlessness and the respondents' expected average. The subsequent table indicates these frequencies.

Table 21:                      POWERLESSNESS

| <u>EXPECTED AVERAGE</u> | LOW        | MOD. LOW   | MOD. HI    | HI         | Row Total    |
|-------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| A+                      | 0<br>0.0   | 1<br>100.0 | 0<br>0.0   | 0<br>0.0   | 1<br>.4%     |
| A                       | 4<br>30.8  | 4<br>30.8  | 2<br>15.4  | 3<br>23.1  | 13<br>5.3%   |
| A-                      | 9<br>37.5  | 8<br>33.3  | 3<br>12.5  | 4<br>16.7  | 24<br>9.8%   |
| B+                      | 16<br>27.6 | 15<br>25.9 | 15<br>25.9 | 12<br>20.7 | 58<br>23.7%  |
| B                       | 29<br>31.5 | 19<br>20.7 | 22<br>23.9 | 22<br>23.9 | 83<br>37.6%  |
| C+                      | 11<br>27.5 | 6<br>15.0  | 12<br>30.0 | 11<br>27.5 | 40<br>16.3%  |
| C                       | 4<br>23.5  | 3<br>17.6  | 1<br>5.9   | 9<br>52.9  | 16<br>6.9%   |
| Column Total            | 73<br>29.8 | 56<br>22.9 | 55<br>22.4 | 61<br>24.9 | 245<br>100.0 |

Antecedents of Powerlessness:

To further understand the relationship between powerlessness and expected average, the test factor, gender, was introduced. The following table shows this relationship.

Table 22: POWERLESSNESS BY GENDER AND EXPECTED AVERAGE

|    | MALE          |        |        |      |       | FEMALE        |        |        |      |       |
|----|---------------|--------|--------|------|-------|---------------|--------|--------|------|-------|
|    | POWERLESSNESS |        |        |      |       | POWERLESSNESS |        |        |      |       |
|    | LO            | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL | LO            | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL |
| A+ | 0             | 1      | 0      | 0    | 1     | 0             | 0      | 0      | 0    | 0     |
|    | 0.0           | 100.0  | 0.0    | 0.0  | 100   | 0.0           | 0.0    | 0.0    | 0.0  | 0.0   |
| A  | 2             | 1      | 1      | 0    | 4     | 2             | 3      | 1      | 3    | 9     |
|    | 50.0          | 25.0   | 25.0   | 0.0  | 100   | 22.2          | 33.3   | 11.1   | 33.3 | 100   |
| A- | 4             | 1      | 0      | 1    | 6     | 5             | 7      | 3      | 3    | 18    |
|    | 66.7          | 16.7   | 0.0    | 16.7 | 100   | 27.8          | 38.9   | 16.7   | 16.7 | 100   |
| B+ | 8             | 5      | 2      | 3    | 18    | 8             | 10     | 13     | 9    | 40    |
|    | 44.4          | 27.8   | 11.1   | 16.7 | 100   | 20.0          | 25.0   | 32.5   | 22.5 | 100   |
| B  | 11            | 4      | 7      | 9    | 31    | 18            | 15     | 15     | 13   | 61    |
|    | 35.5          | 12.9   | 22.6   | 29.0 | 100   | 29.5          | 24.6   | 24.6   | 21.3 | 100   |
| C+ | 7             | 3      | 6      | 5    | 21    | 4             | 3      | 6      | 6    | 19    |
|    | 33.3          | 14.3   | 28.6   | 23.8 | 100   | 21.1          | 15.8   | 31.6   | 31.6 | 100   |
| C  | 1             | 1      | 1      | 3    | 6     | 3             | 2      | 0      | 6    | 11    |
|    | 16.7          | 16.7   | 16.7   | 50.0 | 100   | 27.3          | 18.2   | 0.0    | 54.6 | 100   |

Pearson's  $r$  was .07725 ( $p=.1673$ ) for female students and .24241 ( $p=.0118$ ) for male students; the relationship gained strength for males, yet vanished for females. Expected average had an influence on

powerlessness for male respondents, while it exercised no influence on the relationship for female respondents. Thus, for males the lower their expected grade average the more they experienced a sense of powerlessness.

In order to further understand this relationship, the test factor, country of birth, was introduced in the following table.

Table 23: POWERLESSNESS BY COUNTRY BORN AND EXPECTED AVERAGE

|    | CAN & U.S.A.  |        |        |      |       | ELSEWHERE     |        |        |       |       |
|----|---------------|--------|--------|------|-------|---------------|--------|--------|-------|-------|
|    | POWERLESSNESS |        |        |      |       | POWERLESSNESS |        |        |       |       |
|    | LO            | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL | LO            | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI    | TOTAL |
| A+ | 0             | 1      | 0      | 0    | 1     | 0             | 0      | 0      | 0     | 0     |
|    | 0.0           | 100.0  | 0.0    | 0.0  | 100   | 0.0           | 0.0    | 0.0    | 0.0   | 0.0   |
| A  | 3             | 4      | 1      | 2    | 10    | 1             | 0      | 1      | 1     | 3     |
|    | 30.0          | 40.0   | 10.0   | 20.0 | 100   | 33.3          | 0.0    | 33.3   | 33.3  | 100   |
| A- | 9             | 8      | 3      | 1    | 21    | 0             | 0      | 0      | 3     | 3     |
|    | 42.9          | 38.1   | 14.3   | 4.8  | 100   | 0.0           | 0.0    | 0.0    | 100.0 | 100   |
| B+ | 14            | 13     | 13     | 12   | 52    | 2             | 2      | 2      | 0     | 6     |
|    | 26.9          | 25.0   | 25.0   | 23.1 | 100   | 33.3          | 33.3   | 33.3   | 0.0   | 100   |
| B  | 26            | 19     | 18     | 17   | 80    | 3             | 0      | 3      | 5     | 11    |
|    | 32.5          | 23.8   | 22.5   | 21.3 | 100   | 27.3          | 0.0    | 27.3   | 45.5  | 100   |
| C+ | 10            | 6      | 9      | 10   | 35    | 1             | 0      | 3      | 1     | 5     |
|    | 28.6          | 17.1   | 25.7   | 28.6 | 100   | 20.0          | 0.0    | 60.0   | 20.0  | 100   |
| C  | 4             | 3      | 1      | 8    | 16    | 0             | 0      | 0      | 1     | 1     |
|    | 25.0          | 18.8   | 6.3    | 50.0 | 100   | 0.0           | 0.0    | 0.0    | 100.0 | 100   |



Pearson's  $r$  was .03643 ( $p=.4256$ ) for those students born elsewhere and .15363 ( $p=.0121$ ) for those students born in Canada or the U.S.A. Thus, the relationship was maintained for North American born respondents, while it weakened for those students born elsewhere. Expected grade average had an influence on powerlessness for those born in North America, yet it had no influence for those born elsewhere.

#### Summary

It would appear that powerlessness is a sense held by individuals that their behaviors cannot determine desired outcomes. The data indicated that those students who were satisfied with their living arrangements and those who were discontented were alike in their sense of powerlessness. Notably, many of the respondents who were in residence on campus complained of too many interruptions, and no privacy, whereas the students who lived with their families also complained of no privacy and no freedom. For males born in North America the association between powerlessness and confidence in academic goals, and powerlessness and expected grade average remained strong. Thus, males born in North America felt that their behaviour could not determine their goals, nor their expected grade average.

When this expected average was reported to be in the C to C+ range the powerlessness was even more pronounced. Those female students born elsewhere felt a strong sense of powerlessness that seemed more pervasive and less directed. Correspondingly, the relationship between powerlessness and satisfaction with social life remained strong for the entire sample. These findings seem to indicate that students from this sample felt a sense of powerlessness.

### 6.3 NORMLESSNESS

Normlessness is "a high expectancy that socially unapproved behaviours are required to achieve given goals" (Seeman, 1959, p.787).

#### Normlessness and Country of Birth

In order to determine if a correlation existed between country of birth and a sense of normlessness, the following measures were computed. Kendall's Tau-c was .11270 ( $p=.0052$ ), and Somer's  $d$  indicated a positive direction. Thus, there was a significant relationship between country of birth and a sense of normlessness. The  $t$  value was  $-2.19$  ( $p=.035$ ); while the means for

Canadian and American born respondents was 2.3612, the means for respondents born elsewhere was 2.8667. Thus, Canadian and American born students felt less normless than the 28 (11.2%) respondents born elsewhere. The following table shows this relationship.

Table 24:                      NORMLESSNESS

| <u>COUNTRY BORN</u> | LOW       | MOD. LOW   | MOD. HI    | HI         | Row Total    |
|---------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| CANADA & U.S.A.     | 15<br>6.8 | 76<br>34.2 | 71<br>32.0 | 60<br>27.0 | 222<br>88.8% |
| OTHER               | 1<br>3.6  | 3<br>10.7  | 12<br>42.9 | 12<br>42.9 | 28<br>11.2%  |
| Column Total        | 16<br>6.4 | 79<br>31.6 | 83<br>33.2 | 72<br>28.8 | 250<br>100.0 |

Effects of Gender

For further understanding of the relationship between normlessness and country of birth the test factor, gender, was introduced.

Table 25: NORMLESSNESS BY GENDER AND COUNTRY BORN

|       | MALE         |           |           |      |       | FEMALE       |           |           |      |       |
|-------|--------------|-----------|-----------|------|-------|--------------|-----------|-----------|------|-------|
|       | NORMLESSNESS |           |           |      |       | NORMLESSNESS |           |           |      |       |
|       | LO           | MOD<br>LO | MOD<br>HI | HI   | TOTAL | LO           | MOD<br>LO | MOD<br>HI | HI   | TOTAL |
| CAN&  | 4            | 29        | 19        | 25   | 77    | 11           | 47        | 52        | 35   | 145   |
| U.S.  | 5.2          | 37.7      | 24.7      | 32.4 | 100   | 7.6          | 32.4      | 35.9      | 24.1 | 100   |
| OTHER | 0            | 3         | 3         | 3    | 9     | 1            | 0         | 9         | 9    | 19    |
|       | 0.0          | 33.3      | 33.3      | 33.3 | 100   | 5.2          | 0.0       | 47.4      | 47.4 | 100   |

Kendall's Tau-c for the female students was .13036 ( $p=.0010$ ), and for the male respondents was .03245 ( $p=.3275$ ). The relationship remained for those who were female and disappeared for those who were male. With the introduction of gender, the statistics indicated that country of origin had an influence on normlessness for females, and no influence for male students.

Normlessness and Confidence in Large Classes

Confidence in large classes was computed with normlessness to determine if there was a relationship. Kendall's Tau-c for this relationship was .12762 ( $p=.0007$ ). Thus, there was a strong significant relationship between confidence in large classes and a sense of normlessness. The  $t$  value was -3.69 ( $p < .001$ ).

The mean for normless scores for the confident group was 2.7621 and for the nonconfident group 3.2326. Therefore, the confident group felt significantly less normless than the nonconfident group.

Table 26:                      NORMLESSNESS

| <u>CONFIDENCE IN<br/>LARGE CLASSES</u> | LOW       | MOD. LOW   | MOD. HI    | HI         | Row<br>Total |
|--|-----------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| YES                                    | 16<br>7.8 | 72<br>35.0 | 63<br>30.6 | 55<br>26.7 | 206<br>82.1% |
| NO                                     | 0<br>0.0  | 7<br>16.3  | 19<br>42.2 | 17<br>39.5 | 43<br>17.1%  |
| Column<br>Total                        | 16<br>6.4 | 79<br>31.5 | 83<br>33.1 | 73<br>29.1 | 249<br>100.0 |

Effects of Gender and Country of Birth

In order to discern the relationship between normlessness and confidence in large classes the test factor, gender, was introduced. Kendall's Tau-c was .12655 ( $p=.0340$ ) for male students, and .12760 ( $p=.0046$ ) for the female students. Thus, the relationship remained for both sexes. Confidence in large classes had an influence on normlessness for both sexes. Gender was not a discriminating variable.

Similarly, the test factor, country of birth, was introduced in order to further understand the

relationship between normlessness and confidence in large classes. The subsequent table illustrates these frequencies.

Table 27: NORMLESSNESS BY COUNTRY BORN AND CONFIDENCE IN LARGE CLASSES

|     | CAN & U.S.A. |        |        |      |       | ELSEWHERE    |        |        |      |       |
|-----|--------------|--------|--------|------|-------|--------------|--------|--------|------|-------|
|     | NORMLESSNESS |        |        |      |       | NORMLESSNESS |        |        |      |       |
|     | LO           | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL | LO           | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL |
| YES | 15           | 69     | 56     | 46   | 186   | 1            | 3      | 7      | 9    | 20    |
|     | 8.1          | 37.1   | 30.1   | 24.7 | 100   | 5.0          | 15.0   | 35.0   | 45.0 | 100   |
| NO  | 0            | 7      | 14     | 13   | 34    | 0            | 0      | 5      | 3    | 8     |
|     | 0.0          | 20.6   | 41.2   | 38.2 | 100   | 0.0          | 0.0    | 62.5   | 37.5 | 100   |

Kendall's Tau-c was .11785 ( $p=.0020$ ) for students born in North America, and .04082 ( $p=.4123$ ) for those born elsewhere. Thus, the relationship remained for those students born in Canada and the U.S.A., and faded for students born elsewhere. Confidence in large classes had an influence on normlessness for North American born students, while it had no influence for students born elsewhere.

#### Normlessness and Living Arrangements

Living arrangements and normlessness were tabulated

to determine if they were independent. Chi-square for this relationship was 34.68339 ( $p=.0005$ ). Thus, normlessness and living arrangements were not independent.

Table 28: NORMLESSNESS

| <u>LIVING ARRANGEMENTS</u> | LOW       | MOD.LOW    | MOD.HI     | HI         | Row Total    |
|----------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| WITH FAMILY                | 9<br>6.4  | 46<br>32.6 | 47<br>33.6 | 38<br>27.1 | 140<br>55.8% |
| IN RESIDENCY               | 3<br>5.5  | 17<br>30.9 | 18<br>32.7 | 17<br>30.9 | 55<br>21.9%  |
| OWN PLACE                  | 0<br>0.0  | 5<br>31.3  | 6<br>37.5  | 5<br>31.3  | 16<br>6.4%   |
| SHARING PLACE              | 1<br>2.8  | 11<br>30.6 | 12<br>33.3 | 12<br>33.3 | 36<br>14.3%  |
| OTHER                      | 3<br>75.0 | 0<br>0.0   | 0<br>0.0   | 1<br>25.0  | 4<br>1.6%    |
| Column Total               | 16<br>6.4 | 79<br>31.5 | 83<br>33.1 | 73<br>29.1 | 251<br>100.0 |

Joint Effects of Gender and Country Born

In my quest to ascertain the relationship between normlessness and living arrangements the test factor, sex, was introduced. Kendall's Tau-c was .06202 ( $p=.2159$ ) for male respondents, and .00686 ( $p=.4549$ ) for female students. The relationship vanished for students

of both sexes. Living arrangements had no influence on normlessness for either sex.

To further clarify the relationship between normlessness and living arrangements the control factor, county of birth, was introduced as follows.

Table 29: NORMLESSNESS BY COUNTRY BORN AND LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

|          | CAN & U.S.A. |        |        |      |       | ELSEWHERE    |        |        |      |       |
|----------|--------------|--------|--------|------|-------|--------------|--------|--------|------|-------|
|          | NORMLESSNESS |        |        |      |       | NORMLESSNESS |        |        |      |       |
|          | LO           | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL | LO           | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL |
| FAMILY   | 8            | 43     | 38     | 32   | 121   | 1            | 3      | 9      | 5    | 18    |
|          | 6.6          | 35.5   | 31.4   | 26.4 | 100   | 5.6          | 16.7   | 50.0   | 27.8 | 100   |
| RESIDENC | 3            | 17     | 17     | 15   | 52    | 0            | 0      | 1      | 2    | 3     |
|          | 5.8          | 32.7   | 32.7   | 28.8 | 100   | 0.0          | 0.0    | 33.3   | 66.7 | 100   |
| OWNPL    | 0            | 5      | 5      | 4    | 14    | 0            | 0      | 1      | 1    | 2     |
|          | 0.0          | 35.7   | 35.7   | 28.6 | 100   | 0.0          | 0.0    | 50.0   | 50.0 | 100   |
| SHARE    | 1            | 11     | 11     | 8    | 31    | 0            | 0      | 1      | 4    | 5     |
|          | 3.2          | 35.5   | 35.5   | 25.8 | 100   | 0.0          | 0.0    | 20.0   | 80.0 | 100   |
| OTHER    | 3            | 0      | 0      | 1    | 4     | 0            | 0      | 0      | 0    | 0     |
|          | 75.0         | 0.0    | 0.0    | 25.0 | 100   | 0.0          | 0.0    | 0.0    | 0.0  | 0.0   |

Kendall's Tau-c was .31293 ( $p=.0097$ ) for those students who were born elsewhere and .00335 ( $p=.4741$ ) for those born in North America. Living arrangements had



an influence on normlessness for those born elsewhere, but exercised no influence on the relationship for those born in Canada and the U.S.A.

Normlessness and Friend Here With You at University

The relationship between normlessness and whether a respondents best friend was at university with them was tabulated to find out if there was an association. Somer's  $d$  indicated a negative direction and Kendall's Tau- $c$  was  $-.06993$  ( $p=.0479$ ). Thus, there was a significant, although weak, relationship between a sense of normlessness and respondents who do not have their friends here, as shown in the following table.

Table 20: NORMLESSNESS

| <u>FRIEND HERE</u> | LOW       | MOD. LOW   | MOD. HI    | HI         | Row Total    |
|--------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| YES                | 4<br>4.8  | 17<br>24.6 | 25<br>36.2 | 23<br>33.3 | 69<br>28.0%  |
| NO                 | 12<br>6.7 | 61<br>34.1 | 57<br>31.8 | 49<br>27.4 | 179<br>72.0% |
| Column Total       | 16<br>6.4 | 78<br>31.6 | 82<br>32.8 | 72<br>29.2 | 248<br>100.0 |

### Elaboration By Gender and Country of Birth

In my attempt to understand the relationship between normlessness and whether the students' best friend was here at university with them, the control variable, gender, was introduced. Kendall's Tau-c for males was  $-.02718$  ( $p=.3636$ ), and for female students  $.07989$  ( $p=.0887$ ). The relationship disappeared for both sexes. Having a best friend at university exercised no influence on normlessness, for the entire sample.

Country of birth was introduced as a test factor to the relationship between normlessness and best friend here at university. Kendall's Tau-c was  $-.06008$  ( $p=.1119$ ) for those students who were born in Canada and the U.S.A., and  $.05102$  ( $p=.4002$ ) for those born elsewhere. Having a best friend at university had no influence on normlessness for this sample of students. Thus, gender and country of origin were not discriminating variables.

### Normlessness and Satisfying Social Life

A sense of normlessness was contrasted with satisfaction with social life to determine if there was a correlation. Kendall's Tau-c was  $.16722$  ( $p=.0039$ ). The statistic indicated that there was a significant correlation between the two variables. The  $t$  value was

-2.58 ( $p=.001$ ) and the mean for the satisfied group was 2.7542 and for the dissatisfied group 3.0857. Therefore, the dissatisfied group felt significantly more normless than the satisfied group, as can be seen in the following table.

TABLE 31: NORMLESSNESS

| <u>SATISFYING<br/>SOCIAL LIFE</u> | LOW       | MOD. LOW   | MOD. HI    | HI         | Row<br>Total |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| YES                               | 12<br>6.7 | 65<br>36.3 | 57<br>31.8 | 45<br>25.1 | 179<br>71.9% |
| NO                                | 4<br>5.7  | 14<br>20.0 | 24<br>34.3 | 28<br>40.0 | 70<br>28.1%  |
| Column<br>Total                   | 16<br>6.4 | 79<br>31.7 | 81<br>32.5 | 73<br>29.3 | 249<br>100.0 |

The Effects of Gender and Country of Birth

In my attempt to understand the relationship between normlessness and satisfaction with their social life the test factor, gender, was introduced. Kendall's Tau-c for female students was .12397 ( $p=.0182$ ) and .12980 ( $p=.0476$ ) for the male respondents; the relationship remained for both sexes.

Similarly, in order to further understand this relationship, the test factor, country of birth, was

introduced. Kendall's Tau-c was .09995 ( $p=.0220$ ) for those students born in Canada and the U.S.A., while it was .454408 ( $p=.0113$ ) for those born elsewhere. Thus, the relationship remained for both groups of students. Satisfaction with their social life influences normlessness for this population .

#### Normlessness and Preferred Type of Exam

The type of exams that students preferred was tabulated with normlessness to find out if there was any association. Chi-square was 3.31608 ( $p=.0768$ ). Thus, the association between normlessness and the type of exams preferred was approaching significance. The  $t$  value was -1.45 ( $p=.064$ ); the mean for those students who preferred objective exams was 2.9097 and for those students who selected subjective exams 2.7262. Therefore, those students who selected objective exams felt somewhat more normless than those who prefer subjective testing procedures. The following table illustrates these findings.

Table 32:

NORMLESSNESS

| <u>EXAMS</u><br><u>PREFER</u> | LOW       | MOD. LOW   | MOD. HI    | HI         | Row<br>Total |
|-------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| SUBJECTIVE                    | 7<br>8.3  | 30<br>35.7 | 26<br>31.0 | 21<br>25.0 | 84<br>33.5%  |
| OBJECTIVE                     | 8<br>5.6  | 41<br>28.5 | 51<br>35.4 | 44<br>30.6 | 144<br>57.4% |
| UNDECIDED                     | 1<br>4.3  | 8<br>34.8  | 6<br>26.1  | 8<br>34.8  | 23<br>9.2%   |
| Column<br>Total               | 16<br>6.4 | 79<br>31.5 | 83<br>33.1 | 73<br>29.1 | 251<br>100.0 |

Summary

According to the definition, normlessness is an individuals expectancy that socially unapproved behaviours are necessary to achieve goals. The statistics indicated that those students who felt less confident in the large classes felt a heightened sense of normlessness regardless of gender. Similarly, female students experienced a stronger sense of normlessness, that was less directed, and more pervasive. For those students born elsewhere the association between normlessness and living arrangements remained; these students felt that socially unapproved behaviours were necessary to deal with their living arrangements,

perhaps they would have to break away from family, or roommates. When the test factors were introduced to the weak relationship between normlessness and friend here at university the relationship disappeared. Furthermore, the relationship between normlessness and satisfaction with their social life remained for the entire population sampled. These findings seem to indicate that students from this sample felt a sense of normlessness. Why female students have a more encompassing sense of normlessness is open to conjecture.

#### 6.4 SOCIAL ISOLATION

The socially isolated are those who "assign low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society" (Seeman, 1959, p.788).

##### Social Isolation and Gender

In order to determine if there was a correlation between social isolation and gender these variables were tabulated. Kendall's Tau-c was .13156 ( $p=.0232$ ). Thus, there was a significant relationship between social isolation and whether you are male or female. The  $t$

value was  $-1.99$  ( $p=.049$ ); the mean for males was 2.4713 and for females 2.7485. Therefore, females felt significantly more socially isolated than males, as shown below. Again, one must wonder why.

Table 33:                      SOCIAL ISOLATION

| <u>GENDER</u>       | <u>LOW</u> | <u>MOD.LOW</u> | <u>MOD.HI</u> | <u>HI</u>  | <u>Row Total</u> |
|---------------------|------------|----------------|---------------|------------|------------------|
| <u>MALE</u>         | 21<br>24.1 | 26<br>29.9     | 18<br>20.7    | 22<br>25.3 | 87<br>34.3%      |
| <u>FEMALE</u>       | 11<br>6.6  | 63<br>37.7     | 50<br>29.9    | 43<br>25.7 | 167<br>65.7%     |
| <u>Column Total</u> | 32<br>12.6 | 89<br>35.0     | 68<br>26.8    | 65<br>25.6 | 254<br>100.0     |

Effects of Country of Birth

In order to more fully understand the relationship between social isolation and whether a respondent was male or female the test factor, birth country, was introduced, as shown below.

Table 34: SOCIAL ISOLATION BY COUNTRY BORN AND GENDER

|        | CAN & U.S.A.     |        |        |      |       | ELSWHERE         |        |        |      |       |
|--------|------------------|--------|--------|------|-------|------------------|--------|--------|------|-------|
|        | SOCIAL ISOLATION |        |        |      |       | SOCIAL ISOLATION |        |        |      |       |
|        | LO               | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL | LO               | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL |
| MALE   | 20               | 22     | 15     | 20   | 77    | 1                | 4      | 3      | 2    | 10    |
|        | 26.0             | 28.6   | 19.5   | 26.0 | 100   | 10.0             | 40.0   | 30.0   | 20.0 | 100   |
| FEMALE | 10               | 58     | 44     | 36   | 148   | 1                | 4      | 6      | 7    | 18    |
|        | 6.8              | 39.2   | 29.7   | 24.3 | 100   | 5.6              | 22.2   | 33.3   | 38.9 | 100   |

Kendall's Tau-c was .25000 ( $p=.1092$ ) for those students born elsewhere and .12484 ( $p=.0377$ ) for those born in Canada or the U.S.A. Gender had an influence on social isolation for those students born in North America, yet had no influence on social isolation for those students born elsewhere.

Social Isolation and Satisfied with Living Arrangements

Those respondents who were satisfied or dissatisfied with their living arrangements were contrasted by level of social isolation to determine if there was a relationship. Kendall's Tau-c was .12158 ( $p=.0134$ ). Thus, there was a significant relationship between those who were socially isolated and their



satisfaction with their living arrangements. The  $t$  value was  $-.06$  ( $p=.951$ ). The mean for those who were satisfied was  $2.4203$ , and for the unsatisfied group was  $2.4314$ . Therefore, those who were satisfied with their living arrangements and those who were dissatisfied are essentially alike in mean social isolation score, but the distribution indicates a difference.

Table 35: SOCIAL ISOLATION

| <u>SATISFYING<br/>RESIDENCY</u> | LOW        | MOD. LOW   | MOD. HI    | HI         | Row<br>Total |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| YES                             | 28<br>13.7 | 75<br>36.6 | 56<br>27.3 | 46<br>22.4 | 205<br>80.7% |
| NO                              | 4<br>8.2   | 14<br>28.6 | 12<br>24.5 | 19<br>38.8 | 49<br>19.3%  |
| Column<br>Total                 | 32<br>12.6 | 89<br>35.0 | 68<br>26.8 | 65<br>25.6 | 254<br>100.0 |

Gender and Country of Birth Differences

In my endeavor to discern the relationship between social isolation and satisfaction with living arrangements the test factor, gender, was introduced.

Table 36: SOCIAL ISOLATION BY GENDER AND SATISFIED WITH LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

|     | MALE             |        |        |      |       | FEMALE           |        |        |      |       |
|-----|------------------|--------|--------|------|-------|------------------|--------|--------|------|-------|
|     | SOCIAL ISOLATION |        |        |      |       | SOCIAL ISOLATION |        |        |      |       |
|     | LO               | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL | LO               | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL |
| YES | 19               | 23     | 16     | 15   | 73    | 9                | 52     | 40     | 31   | 132   |
|     | 26.2             | 31.4   | 21.9   | 20.5 | 100   | 6.8              | 39.4   | 30.4   | 23.4 | 100   |
| NO  | 2                | 3      | 2      | 7    | 14    | 2                | 11     | 10     | 12   | 35    |
|     | 14.3             | 21.4   | 14.3   | 50.0 | 100   | 5.7              | 31.4   | 28.6   | 34.3 | 100   |

Kendall's Tau-c for male students was .16700 ( $p=.0295$ ) and was .08376 ( $p=.1134$ ) for the females. Thus, the relationship remained for males and disappeared for female students. Therefore, satisfaction with living arrangements influenced social isolation for males and exercised no influence for female students.

The test factor, country of birth, was introduced to the relationship between social isolation and satisfaction with living arrangements, as shown below.

Table 37: SOCIAL ISOLATION BY BIRTH COUNTRY AND SATISFIED WITH LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

|     | CAN & U.S.A.     |        |        |      |       | ELSEWHERE        |        |        |      |       |
|-----|------------------|--------|--------|------|-------|------------------|--------|--------|------|-------|
|     | SOCIAL ISOLATION |        |        |      |       | SOCIAL ISOLATION |        |        |      |       |
|     | LO               | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL | LO               | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL |
| YES | 26               | 70     | 48     | 39   | 183   | 2                | 5      | 8      | 7    | 22    |
|     | 14.2             | 38.3   | 26.2   | 21.3 | 100   | 9.1              | 22.7   | 36.4   | 31.8 | 100   |
| NO  | 4                | 10     | 11     | 17   | 42    | 0                | 3      | 1      | 2    | 6     |
|     | 9.5              | 23.8   | 26.2   | 40.5 | 100   | 0.0              | 50.0   | 16.7   | 33.3 | 100   |

Kendall's Tau-c was .14515 ( $p=.0059$ ) for those students born in North America, and  $-.04592$  ( $p=.3959$ ) for those born elsewhere. Thus, the relationship gained strength for those students born in Canada and the U.S.A., and disappeared for those born elsewhere. Satisfaction with living arrangements, then, influenced social isolation for those born in North American and exercised no influence for those born elsewhere.

#### Social Isolation and Satisfied Social Life

The variables, satisfactory social life and social isolation were tabulated to determine if there was a relationship. Kendall's Tau-c was .29390 ( $p<.001$ ). Thus, there was a significant relationship between these two

variables. The  $t$  value was  $-4.90$  ( $p < .001$ ); the mean for those satisfied with their social life was  $2.4629$ , and for those dissatisfied  $3.0909$ . Hence, those who are dissatisfied with their social life felt significantly more socially isolated than those that find their social life gratifying, as can be seen in the following table.

Table 38:                      SOCIAL ISOLATION

|                               | LOW        | MOD. LOW   | MOD. HI    | HI         | Row Total    |
|-------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| <u>SATISFYING SOCIAL LIFE</u> |            |            |            |            |              |
| YES                           | 29<br>16.6 | 68<br>38.9 | 46<br>26.3 | 32<br>18.3 | 175<br>69.4% |
| NO                            | 7<br>3.9   | 20<br>26.0 | 21<br>27.3 | 33<br>42.9 | 77<br>30.6%  |
| Column Total                  | 32<br>12.7 | 88<br>34.9 | 67<br>26.6 | 65<br>25.8 | 252<br>100.0 |

Effects of Gender and Country of Birth

To further understand the relationship between satisfaction with social life and social isolation the test factor, gender, was introduced. Kendall's Tau-c was  $.23980$  ( $p = .0015$ ) for male students and  $.15355$  ( $p = .0071$ ) for the female respondents. Satisfaction with their social life had an influence on social isolation for both male and female students.

Similarly, the test factor, country of birth, was

introduced to this relationship. Kendall's Tau-c was .17997 ( $p=.0002$ ) for those born in Canada and the U.S.A., and .61735 ( $p=.0016$ ) for those born elsewhere. Satisfaction with their social life had an influence on social isolation for the entire sample.

Social Isolation and Full-Time Attendance

Full-time and part-time students were crosstabulated with social isolation to determine if there was a relationship. Kendall's Tau-c was  $-.07859$  ( $p=.0263$ ). Hence, there was a significant relationship between these variables. The  $t$  value was 2.18 ( $p=.033$ ); while the mean for those students who attend part time was 2.3696 and for those in full time attendance was 2.7101. These results indicated that full time students felt significantly more social isolation than do students attending part time.

Table 39:                      SOCIAL ISOLATION

| ATTEND       | LOW        | MOD.LOW    | MOD.HI     | HI         | Row Total    |
|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| FULL TIME    | 25<br>12.1 | 66<br>31.9 | 60<br>29.0 | 56<br>27.1 | 207<br>81.8% |
| PART TIME    | 7<br>15.2  | 23<br>50.0 | 8<br>17.4  | 12<br>26.0 | 46<br>18.2%  |
| Column Total | 32<br>12.6 | 89<br>35.0 | 68<br>26.8 | 65<br>25.6 | 253<br>100.0 |

Effects of Gender and Country of Birth

Social isolation, registration status and the test factor, gender, were contrasted. Kendall's Tau-c was .07132 ( $p=.0703$ ) for female students, and -.10041 ( $p=.1515$ ) for male respondents. Thus, the original relationship disappeared.

Then the test factor, birth country was introduced.

Table 40: SOCIAL ISOLATION BY COUNTRY BORN AND ATTENDANCE

|           | CAN & U.S.A.     |        |        |      |       | ELSEWHERE        |        |        |      |       |
|-----------|------------------|--------|--------|------|-------|------------------|--------|--------|------|-------|
|           | SOCIAL ISOLATION |        |        |      |       | SOCIAL ISOLATION |        |        |      |       |
|           | LO               | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL | LO               | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL |
| FULL TIME | 24               | 59     | 53     | 48   | 184   | 1                | 6      | 7      | 8    | 22    |
|           | 13.0             | 32.1   | 28.8   | 26.1 | 100   | 4.5              | 27.3   | 31.8   | 36.4 | 100   |
| PART TIME | 6                | 21     | 6      | 7    | 40    | 1                | 2      | 2      | 1    | 6     |
|           | 15.0             | 52.5   | 15.0   | 17.5 | 100   | 16.7             | 33.3   | 33.3   | 16.7 | 100   |

Kendall's Tau-c was -.18878 ( $p=.1389$ ) for respondents born elsewhere and -.07384 ( $p=.0424$ ) for those born in North America. Thus, the relationship remained for those born in Canada and the U.S.A., and vanished for those born elsewhere. Registration category influenced social isolation for those born in North America, while it had no influence for those born elsewhere.

Social Isolation and Confidence in Reaching Goals

Social isolation was tabulated with confidence in reaching academic goals to determine if there was a relationship. Kendall's Tau-c was .08849 ( $p=.0162$ ). Thus, there was a significant relationship between these two variables. The  $t$  value was -1.97 ( $p=.053$ ); while the mean for the confident students was 2.5980 and 2.9149 for the nonconfident group. Therefore, the confident group felt less socially isolated and the association was approaching significance. The following table shows these findings.

Table 41:

SOCIAL ISOLATION

| <u>CONFIDENCE<br/>IN GOALS</u> | LOW        | MOD. LOW   | MOD. HI    | HI         | Row<br>Total |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| YES                            | 28<br>13.7 | 75<br>36.7 | 54<br>26.5 | 48<br>23.5 | 205<br>81.0% |
| NO                             | 4<br>8.5   | 14<br>28.1 | 13<br>27.7 | 17<br>36.2 | 48<br>19.0%  |
| Column<br>Total                | 32<br>12.6 | 89<br>35.2 | 67<br>26.5 | 65<br>25.7 | 253<br>100.0 |

Effects of Gender and Country of Birth

To further understand the relationship between social isolation and confidence in reaching academic goals the test factor, gender, was introduced. Kendall's

Tau-c was .08842 ( $p=.0582$ ) for the female respondents and was .00581 ( $p=.4620$ ) for male students. Thus, this relationship disappeared when controlled for gender. Confidence in academic goals had no influence on social isolation for either males or females.

When the test factor, country of birth, was introduced to this relationship Kendall's Tau-c was .09584 ( $p=.0527$ ) for those students born in North America and .08801 ( $p=.2357$ ) for those born elsewhere. Confidence in academic goals had no influence on the social isolation for either group.

#### Social Isolation and Confidence in Large Classes

Social isolation and a sense of confidence in the large classes was contrasted to determine if there was a relationship. Kendall's Tau-c was .06384 ( $p=.0531$ ) and Somer's  $d$  indicated a positive direction. This correlation was approaching significance. The  $t$  value was -2.15 ( $p=.035$ ); the means for the confident group was 2.6048 and for the nonconfident group 2.9302. Thus, the group that felt less confident were more socially isolated than those students who felt confident in a large class. The means test was probably not relevant here. The following table illustrates these findings.



Table 42:

SOCIAL ISOLATION

| <u>CONFIDENCE</u><br><u>LARGE CLASS</u> | LOW        | MOD. LOW   | MOD. HI    | HI         | Row<br>Total |
|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| YES                                     | 30<br>14.3 | 74<br>35.2 | 55<br>26.2 | 51<br>24.3 | 210<br>82.7% |
| NO                                      | 2<br>2.3   | 15<br>34.9 | 13<br>30.2 | 14<br>30.6 | 44<br>17.3%  |
| Column<br>Total                         | 32<br>12.6 | 89<br>35.0 | 68<br>26.8 | 65<br>25.6 | 254<br>100.0 |

Effects of Gender and Country of Birth

In my attempt to understand the relationship between social isolation and a sense of confidence in large classes the test factor, gender, was introduced. Kendall's Tau-c was .09868 ( $p=.0604$ ) for the females and .05549 ( $p=.2141$ ) for the male respondents. The relationship diminished; Confidence in large classes had no influence on social isolation for either males or females.

The test factor, country of birth, was also introduced. Kendall's Tau-c was .04841 ( $p=.1144$ ) for North American born respondents and .22959 ( $p=.1153$ ) for those born elsewhere. Thus, the relationship diminished for those born in both locations. Confidence in large classes had no influence on social isolation for both groups.

### Summary

Seeman had defined those who are socially isolated as individuals who assign low reward value to goals and values that are typically highly valued by society. The statistics indicated that female students born in North American felt a heightened sense of social isolation. Likewise, males born in North America felt a sense of social isolation via their satisfaction with living arrangements. Students born in North America who attend full-time experienced a sense of social isolation to a greater degree than those in part-time attendance. Two associations disappeared when the test factors were introduced: social isolation and confidence in academic goals, along with social isolation and confidence in large classes. But, the relationship between social isolation and satisfaction with their social life remained for the entire population. The data suggests that students from this sample experienced a sense of social isolation, but it was weak in comparison with the other dimensions.

## CHAPTER VII

### ALIENATION

#### 7.1 INTRODUCTION

The composite measure of the three dimensions, is necessarily an aggregation of the dimensions and suffers, therefore, from a loss of information. This concept was defined by Seeman (1959) as situations where "values, behavior, and expectations" are out of harmony with themselves and with society.

Alienation was recoded to similar ranges. The low range was assigned to scores from 2.21 through 3.91, the moderately low range was allocated to scores from 3.91 through 4.44, the median. Moderately high was assigned to scores from 4.44 through 4.92, while the high range was designated to scores from 4.92 through 7.78.

This chapter will present only those findings found to be significant. It progresses from a testing of the intercorrelation of the dimensions, to the

testing of association between two variables, through to an explanation of the relevant associations in order to determine the nature of the relationships.

## 7.2 Scale Intercorrelation

A review of the literature indicated discrepancies in the Dean scale. Researchers were questioning what this really was measuring, while others were dubious about the variant social isolation. The following analysis is a result of the controversy.

Powerlessness and normlessness were correlated to determine if there was an association. Pearson's  $r$  was .5658 ( $p < .001$ ). Thus, there was a significant correlation between powerlessness and normlessness.

Powerlessness was then tabulated with social isolation. Pearson's  $r$  was .2303 ( $p < .001$ ). Therefore, there was a significant correlation between powerlessness and social isolation.

Similarly, powerlessness and alienation were tabulated. Pearson's  $r$  was .7671 ( $p < .001$ ). Thus, powerlessness and alienation were significantly correlated.

Normlessness and social isolation were also computed to determine if there was a correlation. Pearson's  $r$  was .1875 ( $p = .002$ ). Thus, a significant correlation exists between normlessness and social

isolation.

Normlessness was then tabulated with alienation to determine if there was a correlation. Pearson  $r$  was .7617 ( $p < .001$ ). Therefore, normlessness and alienation were significantly correlated.

Furthermore, social isolation was tabulated with alienation. Pearson's  $r$  was .5505 ( $p < .001$ ). Thus, social isolation and alienation are significantly associated. The following table exhibits these relationships.

Table 43:

MEASURES

|        | POWERL                 | NORML                  | SOCIS                  | ALIEN                  |
|--------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| POWERL | $r=1.0000$<br>$p=.000$ |                        |                        |                        |
| NORML  | $r=.5658$<br>$p=.000$  | $r=1.0000$<br>$p=.000$ |                        |                        |
| SOCIS  | $r=.2303$<br>$p=.000$  | $r=.1875$<br>$p=.002$  | $r=1.0000$<br>$p=.000$ |                        |
| ALIEN  | $r=.7671$<br>$p=.000$  | $r=.7617$<br>$p=.000$  | $r=.5505$<br>$p=.000$  | $r=1.0000$<br>$p=.000$ |

These variants are strongly correlated, yet the dimension of social isolation is the weakest. Although

the computations do not reflect any discrepancies, the questionnaire design did not allow this anomaly to become apparent.

Alienation and Gender

The index of alienation was tabulated with gender to determine if there was an association between the two variables. Kendall's Tau-c was .12668 ( $p=.0352$ ). Thus, there was a significant relationship between alienation and gender. The  $t$  value was -1.75 ( $p=.083$ ); the means for male students was 2.3214 and for the female group 2.5960. Therefore, females were more alienated than males: the association was approaching significance. The following table shows this relationship.

Table 44:                      ALIENATION

| <u>GENDER</u> | LOW        | MOD.LOW    | MOD.HI     | HI         | Row Total    |
|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| MALE          | 30<br>35.7 | 17<br>20.2 | 17<br>20.2 | 20<br>23.8 | 84<br>35.7%  |
| FEMALE        | 29<br>19.2 | 44<br>29.1 | 37<br>24.5 | 41<br>27.2 | 151<br>64.3% |
| Column Total  | 59<br>25.1 | 61<br>26.0 | 54<br>23.0 | 65<br>26.0 | 235<br>100.0 |

Alienation and Country of Birth

Alienation was tabulated with country of birth to ascertain if there was a relationship. Kendall's Tau-c was .10804 ( $p=.0105$ ) and Somer's  $d$  indicated a positive direction. The  $t$  value was -2.45 ( $p=.020$ ); the mean for Canadian and American born students was 2.4300 and for those born elsewhere, 2.9630. Hence, the students born in Canada and the U.S.A. were significantly less alienated than those students who were born elsewhere.

Table 45:                      ALIENATION

| <u>COUNTRY BORN</u> | LOW        | MOD.LOW    | MOD.HI     | HI         | Row Total    |
|---------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| CANADA & U.S.A.     | 56<br>27.1 | 55<br>26.6 | 47<br>22.7 | 49<br>23.7 | 207<br>88.5% |
| OTHER               | 3<br>11.1  | 6<br>22.2  | 7<br>25.9  | 11<br>40.7 | 27<br>11.5%  |
| Column Total        | 59<br>25.2 | 61<br>26.1 | 54<br>23.1 | 60<br>25.6 | 234<br>100.0 |

Joint Effects of Gender and Country of Birth

The test factor, gender, was introduced and the following table illustrates these findings.

Table 46: ALIENATION BY COUNTRY BORN AND GENDER

|        | CAN & U.S.A. |           |           |      |       | ELSEWHERE  |           |           |      |       |
|--------|--------------|-----------|-----------|------|-------|------------|-----------|-----------|------|-------|
|        | ALIENATION   |           |           |      |       | ALIENATION |           |           |      |       |
|        | LO           | MOD<br>LO | MOD<br>HI | HI   | TOTAL | LO         | MOD<br>LO | MOD<br>HI | HI   | TOTAL |
| MALE   | 27           | 15        | 15        | 18   | 75    | 3          | 2         | 2         | 2    | 9     |
|        | 36.0         | 20.0      | 20.0      | 24.0 | 100   | 33.3       | 22.2      | 22.2      | 22.2 | 100   |
| FEMALE | 29           | 40        | 32        | 31   | 132   | 0          | 4         | 5         | 9    | 18    |
|        | 22.0         | 30.3      | 24.2      | 23.5 | 100   | 0.0        | 22.2      | 27.8      | 50.0 | 100   |

Kendall's Tau-c was .40604 ( $p=.0227$ ) for those born elsewhere and .08430 ( $p=.1300$ ) for those students born in Canada or the U.S.A. Thus, the relationship gained strength for students born elsewhere and vanished for those born in North America. Gender had an influence on alienation for foreign born students, while it exercised no influence for those students born in either Canada or the United States. Foreign born females had the highest levels of alienation.

Alienation and Confidence in Academic Goals

Alienation was tabulated with a students' sense of



confidence in the academic goals they hold for themselves in order to determine if there was an association between the variables. Kendall's Tau-c was .07292 ( $p=.0462$ ). Hence, there was a significant relationship between academic confidence and alienation. The following table displays these findings.

Table 47: ALIENATION

| <u>CONFIDENCE<br/>IN GOALS</u> | LOW        | MOD. LOW   | MOD. HI    | HI         | Row<br>Total |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| YES                            | 52<br>27.5 | 47<br>24.9 | 44<br>23.3 | 46<br>24.3 | 189<br>81.3% |
| NO                             | 7<br>14.4  | 14<br>32.6 | 9<br>19.0  | 15<br>34.9 | 45<br>18.7%  |
| Column<br>Total                | 59<br>25.2 | 61<br>26.1 | 53<br>22.6 | 61<br>26.1 | 234<br>100.0 |

Effects of Gender and Country of Birth

In my effort to understand the relationship between alienation and confidence in academic goals, gender was introduced as the test factor.

Table 48: ALIENATION BY GENDER AND CONFIDENCE IN ACADEMIC GOALS

|     | MALE       |        |        |      |       | FEMALE     |        |        |      |       |
|-----|------------|--------|--------|------|-------|------------|--------|--------|------|-------|
|     | ALIENATION |        |        |      |       | ALIENATION |        |        |      |       |
|     | LO         | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL | LO         | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL |
| YES | 29         | 17     | 15     | 17   | 78    | 23         | 30     | 29     | 29   | 111   |
|     | 37.0       | 22.0   | 19.0   | 22.0 | 100   | 20.7       | 27.1   | 26.1   | 26.1 | 100   |
| NO  | 1          | 0      | 2      | 3    | 6     | 6          | 14     | 7      | 12   | 39    |
|     | 16.7       | 0.0    | 33.3   | 50.0 | 100   | 15.4       | 35.9   | 17.9   | 30.8 | 100   |

Kendall's Tau-c was .10884 ( $p=.0414$ ) for male respondents and .02184 ( $p=.3587$ ) for females. Thus, the relationship gained strength for the male students and vanished for female respondents. Confidence in academic success influenced alienation for male students, while there was no influence for female students. Perhaps females see academic success as less meaningful to their lives.

In order to further understand the relationship between alienation and confidence in academic goals the test factor, country born, was introduced, as shown in the table below.

Table 49: ALIENATION BY COUNTRY BORN AND CONFIDENCE IN ACADEMIC GOALS

|     | CAN & U.S.A. |        |        |      |       | ELSEWHERE  |        |        |      |       |
|-----|--------------|--------|--------|------|-------|------------|--------|--------|------|-------|
|     | ALIENATION   |        |        |      |       | ALIENATION |        |        |      |       |
|     | LO           | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL | LO         | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL |
| YES | 49           | 44     | 38     | 35   | 166   | 3          | 3      | 6      | 10   | 22    |
|     | 29.5         | 26.5   | 22.9   | 21.1 | 100   | 13.6       | 13.6   | 27.3   | 45.5 | 100   |
| NO  | 7            | 11     | 9      | 14   | 41    | 0          | 3      | 0      | 1    | 4     |
|     | 17.1         | 26.8   | 22.0   | 34.1 | 100   | 0.0        | 75.0   | 0.0    | 25.0 | 100   |

Kendall's Tau-c was .11884 ( $p=.0277$ ) for those born in Canada and the U.S.A., and  $-.11934$  ( $p=.1714$ ) for those born elsewhere. Confidence in academic goals had an influence on alienation for North American born students, while it exercised no influence for those born elsewhere.

Alienation and Expected Average

Alienation was tabulated with expected average to determine if there was a correlation. Pearson's  $r$  was .11603 ( $p=.0412$ ). Hence, there was a significant, although weak, relationship between alienation and expected average. The following table illustrates these findings.

Table 50:

ALIENATION

| <u>EXPECTED<br/>AVERAGE</u> | LOW        | MOD. LOW   | MOD. HI    | HI         | Row<br>Total |
|-----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| A+                          | 0<br>0.0   | 0<br>0.0   | 1<br>100.0 | 0<br>0.0   | 1<br>.4%     |
| A                           | 2<br>34.8  | 6<br>50.0  | 1<br>8.3   | 3<br>25.9  | 12<br>5.3%   |
| A-                          | 8<br>34.8  | 7<br>30.4  | 6<br>26.1  | 2<br>8.7   | 23<br>10.2%  |
| B+                          | 12<br>22.2 | 16<br>29.6 | 16<br>29.6 | 10<br>18.5 | 54<br>24.0%  |
| B                           | 22<br>26.5 | 23<br>27.7 | 16<br>19.3 | 22<br>26.5 | 83<br>36.9%  |
| C+                          | 8<br>22.2  | 7<br>19.4  | 7<br>19.4  | 14<br>38.9 | 36<br>16.0%  |
| C                           | 5<br>31.3  | 2<br>12.5  | 2<br>12.5  | 7<br>43.8  | 16<br>7.1%   |
| Column<br>Total             | 57<br>25.3 | 61<br>27.1 | 49<br>21.8 | 58<br>25.8 | 225<br>100.0 |

Effects of Gender and Country of Birth

While endeavoring to understand the relationship between alienation and expected grade average the test factor, gender, was introduced. The subsequent table illustrates these findings.

Table 51: ALIENATION BY GENDER AND EXPECTED AVERAGE

|                | MALE       |        |        |      |       | FEMALE     |        |        |      |       |
|----------------|------------|--------|--------|------|-------|------------|--------|--------|------|-------|
|                | ALIENATION |        |        |      |       | ALIENATION |        |        |      |       |
|                | LO         | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL | LO         | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL |
| A <sup>+</sup> | 0          | 0      | 1      | 0    | 1     | 0          | 0      | 0      | 0    | 0     |
|                | 0.0        | 0.0    | 100.0  | 0.0  | 100   | 0.0        | 0.0    | 0.0    | 0.0  | 0.0   |
| A              | 0          | 3      | 0      | 0    | 3     | 2          | 3      | 1      | 3    | 9     |
|                | 0.0        | 100.0  | 0.0    | 0.0  | 100   | 22.2       | 33.3   | 11.1   | 33.3 | 100   |
| A <sup>-</sup> | 3          | 2      | 1      | 0    | 6     | 5          | 5      | 5      | 2    | 17    |
|                | 50.0       | 33.3   | 16.7   | 0.0  | 100   | 29.4       | 29.4   | 29.4   | 11.8 | 100   |
| B <sup>+</sup> | 7          | 4      | 4      | 3    | 18    | 5          | 12     | 12     | 7    | 36    |
|                | 38.9       | 22.2   | 22.2   | 16.7 | 100   | 13.9       | 33.3   | 33.3   | 19.4 | 100   |
| B              | 12         | 4      | 3      | 9    | 28    | 10         | 19     | 13     | 13   | 55    |
|                | 42.9       | 14.3   | 10.7   | 32.1 | 100   | 18.2       | 34.5   | 23.6   | 23.6 | 100   |
| C <sup>+</sup> | 5          | 4      | 5      | 5    | 19    | 3          | 3      | 2      | 9    | 17    |
|                | 26.3       | 21.1   | 26.3   | 26.3 | 100   | 17.6       | 17.6   | 11.8   | 52.9 | 100   |
| C              | 3          | 0      | 1      | 2    | 6     | 2          | 2      | 1      | 5    | 10    |
|                | 50.0       | 0.0    | 16.7   | 33.3 | 100   | 20.0       | 20.0   | 10.0   | 50.0 | 100   |

Pearson's  $r$  was .11986 ( $p=.1433$ ) for male respondents and .13888 ( $p=.0485$ ) for the female respondents. Expected average had a weak influence on alienation for female students, but exercised no influence for male students.

Country of birth was also introduced as a test factor. Pearson's  $r$  was .10214 ( $p=.0761$ ) for North American born students and .27310 ( $p=.0885$ ) for those students born elsewhere. Thus, the relationship



Effects of Gender and Country of Birth

To fully understand the relationship between alienation and a sense of confidence in the large classes the test factor, gender, was introduced. The following table shows this relationship.

Table 53: ALIENATION BY GENDER AND CONFIDENCE IN LARGE CLASSES

|     | MALE       |        |        |      |       | FEMALE     |        |        |      |       |
|-----|------------|--------|--------|------|-------|------------|--------|--------|------|-------|
|     | ALIENATION |        |        |      |       | ALIENATION |        |        |      |       |
|     | LO         | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL | LO         | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL |
| YES | 27         | 14     | 13     | 15   | 69    | 27         | 40     | 28     | 31   | 126   |
|     | 39.2       | 20.3   | 18.8   | 21.7 | 100   | 21.4       | 31.7   | 22.2   | 24.7 | 100   |
| NO  | 2          | 3      | 4      | 5    | 14    | 2          | 4      | 9      | 10   | 25    |
|     | 14.3       | 21.4   | 28.6   | 35.7 | 100   | 8.0        | 16.0   | 36.0   | 40.0 | 100   |

Kendall's Tau-c was .09906 ( $p=.0788$ ) for males and .16631 ( $p=.0070$ ) for females. Confidence in large classes influenced alienation for female respondents, yet had no effect on alienation for the males in this sample.

The control factor country of birth was also introduced, as shown in the following table.

Table 54: ALIENATION BY COUNTRY BORN AND CONFIDENCE IN LARGE CLASSES

|     | CAN & U.S.A. |        |        |      |       | ELSEWHERE  |        |        |      |       |
|-----|--------------|--------|--------|------|-------|------------|--------|--------|------|-------|
|     | ALIENATION   |        |        |      |       | ALIENATION |        |        |      |       |
|     | LO           | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL | LO         | MOD LO | MOD HI | HI   | TOTAL |
| YES | 51           | 50     | 36     | 39   | 176   | 3          | 4      | 5      | 7    | 19    |
|     | 29.0         | 28.4   | 20.5   | 22.2 | 100   | 15.8       | 21.1   | 26.3   | 36.8 | 100   |
| NO  | 4            | 5      | 11     | 10   | 30    | 0          | 2      | 2      | 4    | 8     |
|     | 13.3         | 16.7   | 36.7   | 33.3 | 100   | 0.0        | 25.0   | 25.0   | 50.0 | 100   |

Kendall's Tau-c was .08969 ( $p=.0157$ ) for North American born respondents and .16461 ( $p=.2011$ ) for those respondents born elsewhere. Confidence in large classes, then, had an influence on alienation for those students born in Canada and the U.S.A., and exercised no influence for those born elsewhere.

#### Alienation and Satisfactory Social Life

Alienation was contrasted with satisfaction with social life in order to determine if there was an association. Kendall's Tau-c was .26525 ( $p<.001$ ). Thus, there was a significant relationship between alienation and a student's satisfaction with their social life. The  $t$  value was -4.14 ( $p<.01$ ); the mean for the satisfied group was 2.3155 and for the dissatisfied students 2.9846. Therefore, the discontented group felt



significantly more alienated than those students who were satisfied with their social life. This was one of the stronger relationships found.

Table 55: ALIENATION

| <u>SATISFYING<br/>SOCIAL LIFE</u> | LOW        | MOD. LOW   | MOD. HI    | HI         | Row<br>Total |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| YES                               | 49<br>29.2 | 49<br>29.2 | 38<br>22.6 | 32<br>19.0 | 168<br>72.1% |
| NO                                | 10<br>15.4 | 10<br>15.4 | 16<br>24.6 | 29<br>44.6 | 65<br>27.9%  |
| Column<br>Total                   | 59<br>25.3 | 59<br>25.3 | 54<br>23.2 | 61<br>26.2 | 233<br>100.0 |

Effects of Gender and Country of Birth

The control factor, gender, was introduced and Kendall's Tau-c was .23980 ( $p=.0015$ ) for male students and .15355 ( $p=.0071$ ) for female students. Therefore, for both sexes, the relationship remained. Satisfaction with their social life influenced alienation for both male and female students.

The test factor, country born, was also introduced. Kendall's Tau-c was .16005 ( $p=.0010$ ) for North American born students and .52675 ( $p=.0064$ ) for those born elsewhere. For both groups, the relationship remained. Satisfaction with their social life, thus, had an

influence on alienation for all students sampled.

### Summary

Alienation, the composite of the three dimensions, is the concept measured by Dean's scale. This concept is such that an individuals' values, expectations and behaviours are no longer congruent, rather they are at odds with each other and society. The statistics indicated that females born in a country other than Canada or the U.S.A. felt a stronger sense of alienation, than did those students born in North America. Likewise, males who were born in North America who were not confident in reaching their goals felt a stronger sense of alienation, than the confident group. Females who expected low averages also felt a heightened sense of alienation, even though this alienation was not a result of powerlessness. Thus, their values, expectations and behaviours were at odds with each other. Hence, these students expect poor grades, yet they value higher marks, and/or their study behaviour is not accordant with their expectations of a low average. This discrepancy could be an example of Festinger's (1957) cognitive dissonance theory. Some of these students could be studying tenaciously, yet find the work load heavy or difficult. Others could have

internalized the value of high marks, and because their study time is limited their expectations diminish. Thus, these expectations of poor grades could be dissonance reducing beliefs.

Similarly, females born in North America, who are apprehensive in large classes are more alienated than those students who are confident in that milieu. Furthermore, the relationship between alienation and satisfaction with their social life remained strong for the entire sample. Students who are experiencing alienation because of their social life are probably not seeing their friends very often because of jobs and school work. In modern society the various roles people have in their role-repertoire are often conflicting. Students in this sample often complained of not being able to get involved in extra-curricular activities because of work, study load, friendship and, in the case of a large portion of the part-time students, spousal demands and raising children. Many of the students' role-repertoires are extensive and role conflict seems to be the norm, making it too incompatible for students to be a part of the school newspaper, Student's Administrative Council (S.A.C.), or sports. Role overload, the inability to live up to a role's demands, would require adjustments to avoid further role strain, especially for those students (not necessarily part-

time) who work and have children. An example would be the response I received from a 19 year old female who works and goes to school full time: when asked if she felt confident she would achieve her goals at university she replied that "It is really hard to keep up, a lot of changes have to be made before I can succeed in school." In the sample a large proportion of the students work, some attending school in the mornings and working afternoons, others working nights and attending school during the day. Even though a large percentage of the part-time students work and have families, the full-time students who work are also in the majority. This situation leads to role strain, where the role of the student with all of its various sub-roles is incompatible with other roles. It seems, for this sample of students, that the modern structuralist's assumption that these conditions exist is true. When asked about extra-curricular activities, students often explained that "I don't have time" or "with nursing I have a very heavy course load and minimal time for sleep, let alone outside activities." Another full-time student claimed "classes and job take up my spare time" while one part-time student said "I work full-time, and have a husband and three girls and also belong to Girl Guides and am V.P. for the Canadian Diabetes Assoc. - no more time left!" Both role strain

and role conflict are evident in these responses, flexibility and often re-establishing priorities is necessary to avoid further role difficulties. Thus, they experience this sense of "nonfitting relations" (Festinger 1957) and the ensuing pressures to reduce this dissonance.

Further, the data determined that the following variables: age, marital status, parents' occupation, year the students were in at university, faculty chosen, who made the choice of study, high-school average, whether their friends academic achievements exceeded their own, what type of exams they preferred, and their involvement in extra-curricular activities, were not the consequence of a sense of powerlessness, normlessness, social isolation, and thus, alienation. (see Appendix B)

## CHAPTER VIII

### CONCLUSIONS

#### 8.1 Findings and Discussion

In general, both sexes in this sample experienced a sense of alienation, although differently. When computing the associations with gender, females repeatedly illustrated a more pervasive sense of all the dependent measures. On the other hand, male students experienced powerlessness and alienation because of their lack of confidence in reaching academic goals. Thus, male respondents felt that their behaviours could not determine their desired outcomes. Males who expected a low grade average experienced a sense of powerlessness, whereas females who expected to acquire a low average experienced a more general sense of alienation. These findings added credibility to the argument advanced by many researchers in the area that individuals perceive alienation

differently; alienation was highly discriminating for male respondents, and remained more unfocused for females, even though it was found within the same milieu.

More specifically, most of the students experienced a sense of normlessness when in large classes. Perhaps this environment fostered a need to ignore people, and/or talk and laugh during class. This could also explain the need to sit in the back of the class, or to cheat during exams. A smaller portion of students felt a strong sense of normlessness regarding their living arrangements. Consequently, those students who were discontented with their living arrangements felt that socially unapproved behaviours were necessary to manage the situation. Perhaps they felt a need to lie to parents, or to distance themselves emotionally in order to gain a sense of independence. Females in this sample, experienced a more extensive sensation of normlessness that was undirected. Carol Dweck's (1980) research corroborates this finding. From her work examining students and learning, she found that females tended to generalize their feelings of inadequacy, while males seemed able to remain confident in all other areas of their life -- their sense of failure, or inadequacy was more specific (p. 451).

The results indicated that feelings about living arrangements did not affect the sense of powerlessness,

even though many of the students in residence complained of being unable to control their living space, and those at home complained of not having control over their freedom. Those in residence claimed that, too often, they were subjected to loud noise and intrusions, while those living with their families felt they had no freedom, that their parents monitored their behaviour too closely; they felt helpless to control their own lives. The most significant finding with regard to powerlessness was that males felt that their behaviour would not determine their academic goals and expected grade average. When these students expected a low average, and felt unsure of reaching their goals; their sense of powerlessness escalated.

Students who were in full-time attendance experienced a stronger sense of social isolation than did students attending part-time. Males felt a sense of social isolation regarding their satisfaction with living arrangements. These students, whether in university dorms, or at home with families, placed little value on society's goals and beliefs. Females, again, experienced a more general sense of social isolation which was not associated with any specific independent measures.

Of further interest was the finding that every dependent measure correlated with satisfaction with social



life. Yet these students generally made their choice to come to university and study their interests; their parents did not make these choices for them. Thus, it seems unlikely that their primary goal was to socialize. It was found that many students worked at jobs off campus, which restricted their available time for a gratifying social life. Therefore, it seemed more logical to conclude that this population of students felt a strong sense of distance from university life, and this distance produced the alienation.

The above findings provide strong evidence for Seeman (1967, 1971, 1972) and Dean's (1961) conviction that the various dimensions of alienation are selective and situation-relevant. For example, male students in this population experienced powerlessness with regard to academic goals and expected grade average, while all students experienced a sense of normlessness when in large classes. This study also lends strong support to Dean (1961) and Anderson's (1973) contention that "the alienations" are part of the general concept of alienation. The dimensional model of alienation, when applied to specific aspects of a given milieu, corroborated this contention.

For the population in this study, gender proved to be a discriminating variable; indicating that males and

females experienced alienation differently. Female students who experienced a more general sense of alienation also experienced a more general sense of social isolation, powerlessness and normlessness, while male students only experienced powerlessness and alienation to a significant degree. Again, the work of Carol Dweck (1980) helped in the understanding of this important finding. Her research concluded that female grade-school students generalized their failures to a widespread sense of inadequacy, while male students focused their failures, and did not generalize beyond the given situation. This female tendency toward generalization could then explain the general sense of alienation, found among the female respondents, an alienation which was not directed toward any of the independent measures. While Seeman's (1963, 1964, 1966, 1967, 1972), and Bickford and Neal's (1969) research found that "the alienations" were highly discriminating, the work was administered only to male respondents; thus the female tendency toward generalization never emerged. When studies regarding alienation included female respondents the focus was on comparisons with bureaucracies, or self-esteem scales and this difference did not surface.

However, these results contradict the findings of Wenz (1953) and Ma (1985). Wenz (1953) found that gender

had no influence on alienation for his sample of 200 adolescents. Ma's (1985) research concluded that mother's occupation related strongly with the degree of social isolation and alienation the college student experienced; the degree of normlessness a student experienced related to father's occupation. For the students sampled at the University of Windsor, there was no correlation found between these measures: neither mother's or father's occupation correlated with alienation.

## 8.2 Implications for Further Research

The most significant finding in this research is the way the two genders endure alienation. For this reason, it would be worthwhile to determine why this phenomenon occurred. Why do females experience alienation as a general, non-specific incidence, while males experience an alienation which is focused and situational? Perhaps a research project which is directed toward female roles could be profitable. Male roles are, historically, more focused and specific, while female roles are dynamic, expanding, and have less directionality. The definition of role has been derived from male roles and then applied to women; yet further insight could be gained if women

defined their diverse roles, and these definitions in turn were applied to a control group of men. Do females experience alienation globally because their roles are more diverse and expansive? Do males experience alienation as a situational phenomenon because their roles are more clear-cut, and their role-repertoire smaller?

Since alienation from the university environment was another significant factor, questions regarding students jobs could have added explanatory power to this research. Perhaps determining the number of hours a week the students work and the amount of responsibility their jobs entail would have added greater insight. Further, it would have been useful to compare this alienation scale to the locus of control scale, or parenting styles, since researchers have correlated this concept with external locus of control and authoritarian families.

Other factors worthy of consideration in the future are the issues of stress and loneliness a first year student experiences. Since these data were gathered in the last week of November 1988, exams were imminent, as was the likelihood of stress. Similarly, homesickness could have accounted for the strong measure of social distance found throughout. Thus, it would seem advisable to provide measures for these factors, so that controls could be established.

Notably, in the planning stages of this project it was my intention to have approximately 500 students in the sample. Low attendance accounted for the relatively small number of respondents; conducting this research at the end of September would have been better, since many of the intended controls could not be utilized. Country of origin was used, even though the number of students born outside of North America was small, but this was done to gain a sense of the population under review.

It is hoped that this research has added to the growing body of research which defines alienation as a dimensional phenomenon. Research that treats alienation as a summary measure is overlooking valuable data.. Hopefully the present research helps to underscore this conviction.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

COVER LETTER:

The first part of this questionnaire contains statements about various attitudes and beliefs. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the statements by putting an "X" in the appropriate box. Please DO NOT write your name on the questionnaire, since ALL ANSWERS ARE ANONYMOUS.

The second part of this questionnaire requires that you fill in the appropriate blanks and also that you answer some specific questions. When asked to explain, please just tell me how you feel.

MUCH THANKS FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION WITH THIS  
RESEARCH PROJECT.



|  | * | SA | A | D | SD |
|--|---|----|---|---|----|
| 17. There are few dependable ties between people any more.                                 |   |    |   |   |    |
| 18. There is little chance of promotion on the job unless a person gets a break.           |   |    |   |   |    |
| 19. With so many religions abroad, one really does not know which to believe.              |   |    |   |   |    |
| 20. We are so regimented today that there is not much room for choice in personal matters. |   |    |   |   |    |
| 21. We are just so many cogs in the machinery of life.                                     |   |    |   |   |    |
| 22. People are just naturally friendly and helpful.  |   |    |   |   |    |
| 23. I don't get to visit my friends as often as I'd really like.                           |   |    |   |   |    |
| 24. The future looks dismal.   |   |    |   |   |    |

\*SA=strongly agree  
 A=agree  
 D=disagree  
 SD=strongly disagree



25. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_.

26. Are you male \_\_\_\_\_, or female \_\_\_\_\_.

27. In what country were you born? \_\_\_\_\_.

28. Are you

1 — single

2 — married

3 — widowed

4 — seperated

5 — divorced

6 — other, please explain

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_.

29. What is your mother's present occupation? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_.

30. What is your father's present occupation? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_.

31. What year are you in at university?

1 — first

2 — second

3 — third

4 — fourth

5 — other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_.

32. Are you attending university

1 — full time ( four or more courses)

2 — part time ( three or less courses)

3 — other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_.

33. What faculty are you majoring in? \_\_\_\_\_.

34. Is this major

1 — your choice alone

- 2 — your choice and your parents choice, jointly made
- 3 — your parents choice completely

35. While here at university, are you residing

- 1 — with your family
- 2 — in residence
- 3 — alone in your own place, off campus
- 4 — sharing a place off campus
- 5 — other, please explain\_\_\_\_\_

36. Are you satisfied with your living arrangements?

- 1 — yes
- 2 — no, please explain\_\_\_\_\_

37. What was your grade average in high-school?

- |                |               |
|----------------|---------------|
| 1 — A+(100-96) | 5 — B(80-76)  |
| 2 — A(95-91)   | 6 — C+(75-71) |
| 3 — A-(90-86)  | 7 — C(70-66)  |
| 4 — B+(85-80)  | 8 — D(65-60)  |

38. What is your expected grade average for university?

- |                |               |
|----------------|---------------|
| 1 — A+(100-96) | 5 — B(80-76)  |
| 2 — A(95-91)   | 6 — C+(75-71) |
| 3 — A-(90-86)  | 7 — C(70-66)  |
| 4 — B+(85-80)  | 8 — D(65-60)  |

39. If you achieve this expected grade average, will you be satisfied?

- 1 — yes
- 2 — no, please SKIP THE NEXT QUESTION and proceed to Question 41.

40. If you answered yes to the above question, would you still be satisfied with your expected grade average, if your friends did much better than you?

- 1 — yes
- 2 — no, please explain \_\_\_\_\_

41. Do you feel confident that you will be able to achieve your academic goals here at university?
- 1 — yes  
 2 — no, please explain\_\_\_\_\_
42. Do you feel comfortable and confident in the large classes?
- 1 — yes  
 2 — no, please explain\_\_\_\_\_
43. Do you prefer subjective (essay-type) exams, or do you prefer objective (multiple-choice, true-false) exams?
- 1 — subjective, please explain\_\_\_\_\_
- 2 — objective, please explain\_\_\_\_\_
44. Is your best friend here at university with you?
- 1 — yes  
 2 — no
45. Are you involved in, or are you planning to become involved in extra-curricular activities, such as sports, newspaper, student government, while you are here at university?
- 1 — yes  
 2 — no, please explain\_\_\_\_\_
46. Are you satisfied with your social life?
- 1 — yes  
 2 — no, please explain\_\_\_\_\_

IF YOU WOULD NOT MIND BEING INTERVIEWED, PLEASE LEAVE YOUR FIRST NAME ONLY, AND YOUR PHONE NUMBER.

FIRST NAME ONLY\_\_\_\_\_ PHONE#\_\_\_\_\_



Table 1 continued:

|          | POWERL                    | NORML                     | SOCIS                     | ALIEN                     |
|----------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| EXPAVG   | $r=.13124$<br>$p=.0201$   | $r=.09277$<br>$p=.0755$   | $r=.08477$<br>$p=.0948$   | $r=.11603$<br>$p=.0412$   |
| SATGRD   | $c=.02836$<br>$p=.3220$   | $c=.02671$<br>$p=.3284$   | $c=.03060$<br>$p=.3071$   | $c=.00287$<br>$p=.4818$   |
| SATFRHI  | $c=.04119$<br>$p=.2121$   | $c=.03795$<br>$p=.2274$   | $c=.00149$<br>$p=.4884$   | $c=-.00440$<br>$p=.4673$  |
| CONFGOAL | $c=.07958$<br>$p=.0275$   | $c=.05054$<br>$p=.1137$   | $c=.08849$<br>$p=.0162$   | $c=.07292$<br>$p=.0462$   |
| CONFLGCL | $c=.03263$<br>$p=.2010$   | $c=.12762$<br>$p=.0007$   | $c=.06384$<br>$p=.0531$   | $c=.11245$<br>$p=.0032$   |
| EXPREFER | $X^2=7.8996$<br>$p=.2456$ | $X^2=3.3161$<br>$p=.0768$ | $X^2=6.2750$<br>$p=.3931$ | $X^2=2.9748$<br>$p=.8120$ |
| FRHERE   | $c=-.01478$<br>$p=.3620$  | $c=-.06993$<br>$p=.0479$  | $c=-.05156$<br>$p=.1321$  | $c=-.03632$<br>$p=.2281$  |
| EXTACTS  | $c=.05958$<br>$p=.1235$   | $c=-.06500$<br>$p=.1040$  | $c=.01837$<br>$p=.3602$   | $c=.05383$<br>$p=.1588$   |
| SATSOC   | $c=.24426$<br>$p=.0001$   | $c=.16722$<br>$p=.0039$   | $c=.29390$<br>$p=.0000$   | $c=.26525$<br>$p=.0000$   |

## REFERENCES

- Albas, D., Albas, C., McCluskey, K. (1978). Anomie, social class and drinking behavior of high-school students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 39, 910-913.
- Anderson, B.D. (1973). School bureaucratization and alienation from high school. *Sociology of Education*, 46, 315-334.
- Avi-Itzhak, Tamara. (1987). Alienation from secondary school: The effect of school climate on Arab Israeli students. *Urban Education*, 21, 353-364.
- Bickford, Hugh L. and Neal, Arthur G. (1969). Alienation and social learning: A study of students in a vocational training center. *Sociology of Education*, 42, 141-153.
- Blumer, Herbert. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Burbach, H. (1972). An empirical study of powerlessness among high school students. *The High School Journal*, 55, 343-354.
- Calabrese, R.L. and Anderson, R.E. (1986). The public school: A source of stress and alienation among female teachers. *Urban Education*, 21, 30-41.
- Calabrese, R.L., Miller J.W., Dooley, B. (April 1987). The identification of alienated parents and children: Implications for school psychologists. *Psychology in the Schools*, 24, 145-150.

- Calabrese, R.L. and Seldin, C.A. (July 1987). A contextual analysis of alienation among school constituencies. *Urban Education*, 22, 227-237.
- Calabrese, R.L. (Winter 1987). Adolescence: A growth period conducive to alienation. *Adolescence*, 22, 929-938.
- Clark, John P. (1959). Measuring alienation within a social system. *American Sociological Review*, 24, 849-852.
- Dean, Dwight. (1961). Alienation: Its meaning and measurement. *American Sociological Review*, 26, 753-758.
- Dean, Dwight and Lewis Ann K. (1978). Alienation and emotional maturity: A preliminary investigation. *Psychological Reports*, 42, 1006.
- DeMan, Anton. (January 1982). Autonomy-Control variation and self-esteem: Additional findings. *The Journal of Psychology*, 111, 9-13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (July 1982). Autonomy-Control variation in child rearing and level of alienation in young adults. *The Journal of Psychology*, 112, 71-78.
- DeMan, Anton and Devisse, Thierry. (1987). Locus of control, mental ability, self-esteem and alienation. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 15, 233-236.
- Durkheim, Emile. (1951). *Suicide - A study in sociology*. New York: The Free Press.
- Dweck, Carol, Goetz, Theresa, E. and Strauss, Nan L. (1980). Sex differences in learned helplessness: IV. An experimental and naturalistic study of failure generalization and its mediators. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 441-452.

- Etzioni, Amitai. (1968). Basic human needs, alienation and inauthenticity. *American Sociological Review*, 33, December 870-885.
- Festinger, Leon. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Fischer, Claude. (1976). Alienation: Trying to bridge the chasm. *British Journal of Sociology*, 27, 35-49.
- Fromm, Erich. (1955). *The sane society*. New York: Rinehart.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1956). *The art of loving*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Goswick, Ruth Ann & Jones, Warren H. (1982). Components of loneliness during adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 11, No.5, 373-383.
- Heaven, Patrick C.L. and Bester, C.L. (1986). Alienation and its psychological correlates. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 126, 593-598.
- Hegel, G.W. (1963). *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*. Trans. Haldane and Simson. New York: Humanities Press.
- Hobbes, Thomas. (1950). *Leviathan*. New York: E.P. Dutton.
- Holian, John Jr. (1972). Alienation and social awareness among college students. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 13, 114-125.
- Kanungo, R. (1979). The concepts of alienation and involvement revisited. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 119-138.
- Locke, John. (1947). *An Essay Concerning the True Original, Extent and End of Civil Government*. (Ed.) Sir Ernest Barker. London: Oxford University Press.



- Ma, Li-Chen. (1985). Social correlates of alienation among college students in Taiwan. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 125, 671-673.
- Marx, Karl. (1978). *The Marx-Engels Reader* (Robert C. Tucker, Trans.). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Mead, G.H. (1934). *Mind self and society*. C. Morris, (Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McClosky, Herbert and Schaar, John H. (1965). Psychological dimensions of anomy. *American Sociological Review*, 30, 14-40.
- Merton, R.K. (1957). The role set: Problems in sociological theory. *British Journal of Sociology*, 8, 106-120.
- . (1968). *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: The Free Press.
- Neal, A.G., Seeman, Melvin. (1964). Organization and powerlessness: A test of the mediation hypothesis. *American Sociological Review*, 29, 222-232.
- Reisman, David. (1950). *The lonely crowd*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Rotter, Julian B. (1966). Generalized expectancies of internal versus external locus of control. *Psychological Monographs, General and Applied*, 80. (whole no. 609)
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. (1964). *The First and Second Discourses*. (Ed.) Roger D. Masters. New York: St. Martin's.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. (1956). *Being and nothingness*. Trans. Hazel Barnes. New York: Philosophical Library.

- Seeman, Melvin. (1959). On the meaning of alienation. *American Sociological Review*, 24, 783-791.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1963). Alienation and social learning in a reformatory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 69, 270-284.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1966-a). Alienation, membership, and political knowledge: A comparative study. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 30, 353-367.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1966-b). Powerlessness and knowledge: A comparative study of alienation and learning. *Sociometry*, 30, 105-123.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1967). On the personal consequences of alienation in work. *American Sociological Review*, 32, 273-285.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1972). The signals of '68: Alienation in pre-crisis France. *American Sociological Review*, 37, 385-402.
- Seeman, Melvin and Evans, John W. (1962). Alienation and learning in a hospital setting. *American Sociological Review*, 27, 772-782.
- Seeman, Melvin and Neal, A.G. (1964). Organizations and powerlessness: A test of the mediator hypothesis. *American Sociological Review*, 29, 772-782.
- Struening, Elmer, L. and Richardson, Arthur, H. (1965). A factor analytic exploration of the alienation, anomia and authoritarianism domain. *American Sociological Review*, 30, 768-777.
- Travis, Robert. (1986). On powerlessness and meaninglessness. *British Journal of Sociology*, 37, 61-73.

Tillich,Paul. (1951). *Systematic theolgy. Vol. 1,2,3.*  
Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tucker,Robert. (1978). (Ed.) *The Marx-Engels reader.* 2nd  
ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Wenz,Friedrich V. (1953). Sociological correlates of  
alienation among adolescent suicide attempts.  
*Adolescence, 14,* 19-30.

## VITA AUCTORIS

Susan was born in Windsor Ontario. She attended St. Peter's Separate School, and Corpus Christi High School.

Her daughter, Dana, was born in 1967 and her son, Brad, was born in 1969.

She completed her Honours B. A. at the University of Windsor in 1987 and her M.A. in 1989.