THE RELATIONSHIP OF CENTRALIZATION AND FORMALIZATION TO PERCEIVED WORK ALIENATION AMONG HIGHER EDUCATION FACULTY

By

FEREYDOON SAMURI

Bachelor of Arts
Teachers College
Tehran, Iran
1963

Master of Education
Boston University
Boston, Massachusetts
1979

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
December, 1981

THE RELATIONSHIP OF CENTRALIZATION AND

FORMALIZATION TO PERCEIVED WORK

ALIENATION AMONG HIGHER

EDUCATION FACULTY

Thesis Approved:

Carl R. Anderson
Thesis Adviser

William Adams

[illegible]

Jacob [illegible]

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author will always be indebted to Dr. Carl R. Anderson, Thesis Adviser, for his immense assistance, criticisms and guidance throughout this study. Many thanks go to the rest of his advisery committee: Drs. William B. Adrian, Russell L. Dobson and Jacob D. Zucker for their substantial contributions and critical evaluation of the study. Also, a note of thanks should be given to Dr. Mahmood Shandiz for his assistance with the statistical model used in the analysis of data.

The author is exceedingly grateful to his father, Mr. Darvishali Samuri, his mother, Mrs. Mahtab Mehdiazad and his brothers, Mr. Azizollah Samuri and Zabihollah Samuri, for their endless love, sacrifices, understanding, encouragement and prayers throughout the program. Myriads of thanks to his sisters, brothers-in-law, relatives and friends for their love and ceaseless encouragement throughout the study.

Finally, the author extends deep appreciation to God. To God, his Lord he worships and praises for placing his feet on highest academic ground and for making him what he is today. God is worthy to be loved, praised, worshipped and honoured.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter | Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

The increase of population and the development of science and technology have made the existence of organizations inevitable. The objective of organizations is to develop improved relationships and communications among individuals so that efficiency of the group effort can be maximized (Haire, 1962). The efficiency of organizations depend on their structure, stability and order. These traits of any organization are both useful and detrimental to the nature of human beings. Whether for good or for evil, there is little doubt that the existence of rational complex organizations is essential for the survival of every modern society.

Etzioni (1964) presents evidence that organizations dominate all of our lives: Most of us are born in organizations, educated by organizations, and most of us spend much of our lives working for organizations. Etzioni maintains that we spend much of our leisure time paying, playing, praying and working in organizations. The influence of organizations on an individual's life has led Perrow to state:

> No matter what one has to do with an organization - whether one is going to study it, work in it, subvert it, or use it in the interest of another organization - one must have some view of the nature of the beast with which one is dealing (1970:1).

The purpose of this study was to identify the dysfunctional aspects of organizations on human beings, specifically those features of organizations which are in adverse relationships with the nature of human beings. Gouldner (1971:9), for instance, sees the growth of organizations, the impending bureaucratization of the world and the rise of the "organization man" with increasing alarm. Scott and Hart (1979), however, indicate that modern organizations are both useful and detrimental to the nature of man. Scott and Hart attribute the primary success of America in this century neither to its military prowess nor to its wealth, but to its most successful social invention: the modern organizations. But Scott and Hart warn about the danger of modern organizations, and they state that modern organizations have become the dominant force in American lives; shaping and changing American values. Scott and Hart state that the most important thing for every individual is satisfaction and there is nothing worthwhile for individuals in this world beyond freedom and dignity. Scott and Hart conclude that modern organizations have presented enough peril to individuals' freedom that man should look critically at the organizations created regardless of its usefulness.

Previous examples indicate that the organizations are costly for individuals, and after many years of investigation, man is not close to answering the great ethical questions about organized life. As historian Carl Becker (1936:37) remarked about the paradox of organization, "The power of man has been extended by limiting the freedom of man." Self-imprisonment through enduring relations with others makes us free in the sense of having a wider range of choices among alternatives. To achieve a variety of goals, we have to cooperate with others, and cooperation usually requires subordination on the part of someone. Even superiors within organizations lose some independence of action since they must take into account the behavior of others in the group. Consequently, the tension between individuals and specifically bureaucratic organizations is inevitable (Blau and Meyer, 1971).

Since bureaucratic organizations have become dominant institutions in contemporary society (Blau et al., 1971), the study of bureaucratic organizations will reveal the dysfunctional features of bureaucracy, especially in professional organizations, is significant. The survival of advanced organizations depend on the professionals whose advanced education and practical expertise make them able to perform technical and scientific jobs properly. For instance, if the mission of the university is to preserve and expand knowledge, it should provide an environment in which professors can discover, examine critically, preserve and transmit knowledge, wisdom, and values that will help ensure the survival of present and future generations, with enrichment in the quality of life. The performance of these tasks is absolutely essential to modern universities; the administrators simply could not function without support of the professors. For this reason, the place of the professional in an essentially bureaucratic organization will be the focus of such analysis.

The simultaneous increase in the professionalization of work and the bureaucratization of organizations (Spinks, 1980) coupled with the recognition of the difference between the two systems (Blau and Scott, 1962; Perrow, 1970) have made this study urgent, to delineate the specific traits of each system and their conflicts. Blau and Scott

(1962) state that professional form of occupational life and the bureaucratic form of organizational administration are two institutional patterns that are prevalent today and that, in many ways, typify modern societies. Parsons (1947), in a footnote to his translation of Weber's Theory of Social and Economic Organizations, states that there exists a fundamental inconsistency between the sets of norms governing the professional and the bureaucratic models.

Huxley (1958) indicates that bureaucratic systems are seen to be inconsistent with liberty, for liberty arises and has meaning within a self regulating community of freely cooperating individuals. Bureaucratic organizations transform man into a robot, suffocate creative spirit, and abolish the possibility of freedom. Huxley concludes that bureaucratic orientation is naturally at odds with that of professional orientation concept of autonomy. Morrissey and Gillespie (1975), in supporting Parsons and Huxley's contention, point out that professionals tend to organize around individual expertise, whereas bureaucracies generally organize in hierarchical arrangements, sanctioned by written rules and procedures. Etzioni elaborates the source of tension when he writes:

> Professionals desire automony to apply their expertise and freedom to justify their actions as based on professional knowledge and in the best interest of their clients, while bureaucrats coordinate all activities on the basis of bureaucratic features rather than professional traits (1964: 75).

Blau and Scott contrast and compare two models clearly when they write:

> . . . the professional . . . and bureaucratic forms of organizational administration are two structural patterns prevalent today. While professional principles share many elements with bureaucratic ones, they include some that are

> not common. Both require that decisions be governed by universalistic standards independent of any personal consideration in the cases handled. Their orientations are expected to be impersonal and detached, a principle designed to facilitate rational judgement. Both groups are marked by specialized competence based on technical training and limit the professional's authority to a specialized area of jurisdiction. Both professionals and bureaucrats occupy an achieved rather than ascribed status. With the selection of personnel governed by such performance criteria as competence and training (1962:65).

The authors maintain with the caveat that their similarities must not be allowed to obscure critical differences between the two models. This study, however, limited its scope to the investigation and analysis of the relationships of two features of bureaucracy, namely: centralization and formalization with faculty's perceived work alienation. This study specifically examined one type of perceived alienation, namely: self-estrangement. Self-estrangement is created when an individual perceives that his/her own work cannot determine the occurence of the outcomes or the reinforcements he/she seeks (Seeman, 1958). Patchen (1970) applies this term to a person who is prevented from involvement in setting his/her objectives.

Indications are that the influence of bureaucratic features, especially centralization and formalization, can be felt deeply among the professionals within organizations (Blau, 1955, 1973; Wilensky, 1965; Hughes, 1965; Levine, 1978). Thus, more specifically, the relationships of two subconstructs of centralization, namely, participation in decision making and hierarchy of authority as well as two subconstructs of formalization, namely; job codification and rule observation to faculty's perceived work alienation considered as they were here, separately and interaction, were studied in one particular type of complex organization - namely, the schools of education.

The American higher education establishments have been particularly receptive to the bureaucratic ideology, having incorporated a number of bureaucratic principles into the organizational practices of the educational enterprise (Hughins, 1968; Blau, 1973; Levine, 1978). Blau (1973) writes that higher education shares some of the bureaucratic characteristics with other bureaucratic organizations, such as formal division of labor, an administrative hierarchy, and a clerical apparatus. But it does not have other bureaucratic attributes. For instance, there is no direct supervision of the work of the major group of employees, the faculty, and there are no detailed operating rules governing the performance of academic responsibilities. There is also disagreement among social scientists on the question whether academics are professionals. Goode (1969) considers university faculty members the prototype of professionals. On the other hand, Hughes (1958) draws a contrast between scientists and professionals. The distinguishing criterion being that scientists do not have clients and professionals do, which implies that academics in their role as scientists and scholars are not professionals. These differences are discussed in the review of the literature in greater details.

Problem Statement

The purpose of this study was to examine perceived work alienation as one major consequence arising from two aspects of bureaucracy, namely, centralization and formalization among professors in colleges of education. Subjectively, formative factors related to perceived self-estrangement among professors were investigated in the context of described and achieved characteristics of individuals who perceived that lack of sufficient participation in decision making in academic areas, hierarchial authority of formalization, coupled with rigidity of standardized rules and regulations as well as close supervisions of professional work would increase the professors' sense of self-estrangement. The purpose of this study was only to examine the relationships of centralization and formalization with faculty's perceived work alienation in schools of education.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. Is perceived work alienation among faculty members related to participation in decision making?

2. Is perceived work alienation among faculty members related to hierarchy of authority?

3. Is perceived work alienation among the professors related to job codification?

4. Is perceived work alienation among faculty members related to rule observation?

5. Does perceived work alienation, when measured as the function of organizational controls, vary between tenured and non-tenured professors?

6. Does perceived work alienation, when measured as the function of organization, vary between those professors who work at doctoral granting universities and non-doctoral granting universities?

Assumptions

It was assumed that input into the decision making process was important to professionals who function within bureaucratic organizations. It was also assumed that dimensions of hierarchy of authority, standardized rules and rule observation on the basis of bureaucratic criteria were dysfunctional to professionals who desire to perform their tasks according to professionals' traits. It was further assumed that tenured and non-tenured professors would perceive work alienation differently related to formalization and centralization, while doctoral and non-doctoral granting university professors would not perceive work alienation differently related to formalization and centralization.

Significance of Study

Weber (cited in Blau and Scott, 1962) stated that bureaucracy is the most efficient form of administrative organization. He attributed its efficiency to the high degree of rationality expected from members who are experienced in making technically correct decisions, and whose performance is governed by abstract rules and coordinated by a well defined hierarchy of authority. Weber reasoned that the presence of professionals with a high level of expertise would enhance the ability of an essentially bureaucratic organization to achieve its stated goals in a climate of cooperative action.

Recent investigations have revealed that some aspects of bureaucracy, such as centralization and formalization, are related to tension and alienation among workers. These findings have created new concerns among the public toward improving the quality of the working-life in organization (Hackman and Suttle, 1977). The impact of the public's desire toward improving the quality of the working life condition has been epitomized in Work in America; Report of Special Task Force to The Secretary of the Helath, Education and Welfare (1973). Report recommends that organizations ensure the mental health of their employees by modifing or changing those bureaucratic features which are related to stress, tension and alienation among employees.

If this contention is true, that some aspects of bureaucracy are related to alienation in the work place, then the impact of those features of bureaucracy can be felt more seriously by professionals than other employees (Wilensky, 1956; Hughes, 1958; Miller, 1967; Scott, 1966; Blau, 1973; Levine, 1978). It has been well documented that the professors who relatively experienced academic freedom in the decade of the fifties and sixties, should feel the insufficient academic freedom seriously now. This feeling of lack of academic freedom may lead to professorial perceived work alienation. The professors enjoyed the concept of academic freedom and possessed immunity from professional pressures during the two decades (Clark, Burton, 1966). Etzioni (1964) also writes that the professors were free to investigate, experiment and to take risks without the social repercussions of a failure. Their ideal professional situation was the abundance of research dollars and the growth of enrollment (Clark, Burton, 1966; Baldridge, 1973). Baldridge continues that:

> Faculty autonomy and power developed because of a fortunate convergence of forces in the society; expanding enrollment, public belief in the ability of education to solve social problems, generous financial support, the growth of large

> scale research demanding more faculty experts and a shortage of personnel have placed faculties in a powerful bargaining position (1973:532).

The favorable situations of professors, however, have begun to change since the beginning of the early seventies. Freeman (1976) relates the new unfavorable situation of professors to the current belief among the public that education cannot always solve the social problems any more. Freeman continues that this belief has led to declining enrollment, the shrinkage of research funds, changes in social priorities, and further an overburdance of educated in the marketplace has intensified the issue.

Freeman (1976) concludes that all changes have lowered financial support and have increased the level of control. Bureaucratic features have been manipulated to spend scarce resources efficiently and to control uncertainties. Consequently, those conditions under which the ideal professional situation arose and was sustained have largely disappeared and an unfavorable situation has appeared which is at odds with the professional expectation and experienced. The new organization climate has been created to increase the efficiency. This change has been indicated to be related to the increase of professional perceived work alienation (Morrissey and Gillespie, 1975). If this argument is true, that some bureaucratic features are dysfunctional when applied to a professional organization such as schools of education in which criteria of professionalism dominate; if relationships between certain characteristics of bureaucracy exist, then it is imperative to develop an alternative structure in schools of education which will be satisfactory to the professors for two reasons:

First, according to Hackman and Suttle (1977), by promoting the quality of worklife apart from any immediate interest in productivity, this initiation will meet the public demands; second, it is expected that professors will prepare responsible, innovative and considerate individuals for society. If the professors perceive themselves self-estranged, how can they obtain educational goals? These two significant points have made this study urgent and important.

Limitation of the Study

This study was limited to the analysis of relationships between four dimensions of bureaucracy namely; participation in decision making, hierarchy of authority, job codification and rule observation with perceived work alienation among professors of schools of education according to their seniority in selected public schools of education, including doctoral and non-doctoral colleges in the state of Oklahoma. The findings of this study were generalized only to the settings of these investigations and to other school systems which exhibited characteristics similar to those systems providing data for the study. The findings were predicted on the assumption that responses of participants provided an accurate perception of their organizations.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined to provide clarity regarding their use in this study:

Bureaucracy: For the purpose of this study, bureaucracy will be described by the following characteristics: hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations and impersonalization.

Hierarchy of authority: "The extent to which the locus of decision making is prestructured by the organization" (Hall, 1967:465).

Rules and regulations: "The degree of which the behavior of organizational members is subject to organizational control and the extent to which organizational members must follow organizationally defined procedures" (Hall:465).

Impersonality: "The extent to which both organizational members and outsiders are treated without regard to individual qualities" (Hall, 1967:465).

Organizational control: Organizational control is nominally defined as the extent to which the organization rather than the professional determines or makes decisions concerning the professional's work as measured by specific designated variables. The organizational control will be described by the following characteristics: formalization and centralization.

Formalization: This term was defined as "the use of rules in an organization" and was considered to have two subconstructs: job codification, "The degree to which job occupants are specified, and rule observation, The degree to which job occupants are supervised in conforming to the standards established in job codification" (Hage and Aiken, 1967b:79).

Centralization: This term was defined as "the extent to which power is distributed among social positions" (Hage and Aiken, 1967b:77). It has two subconstructs: the concentration of decisions referring to resource distribution or policy formulation, the indicator being the participation in decisionmaking, and the concentration of decisions referring to the performance of tasks, the indicator being the hierarchy of authority (Hage and Aiken, 1967b).

Alienation: For this study is the dependent variable and is defined as a lack of intrinsic pride in work and lack of instrinic meaning of work (Seeman, 1967:759).

Professionalism: For this study this term is defined according to the academic degree. Those whose degrees are beyond the bachelors will be considered professionals.

Faculty: For the purpose of this study this term is defined as all persons having the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or full-professor. All faculty holding adjunct, visiting, or administrative appointments (including department chairman), and those faculty on sabbatical or leave of absence will be excluded.

Doctoral granting universities: This term is specified as those universities whose schools of education grant degrees of Ed.D. or Ph.D. in some disciplines.

Non-doctoral granting universities: This term is identified as those universities whose schools of education do not grant degrees of Ed.D. or Ph.D. in any discipline.

CHAPTER II

ORGANIZATION

Definition and Purpose of Organization

Whenever groups of persons associate with one another, social organization develops among them. The reason for formation of social organizations such as labor organizations, universities or political parties, is to achieve the benefits of collective action in a situation in which individual action fails. Haire (1962:29) defines the reason for formation of organization and its objectives as: "When a group of people recognize that synergistic effects will result from the proposed cooperative group action." For Haire, the comprehensive objective of organization is to maximize the synergistic effort. Every organization, however, has two components: formal and informal. In the ensuing section the specific characteristics and functions of formal and informal components of groups are discussed.

Formal Organization

The defining criterion of formal organization is the existence of procedures for mobilizing and coordinating the efforts of various, usually specified, groups in the pursuit of joint objectives. Blau et al. (1962:1) identifies formal organizations as social units which are established for the "explicit purpose of achieving certain goals," while Barnard (1938:73) describes the formal organizations as "Systems of consciously coordinated activities of two or more purposes." Haas and Drabeck (1973) define the formal organizations as relatively permanent and complex social systems which have the characteristics of the people that make them up. Jackson et al. (1978) write that every formal organization, regardless of its objectives and personal characteristics has distinct structures, rules and organziational norms that have developed over time. Jackson and his associate realize that every formal organization has a life cycle of its own that goes beyond the lives of individuals and has goals and policies, procedures and practices. It has also been added that every formal organization consists of subgroups, each of which has a name, location, and authority of structure, a division of labor, a program of activity and procedures of replacement. All these elements, which exist in an environment and are effected by it, are deliberately constructed and modified to seek specific goals (Jackson et al., 1978).

The evidence indicates that formal organizations appear when people have objectives and according to those goals establish procedures to coordinate activities which make the attainment of the established goals efficiently feasible. Formal organizations, therefore, do not consider the psychological and social aspects of individuals (Barnard, 1938). These flaws of formal organizations are causes of formation of informal organizations in social systems.

Informal Organizations

People have a propensity to resist depersonalization which formal organizations tend to create. People shape informal organizations to neutralize aspects of formal organizations which are inconsistent with their norms. Selzink (1969) states that informal patterns arise spontaneously, are based on personal relationships, and are usually directed to the control of some specific situations, while Davis (1973:239) says that informal organizations "arise from the social interaction of people which indicate that they develop spontaneously as people associate with each other." Bakke (1958:194) adds, "as factors influencing human behaviors," the informal organizations are shaped by formal organizations, but he emphasizes that informal and formal systems are not separable. However, one can find many reasons for the existence of informal groups such as: relatedness, friendship, affiliation, and security. Argyris (1957) writes that formal organizations create tension, while informal organizations decrease the basic causes of conflict, frustration and failure as a method of improving work performance. He continues that informal organizations, despite formal organizations, operate without an official set of rules or fomal managers.

The Degree of Integration of Formal and Informal Organizations

Although the role of both formal and informal organizations in getting work done efficiently and effectively is very important, the degree of integration between the two systems can not be precisely recommended. The degree of integration of both formal and informal organizations depends on the objectives of every organization, situation and the expectation of employees plus other invested groups or individuals. The degree of integration of informal and formal organizations can not be the same in higher education establishments and military institutions. A soldier is expected to be obedient to his superior on the battlefield for the sake of his life, defending his country and remaining loyal to it, while a professor is expected to follow his career in the class or lab without receiving orders from his superiors on how to pursue every step. This means that the objectives of military institutions can be attained under tough discipline, therefore, there is a kind of agreement between the soldier and his organization, whereas in the case of higher education there is a different type of expectation. A professor is expected to seek the truth and is supposed to have the wisdom to follow accepted procedures. It should be kept in mind that the public school accept the norms of both institutions as sometimes both professor and soldier may not agree on what they do. This discussion indicates that formal organizations can play a significant role in military institutions, while informal organizations play an important role in educational establishment, or in general, military institutions have more formalized organizations than higher education.

Thus, professorial orientation intensifies the creation of informal organizations, while the patriotic ideology intensifies the formation of formal organizations in military settings. Consequently, one organization may focus on human relations (Argyris, 1955), another one may center on formal organization (Peabody, 1962), while a third organization may create a balance between formal and informal organizations (Parsons, 1957) to obtain the stated goals. As mentioned, the prevalent organization is bureaucracy. From this point, this study will limit its investigation to the bureaucratic organizations.

Bureaucracy

The term bureaucracy initially referred to a cloth covering the desks in French government offices in the eighteenth century. The word bureau came to be linked with a signifying rule of government, probably during the struggle against absolutism preceding the French Revolution. It was applied to decry the torturous procedures, narrow outlook, and highhanded manner of autocratic government officials (Bendix, 1967). However, bureaucracy has two distinct definitions at the current time. Jackson et al. (1978) says that this term is perceived as any aspect of any organization which is responsible for the red tape, buck passing and impersonal treatment by some people. It also means a method of organizing administration in which experts rule under law.

Dimock (1959), however, indicates that organizations have gradually evolved throughout history, and consequently, the developed form has been called bureaucracy. Dimock (1959:59) describes the process of evolution: "As institutions grow they tend to become formal and to have fixed ways of doing things, and it is this general process of formalization that is probably called bureaucracy." Further, Gerth and Mills (1964) specify aspects of bureaucracy according to the ensuing criteria. Bureaucracy consists of special jurisdiction of activities that are governed by rules and regulations, a system of graded levels of authority based on the strict compliance of subordinates to the direction of their superiors, appointment to the officer on the basis of expert compliance for life time tenure and a separation between the bureaucrat's personal life and his official vocation. It has been stated that Weberian definition of bureaucracy has become prevelant

(Merton, 1968; Etzioni, 1969b). Therefore, it is imperative for this study to present the Weberian definition of bureaucracy and analyses of some theorists on his bureaucracy.

Weberian Model of Bureaucracy

Blau (1968) writes that the importance bureaucracy assumes in modern life led Weber to give its analysis a central place in society. The basic question he asked was how collective endeavors must be organized to rationalize complex responsibilities that require the joint efforts of many men. In response to this question, he formalized his model of bureaucracy on the key concepts such as purpose, rationality, impersonality and routine. According to these characteristics, a bureaucratic organization guides its behavior toward some general goal of activities; hence its rationality is achieved by action which is clearly devoted to the achievement of the stated goals efficiently.

Weber (1947) however, specifies the specific traits of his rational model in a different way. Weber writes that every organization has a few policy officials and many operating officials, who are bureaucrats. These employees are subject to the law and to the authority of policy officials; a bureaucrat's authority is attributed to the position he occupies and is not independent of it. This being the case, he has a large professional duty to conform to what is expected of him, his only responsibility is to comply with authority and to do his duty without fear or favor. Weber continues that offices are filled by merit and merit is determined by education requirements and the granting of formal degrees.

Merton (1968) adds that most bureaucratic offices involve the expectation of life-long tenure, in the absence of disturbing factors which may decrease the size of the organization. Therefore, bureaucracy maximizes vocational security. Laski (1930) writes that the function of the security of tenure, pensions, incremental salaries and regularized procedures for promotion is to insure the devoted performance of official duties, without regard for extraneous pressures. Weber (1947) claims that the chief merit of bureaucracy is its technical efficiency, with a premium placed on precision, speed, expert control, continuity, discretion, and returns on input. Weber maintains that the structure is one which approaches the complete elimination of personalized relationships and nonrational consideration.

Spinks (1980) claims that the research fostered by Weber's concept of bureaucracy can be described as volumunious. This research has revealed that characteristics of bureaucracy are not internally consistent with each other. Hall (1963), for instance, discovers that such internal segments are significantly different in the degree to which they are bureaucratized, and Hall concludes that these differences have significant consequences for understanding organizational structure. Hall (1963) realizes that the features of bureaucracy are not highly intercorrelated: the hierarchy of authority might be considered as the central feature in determining the total degree of bureaucratization. Hall finds out that technical merit of competence negatively associated with the presence of other characteristics. As Hall puts it:

> In a highly bureaucratized situation, the highly competent person might not be able to exercise the full range of his competence due to specific procedural limitations, limited sphere of activity, limited authority due to hierarchial demands (Hall, 1963:39).

Udy (1959) realizes that three dimensions of organization were everywhere present and strongly correlated. These dimensions are differential rewards based on office, specialized staff administrators and hierarchial authority. They are closely related to those which Hall investigated. The chief conflict between the two lists is that Udy's list is a set of interrelated characteristics, while Hall's list is not. But this conflict may be accounted for by the similarity in bureaucratic features of so many organizations drawn from both industrial and non-industrial societies is present. Udy also agrees with Hall that the technological nature of the task being performed determines an organization's minimum degree of bureaucratization. Both author's generalizations are compatible to Weber's view that bureaucratization is encouraged by the need to deal with large continuous flows of administrative jobs. Stinchombe (1959) has supported all three authors' views and has concluded that career continuity within the organization, hierarchial authority and fixed communication systems are interrelated. Stinchombe adds that one of the conditions which are favorable to the development of these features is continuity of workload.

Hickson (1966), however, claims that the concept of role specification provides a means of measuring variations within the structural dimension. Blau (1968) also reveals interrelations among structural attributes of division of labor, professionalization, hierarchy of authority and administrative staff of clerks. Golembiewski's (1966) investigations indicate that "life-staff" relations are increasingly inadequate. Finally, Hage (1965) writes that researchers' findings are not in agreement as to whether bureaucracy is a unidimensional or multidimensional construct. Hage continues that in general, most studies have assumed that measurement of organizational characteristics to be unidimensional in nature, although it has been recognized by the researchers that orthogonal relationships among characteristics may exist. Anyway, some researchers are in agreement with six dimensions comprise the bureaucratic structure theorized by Weber (Hall, 1963; Blau and Meyer, 1971; Blau and Scott, 1962). These dimensions are:

1. Hierarchy of authority
2. Specialization
3. Rules and regulations
4. Organizational procedures
5. Impersonality
6. Technical competence

Kaufman (1971) has astutely described the application of these bureaucratic characteristics to the higher educational settings. Kaufman states that higher educational institutions are formal organizations that have many of those characteristics of bureaucratic organizations. The growth in knowledge and demand for expertise that has been the characteristic of recent decades has reinforced the strength of the discipline inside the organizational mass of the systems that have been made ever larger. It has also been indicated that increased specialization in scientific and other academic fields, as well as in the upper reaches of the general labor force, strengthens the influence of those authority rooted in expertise (Parsons, 1968; Jencks et al., 1968). This development has been coupled with the increased number of complex rules designed to effect consistency. The shifting of professors and administrators to experts has gradually developed a separate administrative class from the professional one that has a subculture of its own. Clark says,

> The piling of administrative echelon upon administrative echelon is an unremitting quest for coordination, symmetry, logic and comprehensive order. These administrators range from president to those who are experts in such areas as student admission, record keeping, personnel policy, physical plant management and the like. All of them are responsible to their superiors (1963:244).

Blau (1973) says that universities and colleges are organizations; however, they are unquestionably different in many ways from most organizations. There is no eight-hour working day for faculty, no direct supervision, no unambiguous measure of efficiency. Blau further reminds that although faculty members vary in rank and influence over academic affairs, they are not organized into a hierarchy of supervisors and subordinates; in other words, they are not responsible to the senior professors on the basis of organizational rules. Etzioni (1969a) notes that another difference is that specialists on the faculty perform the major line functions of teaching and research, and administrators provide most of the supportive staff services in academic institutions, whereas in the typical work organization, professional specialists are the managerial hierarchy, has line functions. Barzun (1968) concludes that this difference does not extend to senior administrators, whose basic management functions of mobilizing and distributing resources for the effective achievement of objectives are essentially the same in academic institutions and other organizations. Albeit the ways to execute these responsibilities successfully are not the same.

The various dimensions of bureaucracy which are considered important to an understanding of how an organization functions will be discussed in the ensuing sections.

Hierarchy of Authority

According to this feature of bureaucracy, the offices are arranged in such hierarchical patterns that each official exercises authority over those subordinate to him and is subject to the authority of his superior, but only in his capacity as an office-holder and within the limits established by organizational rules (Cruzzort et al., 1980). Thus, the basic or lowest-level positions are grouped together and assigned to a higher office. In turn, each supervisory office is under the control of a higher one. Each employee is accountable to his superior for his and his subordinates' job-related actions and decisions. All are accountable to the highest official at the top of pyramidal hierarchy. Further, there is also a right of appeal and statement of grievances from the lower to the higher level (Weber, 1947). Blau (1955) writes that this feature of bureaucracy provides a horizontal division between the levels of administration concerned with matters of different scope and importance, it is also the control mechanism that holds the vertical division of labor together.

Thompson (1967) supports Weber's identification of the hierarchial arrangement of offices and writes that ultimately, someone is designated as the "boss". He continues that the boss has a right to veto or affirm the organizationally directed proposals of his subordinates, subject to no appeal, the superior's rights include a near absolute power over the organization ambitions and careers of subordinates. Not only does the superior have the right to tell the subordinate what to do, but the superior has the right to deference from his subordinate.

Weber (1947) states that the officials' right to control is based on the criteria of their appointment and the legality of their positions they occupy and these are based on the amount of training and knowledge they have, that is, the perceived expertise or competence of those with authority and control should reflect the degree to which the hierarchy of authority and the system of control are legitimated by the members of the organization or, concurrently, the members of the system who occupy positions of authority are considered as competent, and eligible to have the right to control. This rationale has led Thompson to say this:

> It is assumed that the superior, at any point in the hierarchy, is able to tell his subordinates what to do, and to guide them in doing it. That is, it is assumed that he is more capable in all of his unit's activities than any of his subordinates who perform them (1967:75).

This assumption cannot be true in a complex organization, since it has many departments, every department has many specialists, and every specialist is expected to be an authority on his/her field. It is impossible for a boss to be competent in all areas. The line of hierarchy become dysfunctional. Blau (1955) reasons that the hierarchy concept in the interest of the organizational efficiency induces subordinates, anxious to be highly thought of by their superiors, to conceal defects in operations from superiors. This obstruction of the flow of information upward in the hierarchy impedes effective management. Ewen (1976) and Woodward (1926) demonstrate that efficiency of organization cannot be obtained by forcing an individual to think, feel and act in a manner directed by a superior. The successful performance of the organizational procedures is possible when it can provide some basic conditions for its employees. Barnard (1938) suggests that any organization has to meet some conditions to motivate a subordinate to accept the authority of a directive from above. The employees must be able to mentally and physically comply with the directive to understand it and believe that it is compatible with their interest as a whole. Within Barnard's context of authority, a subordinate has authoritative means of supporting or denying the superior's directives. This bureaucratic dysfunction can be eliminated when the social relations shift to a two-way process, a reciprocity or give and take concern (Mead, 1934; Blumer, 1969). It means that informal organizations should have opportunities to provide subordinates with some inputs on their functions.

The hierarchial feature of bureaucracy is present in higher education, too. For instance, boards, presidents and other administrators are assigned to their positions. Hierarchically, they are expected to control and supervise the activities of the lower echelons. Every superior is responsible for his activities and the activities of his superiors. Although Blau (1973) claims that professors are not supervised by superiors, their promotions are feasible when the superiors agree. Further, their superiors control their activities which are consistent with the organizational rules.

Impersonal Orientation

The emphasis on impersonal detachment is intended to eliminate the source of irrational action. Since personality and emotionally based relationships interfere with rationality, Weber (1947:341) states that the "working atmosphere of bureaucracy" should be based on the dominance of a spirit of "formalistic impersonality". Everybody should perform his or her function without personal bias or emotion. They should follow the general rules and regulations which are indiscriminatory and are in the interest of all. Weber's definition of impersonality makes it clear that "authority" and "power" rest in the "office" rather than "employees"; therefore, an individual holds an office, and the power he experiences is legitimated in the office. He does not own the power or authority; it is a part of office. He has power because he has been selected on his technical ability, he wields his influence because of his expertise.

Bennis gives some evidence why this feature of bureaucracy has been created and why Weber emphasized on it:

> The bureaucratic machine model Weber outlined was developed as a reaction against the personal subjugation, nepotism, cruelty, emotional viscissitudes and capricious judgement which passed formational practices in the early days of the individual revolutions (1966:32).

Bendix (1961:430) indicates that this feature of bureaucracy supports "the ideology of democracy by demanding equality before the law and providing legal guarantees against arbitrariness in judicial and administrative decisions." Rourke (1969) supports Bendix's view and continues that impersonal orientation does not only hinder administrative favoritism but also advances certain minority interests. It has also been noted that impersonal orientation projects the individual against corruption and the willful misuse of power. By this function it has created a relief and an advance (Wriston, 1980), but with all of its benefits, it has created some dysfunctions, too.

Blau (1955:31-34) says, "if reversed detachment characterizes the attitudes of the members of the organization toward one another, it is unlikely that high spirit de corps will develop among them." Additionally, Hummel (1977) argues that this characteristic of bureaucracy separates human beings in two ways. It separates the individual from others with whom it was supposed to provide a link and the human relationships cease to be personal, emotional and social and begin to be impersonal, rational and machine-like. It also separates individuals from themselves, this is accomplished through the ideology of bureaucracy because people do not readily accept a reduction in their social selves. And finally, Hummel concludes that impersonality reduces people to resources to be manipulated; to a commodity to be sold, bought and resold, and this destruction of an individual's ability to interact among his peers may be deemed violent. Anderson (1966) questions whether the impersonality is good or bad, as the organization is not able to eliminate it completely. Anderson reasons that individual differences in members of the organization are due to training, attitudes and experience, together with the impact of environment on the formal and informal organization and the effects of history on the perception of organizational goals which all serve to have a different impact on every individual employee.

Blau (1973) reveals that the feature of impersonality is a dilemma in higher education because the administration system follows the bureaucratic feature of impersonality while the professional system pursues altruistic impersonality. Parsons (1968) clarifies how the bureaucratic impersonal orientation creates contradictory consequences in social structure. He indicates that the universalistic criteria of judgment, which is characteristic of bureaucracy, comes into conflict with the particularistic allegiances of professorial impersonality, which is based on the sharing of peer values. Blau (1973) reveals that the bureaucratic impersonal atmosphere in multiuniversities, independent of other conditions, appears to make it less attractive to the faculty members and to weaken faculty allegience to the institution. Blau concludes that in educational settings, impersonality tends to run counter to the espoused concern for the individual which characterizes education.

Rules and Regulations

Every bureaucracy is guided by a set of explicit and specific purposes from which a system of rules and regulations is provided which governs the behavior of officials (Cuzzort et al., 1980). These rules are codified in the interests of all or of those in whose general interest a bureaucracy is set up. Specifically, rules are avoided which favor some over others. Weber (1968) writes that rules serve several purposes; rules place emphasis on function, not individuals; as a result, the organization is more stable with greater continuity. Weber (1947) also writes that rules do not require a new solution for each situation; therefore, they save time and effort. Rules also treat people in a standardized way; that is, each case is judged on its merits rather than the reason involved, and this characteristic of rules protects and ensures quality of treatment.

Weber (1968) believes that written rules strictly limit the use of coercion and power, and above all, they make the management perdictable. As a result, rules expectations of functionaries become regular. Consequently, rules serve important functions. Their conciseness and flexibility give a clear picture to every employee as to how to do his/her work. Rules also act as a system of communication that gives direction to role performance (Gouldner, 1954). They are important because they are applicable to everyone regardless of his/her position. However, rules disregard the function of informal groups and they are also too rigid in some situations.

Bendix (1947) argues that the efficiency of organizations cannot be assessed without considering both its formal rules and human attitudes toward them. Bendix also argues against the belief that it is possible to adhere to a rule without the intrusion of general social and political values. Bendix says when rules have to be applied to particular cases, it is very difficult for officials to decide whether a case falls under a rule or not. In the exercise of judgement, the officials are caught in a dilemma since too great a compliance with statutory rules is popularly denounced as bureaucratic. Too great a reliance on initiative, in order to realize the spirit, if not the latter, of the law is popularly denounced as an abuse of power. The rules, however, may not be complete in all cases; the rules give a free certificate to the boss to do whatever he wants to do when he is not accountable.

Huxley (1958) claims the bureaucratic rules force the employees to adjust to them. They may be applied to manipulate the thoughts and feelings of the employees in the interest of some people. Huxley argues that rules may serve to reduce individual thinking ability and create passiveness in the individual, destroying creativeness and other human qualities. Ellul (1964) adds that any complexity of standardized means for attaining a predetermined result converts spontaneous and unreflective behavior into reflective behavior with deliberated means extended to all domains of it. Thus, standardized means transform ends into means. What was once realized in its own right now becomes worthwhile only if it helps achieve something else, and in this way rules turn means into ends.

Rules are also incompatible with technological and social changes. At the present technological and social changes are substantial criteria that demand flexible rules instead of fixed and rigid rules. Ohlin (1958) argues that the sheer rapidity of changes today require the greatest organizational adaptability. The flexibility of rules can support the survival of an organization (Drucker, 1964; Grander, 1963; McNulty, 1962).

Blau (1973), however, indicates bureaucratic rules are prevalent at the university. They are productive when the professors' salary rises on the basis of a regular schedule. This function of rules decreases dissatisfaction, invites comparisons and trust among the faculty. Glaser (1964) realizes that a more direct effect of standardized salaries is that the rules make salary increases independent of the recommendations of chairpersons or deans. Then what is wrong with rules? The response to this question is that the most advanced training and research programs depend most on freedom rather than bureaucratic rules, it is expected that academic institutions keep up with the development in various fields, especially in the rapidly changing scientific fields. This raises the problem of how academic progress can be institutionalized. Blau (1973) claims that the bureaucratic regulations impede the endeavors of individuals to remain abreast of scientific advances. The university can work out this problem by involving the faculty in designing those rules which are related to their jobs. Further, the rules should be flexible, but the dilemma of promotion on the basis of merits and seniority cannot be solved easily.

Division of Labor and Specialization

The extent to which organizationally defined "universalistic" standards are utilized in the personal selection and advancement (Weber, 1947). According to this feature of bureaucracy, every employee and supervisor would have authority over his functions and would not interfere with the conduct of other's jobs. Weber (1968) specifies that bureaucracy's office management requires training because office management as an activity itself becomes specialized and rationalized. Weber reasons that making narrower the range of tasks permits great expertness to be required and applied to the work. This feature also distributes regular activities among subdivisions in a fixed way as official duties (Gerth et al., 1946).

Blau (1973) reveals that when large organizations become increasingly differentiated they are expected to produce sufficiently small subgroups for the regular personal contacts that are essential for social integration. Blau continues that this differentiation also has instrumental advantages because it separates tasks into more homogenous duties of organizational subunits and individuals which typically range from quite routine to highly specialized jobs. Blau writes that since routine jobs can be filled with less skilled personnel and highly specialized ones require and make possible greater expert skills, the division of labor enables an organization to discharge more complex responsibilities with less skilled personnel. These are compelling reasons for a management interested in maximizing integration of individuals and specialization, which has inherent noneconomic advantages.

Though professional and bureaucratic orientations have many things in common, they are different in some aspects. They have the tendency toward specialization or complex division of labor in common. In both cases, specialization is supposed to make the work more efficient. This assumption has been supported by Blau and Scott (1962). But those aspects of two systems which have different orientations create problems. For example, Merton's (1958) analysis of the constraints of bureaucratic structure on personalities includes a discussion of what happens when the division of labor, in carrying out the organizational goal, is too complex that the individual loses the sight of the total picture. This narrowing of focus is one of the factors which leads to an overconcern with procedures and an excessive rigidity and conformity with the rules, often to the detriment or chagrin of clients while professional specialization is supposed to provide the client with expert services (Simon, 1959).

It has also been noted that specialization tends to compartmentalize the organization into a number of separate, and often competing, units. For example, the attempt of one department to maximize its own performance in disregard of the welfare of other departments or of the welfare of total organizations, is called "suboptimization" (Dimock, 1959). Dimock continues that as individuals become loyal to their work group, it becomes the primary source of interest, and they tend to separate their group from others. Consequently they seek to expand their jurisdiction at the expense of others, which when carried to excess, it becomes dysfunctions.

Blau (1973:77), however, notes two distinctive divisions of labor in higher education: "the academic division of labor, which is identified by departments, and bureaucratic division of labor for administration, which is identified by titles." Blau states that departments are likely to be more independent than the functional divisions in a governmental bureau, with each having considerable influence in deciding on its own complement of departments of internal division of labor. Blau (1973) reveals that the division of labor for professors creates two opportunities: first, since the number of professors is limited, the process of social integration among them enhances. Second, as every professor instructs a limited number of courses, his/her level of specialization increases. Blau concludes that division of labor, in a university, makes the function of coordination difficult for the administration.

Summary

Bureaucracy has provided some features as a means of maximizing rational behavior, thereby dealing with uncertainty. This intended rational means permits organizations to plan, and noncommitantly, to predict. But uncertainty is not in accord with prediction. If organization is expected to predict, it has to limit uncertainty. If one agrees with this assumption, he/she should accept the function of bureaucracy, in spite of the dehumanizing effect that seems to accompany rationality. It is very difficult to eliminate the side effects of every feature and it is also irrational to ignore the benefit of every feature.

Professionalism

The industrial changes toward a knowledge economy have created a need for manpower that posses high levels of knowledge and skills. The result has been an increased professionalization of the workplace (Kaufman, 1974). It has been indicated that this increased level of professionalization has led to improvement of the professional social status. Parsons (1968) agrees to this point and states that the professionals occupy a position of importance in American society which is unique in history, but he suggests that professionals still need more freedom. Parsons argues that the professionals must be allowed to function smoothly if modern society would avoid great structural change. Barber (1978-1979) partially agrees with Parson's view; he maintains that professional freedom can contribute to the success of the society, but it also has side effects on the clients. Then Barber writes that everywhere in the United States, the professionals have reached a new height of social power and prestige. Everywhere, because of their special knowlege, they are of increasing consequence in the lives of individuals and in the affairs of group policy and society as a whole. Yet everywhere professionals are in trouble, criticized for their selfishness, their public irresponsibility, their lack of effective self-control, and their resistance to requests for more lay participation in vital decisions.

The sign of the trouble is manifest in organizations (especially professional organizations) when the professionals persist in taking leadership positions as part of their career progression (Luecke, 1973). Here, the professional standards of the expert often come into conflict with the administrative requirements of the managerial official (Blau, 1974). It has been indicated that a professional orientation toward disciplined compliance with procedures (Francies and Stone, 1965), and a professional identification with external preference group (Gouldner, 1957-1958; Caplow and McGee, 1958; Blau and Scott, 1962) are inconsistent with managerial procedure of coordination.

Before getting into a detailed discussion of professionalism, it is imperative to specify what elements constitute a profession; and how professionals, directed by the norm of their profession, interact with the organization in which they function. Literature addressing both concerns will be reviewed in this section. First, however, it is appropriate to present some brief information about professionalism.

Hall (1967) divided the professionals into three basic distinctive settings. Hall has labeled the first setting the "solo practitioner setting", which has served as the basis for the analysis of professionalism in general, the second setting includes such professional organizations as the law or accounting firm, social work agency, and medical clinic. The final setting embraces the large organization of which the professional department is but a part. Scott (1965), however, distinguishes two types of professional organizations, namely "autonomous" and "hetronomous". Scott states that autonomous organizations let professionals follow their professional standards rather than administrative requirements while heteronomous organizations make professionals conform to administrative directives rather than professional standards in one of them. The generally recognized differences in jurisdiction between bureaucratic and professional authority avert many potential conflicts. Blau (1973) identifies the role of a professor in a university setting. Blau writes that university administrators rarely, if ever, tell faculty members what topics to cover in their classes or how to conduct experiments, and faculty members acknowledge that class schedules must be coordinated by administrators, just as hospital administrators do not tell physicians how to perform operations, and physicians recognize the need of their schedules to be coordinated by administrators. Joughin has summarized the authority of the faculty as professional:

> The faculty has primarily responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter, methods of instruction; research; those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process; faculty status including appointments, promotions, reappointments decision, not to reappointment, the granting of tenure and dismissal (1969:53).

But jurisdictions cannot always be neatly separated, and conflicts arise when they cannot be. Blau states:

> A typical illustration of such an area of overlapping jurisdiction in academic institutions is the appointment of faculty members which involves budgetary commitments that are administrative responsibilities and judgements of specialized competence that are professional ones (1973:159).

This distribution in decision making and influence between the faculty and the administration is incongruent with the perception of professional autonomy. And it is assumed that it has a side effect on those professors who consider themselves independent professionals, responsible primarily to themselves and their peers rather than to their institutions. Further, their commitment is to their disciplines rather than to their universities (Jencks and Reisman, 1968). This evidence makes it difficult, if not impossible, to locate or define precisely whether professors are in the second category of Scott's typology or somehow in the first category. It can be assumed that they are in both categories.

The overlapping jurisdiction in a university creates a delicate issue in higher educational settings. It is counter-productive on the basis of Scott's (1965) suggestion which indicates that autonomy is highly valued by professionals, and any fluctuation in the degree of professional autonomy perceived by an individual may affect that person's relationship with the organization. It is imperative to identify the traits of professionalism to understand the professionals' claims.

The Professionals' Attributes

Many have attempted to establish a single model of professionalism, but their attempts have not been fruitful. One of the first theorists who have established a set of attributes to the concept of professionalism in the United States is Greenwood (1957). Greenwood expects that every professional should meet this set of criteria:

1. The basis in systematic theory;
2. Authority recognized by the client;
3. Broader community sanction and approval of that authority;
4. An ethical code regulating relations with clients and colleagues; and,
5. A professional culture sustained by professional association.

Barber (1963) also set criteria for the professional concept. These attributes are: (a) generalized and systematic knowledge; (b) primary orientation to the community interest; (c) self-control through the ethic of codes; and (d) rewards that end in themselves, not means to some end of individual self-interest; self-control through the ethic of codes. These criteria have also been indicated as professional attributes: first, every profession has a need for formal technical training accompanied by some institutionalized mode of validating both the adequacy of training and the competence of trained individuals. This training must lead to some order of mastery of a generalized cultural tradition, and do so in a manner giving prominence to an intellectual component; that is, it must give primary importance to the valuation of cognitive rationality as applied to a particular field. The second attribute is that not only the cultural tradition must be mastered, but in skills in some form of its use must also be developed. The third and final criterion is that a full fledged professional must have some institutional means of making sure that such competence will be put to socially responsible uses. The most obvious uses of professional criteria are in the sphere of practical affairs, such as the application of medical science to the cure of diseases. However, the skills of teaching and of research in the "pure" intellectual disciplines are also cases of such use (Parsons, 1968). Finally, Wilensky (1964) has set a rather consistent sequence of stages through which occupations pass on their way to becoming professional. They are:

1. Creation of full time occupation;
2. Establishment of a training institution;
3. Formation of a professional association;
4. Formation of code of ethics concerned with internal and external relations which are designed to be enforced by the professional association.

Hall (1968) labels these characteristics structural in nature and adds five attitudinal dimensions which relate closely to the individual and his profession:

1. The use of the professional organization as a major reference;
2. A belief in service to the public;
3. A belief in self-regulation;
4. A sense of calling to the field;
5. Autonomy-decision making free of inter and extra organization.

Hall makes up from the combination of these structural and attitudinal attributes a professional model. Hall (1967), on the basis of his attitudinal attributes of the model, developed a scale to measure the degree of professionalism of various occupations. In reporting several studies employing the instrument, Hall (1967) was pretty sure that the instrument measured adequately the attitudinal attributes of professionalism.

However, Hall's model of professionalism has been criticized by some authors. For instance, it has been found that approximately half of the original fifty items formulated by Hall fail to discretely measure the elements of professionalism that the instrument claims to measure. It has also been found that many remaining items were worded poorly and confused the respondents (Snizek, 1972).

Some scholars have limited the discussion of professionalism to fewer dimensions than those delineated by Hall. For example, three essential and somewhat independet attributes have been recommended as the distinctive characteristics of professionals; these features are knowledge, self control and public responsibilities (Parsons, 1968; Durkheim, 1957; Barber, 1963; Wilensky, 1964; Moore, 1970; Reingold, 1976).

These three dimensions of professionalism are each important to the understanding of how professionals function in an organization. Individual discussion of those dimensions which are important to this reseach is therefore in order.

Knowledge

Knowledge is the outcome of specified, rigorous inquiry which originated within the framework of human experience and functions in human experience (Good, 1959). It has also been indicated that knowledge is one of the most important generalized bases of power or consequentiality in systems of human action (Barber, 1978; 1979). Barber refers to knowledge as the whole range of symbols or ideas which define the means and ends, the interests and values, the beauties, and the ultimate meanings of human action. Horkheimer (1972) specifically points out that professional knowledge is acquired through learning experiences, socialization, cognition, or even through a spiritual consciousness; consequently, obtained knowledge with these characteristics is limited to training schools. The same author maintains that the more established professional knowledge should be acquired at the established universities.

Even the proponents of the professionalization in applying the term of knowledge as a precise, measurable trait of a professional are in trouble. Wilensky (1964), for instance, argues that systematic knowledge based on long training is important. Yet, the problem in clarifying how one is to tell if an occupation has such knowledge, since knowledge must be neither too technical nor too common. Wilensky puts:

> In the technical base of an occupation consists of a vocabulary that sounds similar to every one . . . or if the base is scientific but so narrow that it can be learned as a set of values by most people, then the occupation will have difficulty claiming a monopoly or skill or even a roughly exclusive jurisdiction. In short, there may be an optimal base for professional practice. Neither too vague nor too precise neither too broad nor too narrow (1964:148).

This definition of knowledge "neither too broad nor too narrow" makes the nature of a knowledge base very difficult, if not impossible, to apply. Jamous and Pelloile argue that this definition creates a continuing dilemma faced by members of a profession. These two authors show the dilemma:

> Either to act with a view to a greater control of their practice by making it more technical, by codifying it . . . but in doing this, to give the possibilities of intervention and access to all those whose social qualities set them outside it. On the other hand to make use of their qualities in order to continue to monopolize their fields ideological, rationalization about its nature, its function and so avoid all possibility of intervention and appraisal from outside (1970:119).

Knowledge, by this definition, makes the practioners able to change and shape the characteristics of their occupation according to their needs and interests. Further, this type of knowledge also makes problems distinguishable between crafts and professionals. For instance, Hall (1975) notes that professions stress mental prowess, whereas crafts stress manual dexterity. In other words, professions are built on theoretical knowledge, but crafts are not. According to this argument, a surgeon can be understood as a craftsman, and a mechanic who understands the theory of an engine and goes through search procedures to diagnose difficulties and repair them might be called a professional. This analogy indicates that the line between craftsmen and professionals is not clear on the basis of the mentioned definition. Consequently, it can be argued that social perception might be more important to accept these criteria than the degree of mental prowess and theoretical knowledge (Hall, 1975).

This ambiguity of knowledge has led Freidson (1973a) to indicate that the real difference between craftsmen and professionals is where the knowledge is obtained, thus, Freidson puts it:

> The contemporary professions might be regarded as an educated, middle class variant of the occupational principle of organization already presented by the working-class crafts, the difference between two being that the claim for autonomy and self control among professionals is usually based on formal "higher" education rather than on trade school or long apprenticeship in practicing manual skill said to require judgement (1973a:22).

Freidson's argument, however, is not consistent with Jamous and Peloille's view (1970) that a few persons should own knowledge, whereas acquiring a degree in higher education is not an ordeal or a privilege in America, it has become a right. The evidence, however, shows that knowledge on basis of professional qualification is not accurately measurable and at the same time, the concept of knowledge has limitations. For example, in the past, scholars believed that the earth was flat, and that the sun turned around the earth. But scientists have proven that they were wrong. Scholars did not accept the theory of evolution as truth in the past, but now it has become a reality. Therefore, it is plausible to be skeptical about the perfection of knowledge of a professional and accept that the granting of professional status to an occupation is partially a class issue. Rueschemeyer (1973) has indicated that many features are considered specific characteristics of upper-class and upper-middle-class life and structure. Therefore, the use of the knowledge based as a defining characteristic fails to adequately differentiate professions from non-professions. Calhoun states:

> The ultimate standard for what was true in legal knowledge lay in what the state or the public wanted, not in a scientific or transcendent perception to which men had to train their faculties (1965:193).

The evidence of knowledge limitation has created the areas of uncertainties in every discipline, and these uncertainties have made some social forces partly shape some traits of professionals according to the norms of the influential class in the society. Crozier (1964) states the uncertainties lead to unpredictabilities, and these provisions help professionals apply a set of attributes for the definition of the concept of professionalism which is not accurately measurable. Consequently, scientifically based professions can hardly specify all the important variables and their interrelations; thus, some categorization schemes for interpreting data and manipulating raw materials are crude or ambiguous (Fox, 1957). Kuhn (1970) notes that some of these uncertainties are simply holes in the knowledge base that may be filled later by research; but others based on inherent limitations of the scientific enterprise phenomena anomalous to the profession's paradigm may be classified or ignored entirely.

In the literary-based professions, uncertainties involve the varying interpretations that can be made of nonscientific language, as well as basic inconsistencies among positions in the knowledge base. Knowledge uncertainty requires what Perrow (1967) calls "nonroutine technology," because exceptions and inconsistencies are frequently encountered. This situation becomes contradictory to classifications, and as a result, the rules for such interpretations become provisional and search techniques cannot be rationalized. This evidence indicates that exactness of knowledge developed to date remains open to further reinforcement.

Goodle (1977) writes that according to the criteria of professionalism, the professors are considered the most highly knowledgeable group among professionals for three reasons: (a) they are required to have high levels educational training, (b) they create and generalize knowledge, and (c) they teach the most generalized knowledge to the future professionals. Blau (1973) identifies academic work as probably the polar case of work being based on different bodies of knowledge. The concept of knowledge, as in medicine, can also be general. The same is true for law and the ministry. Blau continues that one cannot be a general practioner in "academicology". As a matter of fact, there is no such word, because there is no such discipline. The same writer states that, in terms of this criterion, though different academic disciplines may be considered professionals, the entire academic community cannot be so considered.

Autonomy

The term autonomy, or self-control, has been defined as, "guidance or regulation of behavior with relative or complete freedom from outside control, applied to the activities of either an individual, group or society" (Page et al., 1977). Barber (1978-1979) reasons that since generalized and systematic knowledge is esoterically known and controlled by only a relatively few occupational specialists as a result of considerable and continuing training and work, its development and application require a considerable amount of self-control or autonomy for those who specialize in these tasks. Gross (1958) adds that self-control is effected through a number of different social control mechanisms, such as inculcation of high cognitive and moral standards, and the use of informal peer controls and ethical codes. Gross states that autonomy makes the practitioner able to make decisions without external pressures from clients, those who are not members of his profession or from his employing organizations.

Elliot's (1972) analysis of professionalism as a substantial theoretical body of knowledge as a crucial variable allowing an occupation to gain professional autonomy cannot be sufficient. What is important to the same author is that kind of knowledge which is acceptable to the influential class of society. Elliot states that instead of concentrating on abstract knowledge, it is essential to realize those resources contribute to successful professionalization. Elliot concludes that the authority of professionals stems from linkages to the wider social structure. Johnson (1972) also sees the source of self regulations of professionals in their relationships with the different social groups. Johnson (1977) indicates that professionalism, involving colleague control of activities, can arise only where the ideological and political progresses sustaining in determinations coincide with requirements of capital. The same writer expresses that the power of an occupation can be strengthened by establishing positive relationships with those groups who possess power. It has been indicated that these sources of relationships have provided professionals a condition to monopolize their professions and to promote their incomes and prestige (Gilb, 1966;

Freidson, 1970; Johnson, 1972; Klegon, 1975; Berlant, 1975; Auerbach, 1976; Larson, 1979). Monopoly gives them more opportunities than autonomy. Hughes (1958) realizes that monopoly allows the professionals to research freely and to rationalize their own uncertainties with little or no outside challenge. The same scholar maintains that they generally rationalize for themselves and others the reason behind their ignorance, the explanation for their capriciousness. For instance, when scientists face in defining, conflicting, or unpredicting findings, they habitually refer to them as unidentified variables, inadequate controls, insufficient data sampling error, measurement error, experimenter effects and the like. Until disconfirming evidence is overwhelming, the scholars do not question the overall validity of their own paradigm, theoretical perspective or methodology (Kuhn, 1970; Merton, 1973). Both mentioned writers argue that professional attitudes on this type of interpretations are stemmed from their discretion to avoid endangering their interests and those of their protectors.

Although professors are considered highly professional from the point of professionalization, they have never enjoyed the type of professional status that lawyers and clergymen have enjoyed (Ringer, 1969). Shryock (1952) notes that the quasi-employee status of academic men lowers their general authority. Fuchs (1962) argues that professors should have more authority, but at the same time he reminds us that working in a bureaucratic setting requires some modification of professional aspirations for autonomy. Blau (1973) emphasizes that although professors do not enjoy absolute autonomy, they almost enjoy a significant autonomy and self-regulation. Blau reasons that since the work of specialized experts is too complicated to be accurately judged by laymen, fellow specialists are the only ones qualified to evaluate it. This principle has become institutionalized in professional associations that claim sole jurisdiction of over licensing professionals and in judging their work, and in university faculties demand freedom for administrative interference in evaluating academic work and making faculty appointments. Such authority of professionals, including academics, which rests on institutionally recognized expert knowledge, conflicts with administrative authority, which is based on official positions in a bureaucratic hierarchy. It must be kept in mind that the level of defined self-regulation varies in different higher education institutions. According to the Carnegie Commission of Higher Education (1973) the different institutions delegate the different level of authority to their faculty. It continues that private institutional professors usually have more freedom than public ones.

Service to the Public

Just because of its consequences for human affairs, power of any kind is always restricted in some measure by social and political controls. The power of every kind of specialist is always too important to the public welfare for it to be left to the specialist themselves; that is, in the case of professional power, the necessary granting of a considerable degree of obligation to exercise their power clearly and directly for the welfare of their clients and the public (Barber, 1978-1979). Gross (1958) defines that the belief in service to public includes the idea of indispensibility of the profession and the view that the work performed benefits both the public and practitioner. Goode (1969) places emphasis on the altruistic aspect of professionalism and declares it as vital to the acceptance of professionals within organizations. He maintains that the professional community should provide a set of controls which engender a desire on the part of individuals to conform to professional norms. If society believes that the professional is regulated by this collectivity orientation, it will grant professionals a measure of autonomy or freedom from lay control or supervision.

But when the professionals attempt to increase their status and incomes via their knowledge and skills, they defame the concept of service to public or altruism. Here, their knowledge and skills can be seen at the service of special vested interest groups (Friedson, 1973b). Mills (1971:308) charges that scientists conceal their conservative default, he means that they accept official definitions of world reality uncritically. "What scientists, Mills asks, can claim to be a part of the legacy of science and yet remained to be a part of technician of the military machine". Chomsky (1971) identifies the inability of some academic intellectuals and condemns them in that their activities are planned to meet the needs of economic interests. He claims that the scholarly utilitarian service of indiscriminatingly adapting to every demand manifests that they do whatever possible for maintaining personal interests and power. Louis elaborates the function of some professors who have ignored their professional norms:

> On all military fronts, infiltration, manipulation, indirect and direct armed forces, confrontation universities provided essential resources for waging more effective battles. Without the scholarly efforts of political scientisits, psychologists, and anthropologists, controlling isolating rebels and managing social changes in a backward society, would be impossible. Without the brainpower of engineers, physicists,

> chemists, biologists and computer experts, sophisticated military hardware for detecting and destroying insurgents would not be available (1973:214).

Horowitz (1971) also charges that many academics have ignored their professional responsibilities and responded favorably to the demands of monied military-industrial interests. These arguments, however, demonstrate that professional service cannot guarantee the security of the public on the simply assertion of the professional ethics. Meanwhile, it is necessary to mention that some scholars do not agree with professors serve the needs of clients in their roles as scientists and scholars in different disciplines. Academics do not have clients, as Hughes (1958) emphasizes, and thus are not professionals. In their role as teachers, which the academics in the various disciplines share, they have students whose needs they are expected to serve. Blau (1973) states that university students, particularly advanced students, are not really clients, and university faculties are experts in their various disciplines and not in teaching, which finds institutionalized expression in the fact that they are neither trained nor licensed to teach. If scholarship is the aim, the relationship is not that between practitioner and client, but between scholar and the student who is being socialized to become a fellow expert, whereas professionals do not seek to transform their best clients into colleagues. However, Forsyth and Danisiwicz (1979) reason that existing theories of professionalism fail to account for occupational characteristics, environmental response, and political and power-enhancing mechanism which might affect the attitudes which professionals hold concerning the values of their profession. These authors state that attitudinal autonomy is the product of professional preparation.

Summary

Professional autonomy has been viewed by some as a model against which professions are measured. Different authors present different criteria to differentiate professions from non-professions without considerable success. Once definitional attempts are de-emphasized and a more critical perspective adopted, it becomes apparent that the ability to obtain and maintain professionalism is closely related to both concrete occupational strategies, as well as wider social forces and arrangements of power, that is, the existence of both an internal and external dynamic of professionalism. By examining those dynamics, we begin to understand the social meaning of occupational tasks, the resources behind the emergence and continued existence of an occupational form such as professionalism, and the social meaning of an occupation.

Alienation

The term "alienation" has become the all-explaining catchword of the hour in all the social sciences, in psychology and psychiatry, and in literary circles. It is to current social "thought" what "progress" "evolution", "trends", and "identity" were to previous periods. As used today, however, "alienation" appears to vary from "disenchantment" to "disinvolvement" to "isolation". Traditionally, and especially in legal usage it was employed to refer to estrangement of an owner from his possession of real or other property. It also took on the sense of a person becoming separated from his reason, thus "insane" (McClung, 1972:121).

However, the incorporation of aleination into our everyday language not only indicates the general popularity of social science concepts, it also highlights the extent to which attempts are made to describe and comprehend important manifestations of industrial and post-industrial society through this term. Meanwhile, the wide use of the word raises the question once again about the degree to which social scientific knowledge and consciousness of men about the society in which they live condition one another: to what extent is there a "feeling of alienation because the term alienation is in vogue" (Ludz, 1976:4)?

Disregarding such fundamental philosophical or even theological problems raised by the term "alienation", its popularity serves to increase existing terminology ambiguity. Thus, in contrast to people's immediate comprehension in everyday language, those engaged in scientific inquiry have to admit a certain helplessness. We shall always be reduced to confusion when we read "alienation" (Kaufman, 1970).

Perhaps the most graphic description of the alienated man can be found in creative literature. Cervante's Don Quixote, Kafka's The Castle, Rousseaus Emile and John Osborne's Inadmissible Evidence all depict man in alienated conditions. According to Putnam (1978) the aforementioned authors apply this concept to show man's inability to cope with his society and fellow man, his failure to achieve a satisfactory measure of self-realization, and his ignorance of the condition under which his life might have been happy.

Marcuse (1966) traces the origin of the term from the point of philosophy to Aristotelian logic which sought to order, to classify, and to master reason. In this course, reason becomes increasingly antagonistic to that which is receptive rather than productive. This antagonism embodies alienation. From Aristotle, the concept can be traced to Hegel, who made the great effort to both justify and cancel out the fact of alienation (Bernstein, 1971). The concept of alienation according to the phenomenology of the mind has one sense for Hegel, "It pertains to an awareness on the part of an individual that he has become separated from something from which he is not essentially different and with which he was formerly unified." Denise (1973:152) says that it is in this sense that the term shows an affinity with the term "alien" in certain of its uses. Marx's usage of the term embraces two senses: (a) transfer or externalization is prevalent in his view of religion, money, the state and family; (b) the estrangement is its second meaning. Estrangement pertains alienation from work, alienation from self, from others, and from nature (Kaplan, 1976).

The number of potential externalizations and estrangements is theoretically infinite. Feuerlicht (1978) indicates that since the middle of the twentieth century the word alienation has often been used by itself, without any such reference. He continues that it has joined in everyday usage the series of words expressing a vague, unhappy, and fashionable uneasiness, a wretched hope of helplessness, misery and insecurity, sometimes associated with voluntary or involuntary isolation. This term now stands last in a very old line of similar forms of mental anguish. For instance, Thoreau (1963.8) declares that "Tedium and enni are as old as Adam." Nisbet, (1965:1) quotes Memford that in the Middle Ages "Acedia," a boredom generated by a very regulated life, was "the bane of monastic existence." It involved a "sense of futility, a paralyzing estrangement from God and man". "It was perhaps a mixture of self-alienation, work alienation, social alienation, and alienation from God" (Feuerlicht, 1978:5).

It has been indicated that French authors had several forms of a vague malaise in the first half of the nineteenth century. One was simply the inexpressible malaise felt by the young people of Musset's generation (Feuerlicht quotes Alfred de Musset, 1978:5). The term has also been used "collective sadness" for Durkheim (1972) "malaise" for Freud, (1976) "nausea" for Satre (1948) and "collective plague" for Camus (1953). This term has also been used as a disease from which our age is dying (Roszak, 1973) and many kinds of sickness (Kenneth, 1971). For some, it denotes nothing more than despepsia (Rosenberg, 1964).

Some observers, far from calling alienation a sickness or a misfortune or deriding it as a fad or a phony, find it normal, necessary, and healthy. These scholars relate the term to the intellectuals. For instance, alienation plays a positive role (Bell, 1960), there is something valuable in it or a great deal of creative energy is generated by alienation (Alvarez, 1971). Finally, it has been concluded that from alienation can spring poetry, painting, art and the highest achievement of culture (Keniston, 1965). A few writers believe that alienation in the intellectual is the only stance productive of social insight or moral probity (Hofstadter, 1970), Mills (1956:159) adds that the alienation of the intellectuals gives them "the capacity to formulate radical views and higher standards" and even Keniston (1965) points out the constructive social contribution of the alienated intellectuals. The fact that the word alienation can be applied in a neutral sense, in a negative sense or in a positive sense, might discourage the writer from using it. Its evasiveness and pervasiveness is sometimes the despair of scientists. Some are overwhelmed and even shocked by its vagueness and the number of meanings it may have. Thus, alienation has become an ambiguous and slippery cliche (Levi, 1967) and Keniston (1965) finds the use of the word alienation "highly arbitrary."

What is perhaps worse that this extraordinary variety of psychol-social disorders is the fact that the word alienation is widely used for opposite meanings. It may denote estrangement of self from society as well as estrangement from self through society (Rosenberg, 1965), or it may stand "for apathy and rebellion, conformity and deviance, social isolation and the hippie commune" (Seeman, 1971:483). No wonder scholars look at the term critically because of its preciseness. It has been indicated as a superfluous concept (Feuer, 1967) or meant as a rumbling dissatisfaction with society (Bell, 1966). Despite rejecting the use of alienation as a scientific word (Lobkawicz, 1967; Kon, 1967; Berman, 1968; Denise, 1973), they themselves have claimed that that term is useful, and admitted that they cannot do without it (McClung, 1972).

On the other hand, many scholars have emphasized the importance of alienation. Alienation has become a key concept in the social sciences (Nisbet, 1962; Oken, 1973). Etzioni (1968:618) calls alienation "a concept of the critical intellectual and the social scientist." Hausler (1965) realizes that nothing better expresses the nature and origin of the culture crisis of our time than the concept of alienation.

It has been recommended to clarify the meaning of the concept rather than reject it as merely fashionable (Williams, 1976). Touraine

(1971:7) even states that "alienation, that much criticized notion, is now more useful than ever."

But some of the critics who still attack the concept of alienation want it to be replaced by another, more helpful and specific term. For example, Israel (1971) suggests that it be replaced by reification, and he argues that reification is a specific social process occuring under certain social consequences. Lucas (1971) applied reification as identical to alienation, but he himself conceded that it is neither socially nor conceptually identical to alienation. Bell (1962) sees in reification just one of the two key meanings of alienation. The other one is estrangement. It has been indicated that reification is only one of the manifestations of alienation, albeit the most radical one. Furthermore, as a substitute for alienation, reification sounds too technical, too reified, one might say; the term lacks any emotional overtones (Feuerlicht, 1978).

In addition to reification the term "exploitation" has been suggested as a substitute for alienation, but it has been noticed that "exploitation" might satisfy the critics who stress capitalist greed, injustice, and manipulation; at the same time it is even less comprehensive than the term reification. "One can be exploited without feeling alienated and can feel alienated without being exploited" (Feuerlicht, 1978:13). Finally, it has been suggested that "today it is more useful to speak of alienation than of exploitation" (Touraine, 1971:8). It should be noted that the numerous proposals which are assumed to restrict, drop or replace the term with another one do not seem productive. Nonetheless, the need to limit the use of the work is obvious.

After a lengthy, and thorough investigation of the use of the word alienation, Schact (1970) suggets three restrictions of its use. The first restriction indicates that the concept should only be used when what it is supposed to denote was preceded by union. This suggestion is contradicted by the usage in Schact's book itself. He himself describes alienation as feelings of alieness. Certain things are apprehended, a separate, or strange . . . or remote . . ., etc. There is no mention of previous unity or identity. The second restriction of the concept consists of applying it only to cases where "feelings of alieness are involved" not where inadequacies, disparities, and so on, are objectively determined by writers who have their own criteria for the existence of such disparities and consider them applicable whenever these criteria are satisfied, regardless of whether the individuals have any awareness of the disparities, let alone accept the validity of criteria (Schact, 1970). This restriction flies in the face of Etzioni who considers the feelings of alienated individuals as irrelevant: The concept of alienation does not assume that the alienated are aware of their condition . . . the roots of alienation are not in . . . "intrapsychic processes" but in the "societal and political structure" (Feuerlicht, 1978:15). Feuerlict states that this restriction would exclude much of what Hegel, Tillich, Heidegger, Fromm, Marcuse, and many others have said about alienation. Aron (1968) calls the "unconscious" type of alienation, the worst form of alienation. Marcuse (1964) believes that alienation may even be involved where the person feels satisfied and not alienated. Schact's third restriction of the concept excludes using it as a critical and polemical term denoting something undesirable. Schact thinks this non-evaluative use of alienation is "most consistent" with restriction concerning the feelings of alienation (Schact, 1970). The second provision is not consistent with the third one. Feuerlicht (1978) states that the objectivity which Schact excludes in the second limitation becomes a must in the third one. More importantly, where feelings of alienation are involved, the term may not be used polemically; but from being neutral, it is mostly critical and expresses something undesirable. While it has been noted that the "will to criticize and polemize is precisely the essential intent behind the idea of alienation" (Feuer, 1969:129). Levi (1967:254) emphasizes that alienation is "essentially the subject of negative statement," and Johnson (1973a:34) states that alienation is generally used to describe "the failure to find certain propitious circumstances which the individual feels should be available to him." It is the absence of certain events in the life of persons or groups that ought to be encountered. Therefore, even though the term permits a variety of meanings, it seems that the overwhelming, emotional connotations of the term are negative, depicting frustrated and hostile separation from various desirable ends. Numerous applications of the term persuade Schact (1976) to recommend the application of the term within one or both of two broad areas: human subjectivity and human objectivity, experimental states and social relations, that is, what people feel and what people do. The focus is on psychological states - upon people's perceptions of, feelings about and attitudes toward the situations and relationships in which they find themselves. It is not any feelings in terms of which forms of alienation are to be conceived, however; the relevancies are those which involve certain types of discords, discrepancies or separations. Schact (1976) believes that these forms of alienation are contextual in the sense that they might be called a perspective - relative character. It means the dissatisfactions in which they consist center upon states of affairs which are experienced as dissatisfying, owning at least in part to the perspective from which they are viewed and interpreted. These dissatisfactions, however, are inextricably bound up with the self-understanding, beliefs, conceptual repertoire, attitudes, desires and feelings of those who experience their organizations. In the ensuing section the classification of the term by theorists will be discussed.

Classification of Alienation

Alienation has different interpretations, origins, and aspects. The statement that "it may very well be that alienation is not a unitary phenomenon but a syndrom" is almost a truism (Dean, 1961:758). Therefore, the historical definition of the term such as Durckheim's anomie (1952), Fromm's self estrangement (1955) and Mannheim's meaningless (1940) cannot be subjected to empirical testing. If one wants to measure the term, one has to have the option of speaking of different dimensions, varieties, types or symptoms, even though there is no consensus on the kind and number of dimensions.

Heineman (1958) writes that alienation is a multidimensional phenomenon which distinguishes a psychological, a psychopathological, and a sociological dimension. Levi (1967) who, like Heineman is primarily concerned with existentialism, speaks of three other dimensions: fragmentation, mechanization and distantiation. However, Levi's philosophic article, in spite of its insight and wide range, hardly drew the attention it deserved, while Seeman's psychological analysis "On the meaning of alienation" has been very influential in many fields (1959:472). Seeman devoted himself to two tasks in this article: (1) to make more organized sense of one of the great traditions in sociological thought, and, (2) to make the traditional interest in alienation more amendable to sharp empirical statement. Seeman (1972a) speaks of the task of being to produce a specific and unique social indicator, rather than global indicators of the individual's feelings of happiness or despair, well-being or discontent, futility or optimism. Behind these explicitly stated purposes was the less overt desire to "secularize" the alienation concept (Ludz, 1973). Seeman (1959:791) himself writes that his aim is "to translate what was sentimentally understood into a secular question." Here alienation, seen from the personal standpoint of the actor, is thus treated from a "social-psychological" point of view.

Seeman distinguishes five types, basic ways, alternative meanings or variants of alienation: "powerlessness, meaningless, isolation, normlessness, and self-estrangement" (Seeman, 1959:783).

Powerlessness

Powerlessness, derived by Seeman from the works of Marx and Max Weber (Ludz, 1976). Seeman (1959:784) suggests that this aspect of alienation can be conceived as "the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurence of the outcomes or reinforcement, he seeks." Professors may feel powerless about their ability to affect academic events. Concerning powerlessness, which Seeman calls "perhaps the most frequent usage in current literature" (1959:784). Feuer points out that the all-powerful Stalin was also alienated. Stalin was "estranged from the mankind around him and the social aspirations which once had partially moved him" (Feuer, 1969:130). Feuerlicht (1978) adds that the sense of powerlessness can go together with affection and identification. He maintains that the powerless student was anything but strange from his alma mater years ago, or the powerless followers of dictators may adore them. It is precisely because of his own powerlessness that the believer may love God. Seeman argues with his critics because he defines "powerlessness" as the expectancy of probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurence of outcome or reinforcement he seeks. Further, Seeman distinguishes his expectancy for control of events from the objective situation of powerlessness. Finally Feuerlicht (1978:98) points out that Seeman, himself, arbitrarily "limits the applicability of the concept of alienation to expectancies that have to do with the individual's sense of influence over socio-political events."

Meaninglessness

Meaninglessness, in the sense that norms are unclear, is derived from Karl Manheim's thesis concerning the decline of "substantial rationality" and the increase of "functional rationality" as well as from the research on the authoritarian personality (Ludz, 1976:21). According to Seeman (1959:786), meaninglessness is characterized by "low expectancy that satisfactory predictions about future outcomes of behaviors can be made." Meaninglessness, as a component of alienation, is represented by the feeling of the individual that a clarity of what should be believed does not exist for him as an individual, consequently, the individual is in a situation which makes it impossible for him to act on a given belief and to be able to satisfactorily determine the probable consequences of such action. "The essential problem of the alienated group is that they have not found a satisfactory avenue or channel of growth toward adult competence" (Havinghurst and Stiles, 1961:284).

Normlessness

Normlessness is derived from Durkheim's and Merton's views of anomie, in which norms are seen as losing their regulative force (Ludz, 1976). Normlessness is characterized by "high expectancy that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve given goals" (Seeman, 1959: 788), because the society provides inadequate socially approved means for attaining goals that are socially emphasized, such as becoming wealthy. According to this dimension, an individual believes that socially unapproved behaviors are often required to achieve his goals (Stinchombe, 1964). Therefore, the course of action which leads to immediate gratification is preferred to formally prescribed rules which are deferred goal oriented. However, violation of rules and regulations to the normless persons is appropriate if it leads to immediate gratifications which are seen as preferential to uncertain future goals.

Isolation

The fourth type of alienation is "isolation." Isolation, "in the sense of not sharing the dominant values and beliefs of the surrounding culture" (Klinger, 1977:205). Exception can also be taken to Seeman's description of isolation. Klinger states that "alienation is here taken from the social-psychological view" at the outset of Seeman's article, but Seeman (1959:783) excludes in the discussion of isolation the "lack of social adjustment, the warmth and security or intensity of an individual's social contacts", which is certainly a "social psychological" phenomenon. Klinger (1977:205) maintains that "the aleinated in the isolation are those who, like the intellectual," assign low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society." This concept of isolation is uncommon. Feuerlicht (1978:98) uses Seeman's words to "assign low reward value to beliefs that are highly valued" and notes isolation as a state of feeling of the individual in mass society who lacks close contacts with his fellows and fills himself pitted against everybody else and manipulated by invisible, inaccessible, and inexorable powers. Seeman (1972) realizes this flaw and increases the social isolation to his five-dimensional alienations. Feuerlicht (1978) specifies that popular culture is not the culture of the society, but of a great number of people, further, intellectuals are highly committed to another unpopular culture, and intellectuals feel and consider their detachment from popular culture neither as isolation nor as alienaion. He concludes that alienation is the creature of an emotional bond or where such a bond is desirable, while this is not true in the case of intellectuals.

Self-Estrangement

The fifth and last type of alienation in Seeman's scheme is self-estrangement. In one sense, this feature of alienation is more like the master theme in alienation studies than simply a variety of it, hence the literature that one could encompass under this rubric-alienation taken as the failure of self-realization is almost inexhaustible. Scholars from Marx to Satre have sought to identify the ways in which people in society come to experience and adopt inauthentic, self-changed life styles (O'Neill, 1972). This commonality of general focus, however, has hardly made for any substantial coherence in the treatment of self-estrangement. It may refer to the failure to realize one's human potential (Marcuse, 1964), or it may indicate to the individual's level of self-esteem or to a sensed discrepancy between one's preferred qualities and realized qualities (Coopersmith, 1967), sometimes to repressed or distorted psycho-pathologies (Laing and Esterson, 1965), or to the loss of identity (Rainwater, 1970), it may also refer to behavior that is more or less a form of "bad faith" with oneself (Satre, 1948). It sometimes refers to behavior that is more or less ritualized or stereotyped (Seeman, 1966), or related to action which is characterized by a disjunction between behavior and affect (Johnson, 1973b).

Each of these approaches has its own advantages and disadvantages. But since this wide range of approaches can neither be covered nor clarified here, this study concentrates on the version of self-estrangement proposed by Seeman (1959). Seeman limits "the self-estrangement" to an individual who engages in activities that are not rewarding in themselves. This meaning of Seeman's self-estrangement has been derived originally from the Marxian depiction of work which has become an instrumentalized means rather than a creative end in itself, though Schact (1976) advances objections to this "subjectivized" derivation from the Marxian view. Seeman (1976) emphasizes that the construction of self-estrangement, with its emphasis on instrumentalized activity, bears an important resembalance to two aspects of interaction that are regularly identified as alienated styles: first, complaints are often advanced concerning the treatment of others instrumentally, as objects or abstract means rather that intrinsically as "human" or "whole" persons, such instrumental treatment being one of the signs of alienation; and second there is considerable talk about succumbing to the "reification" process, meaning essentially to a distortion of experience wherein interaction and institutions are transformed into commodities and objects into things (Seeman, 1976). The key point is that these two processes namely; "depersonalization" and "reification" are regularly known as forms of alienation, but they do not have an affinity with the self-estrangement under review here. Self-estrangement refers to a person who undertakes work or other activities exclusively to gain approval or rewards from other people, rather than share in their own exploitation (Aronowitz, 1973; Kaplan, 1970). The alternative argument is that changes encouraging participation in decision making are tied to improvement in job characteristics and are regularly accompanied by positive effects on the workers' participation in community-wide affairs, as well as on productivity itself (Kerr et al., 1979). Greater details of work alienation will be discussed after reviewing the critics' comments on classification of alienation.

Comments on Classification of Alienation

Seeman's compartmentalization of the alienation concept into five or six meanings has served as a guideline to nearly all social scientists who have dealt with alienation after publication of the 1959 article. Yet, there are some criticisms of his formulation. It is impossible to enumerate here all the arguments which have been raised, but some of those criticisms which represent the strongest challenge to his view will be discussed. Scott (1963) maintained that Seeman has provided nothing but an ad hoc listing of various meanings of alienation which fails to indicate relations among the variants. Seeman (1972) has accepted his critics' arguments and made a lenthy dialogue with them. Seeman distinguishes among four different attempts to find a concept that embraced and unifies the variant meaning of alienation he has detected, he has made efforts to restore unity, first, through "a conception of social process"; second, though "a conception of social prerequisits", third, through "statistical coherence"; and, finally, through "identification of a core theme". But he has conceded that his attempts are not very successful, and he has not been able to solve the basic problem of formulating specific variables which may be brought together in the alienation theory so as to permit operationalization and to favor the generation of hypotheses.

Zollschan and Gibeau (1964) have taken up an interesting approach not mentioned by Seeman. They make efforts to modify Seeman's meaning of alienation somewhat and to combine them in a paradigm of conditions for alienation with respect to a given goal. Ludz (1976) notes that although this contribution is stimulating because it provides several valuable insights for psychology and the psychoanalytic theory of personality, but their approach is not broad enough to measure alienation. The evidence points to the fact that alienation functions as a general term which marks out a wide range of conditions of estrangement or separation of individuals or groups from a variety of social circumstances. Indeed Seeman (1972) himself, as well as Schact, (1970; 1976) attributes this range of substantive refrents to alienation. It means that through alienation one can grasp certain aspects of man's malintegration with the large social order. In this case, the concept of sociology should be conceived as pertaining to the realm of soci-psychology.

A systematization of the substantive references of the word alienation has to include both the Marxist and the empirical analytical usage. Both types of application of the term, although appearing to be diametrically opposed, show some points of contact. These will best be revealed if the concentration is to be centered on the systemization of alienation according to specific references (Ludz, 1976). After all, Marx was the first person who classified manifestations of alienation in such a way. He distinguished the type of alienation which is experienced at the place of work in a bureaucratic situation (Axelos, 1976). The same writers maintain that alienation of man at his work is caused by the need for man to sell his labor and abandon his products to whoever may buy it. Therefore, it is appropriate to present some theorists' views on "alienation from work."

Alienation From Work

In his development of a theory of human nature, Marx saw man's essential or unique social activity as labor (Axelos, 1976). Marx means that humanity is a self-defining, historical phenomenon which emerges in the course of productive activities and the creation of products as a result of these activities. Plasek (1947:317) states that "by means of a process of praxis mankind simultaneously engages the creation of himself and of his world while performing productive activities." Marx believes that bureaucratic situation of work is inconsistent with the nature of man. He sees man at work, and he sees work as the externalization and manifestation of man that, as a reifiying externalization, is his alienation. He opposes Hegel's concept of work. He offers his own; and in so doing, he passes from the sphere of metaphysics and the phenomenology of mind to that of historical physics and political economy (Marx, 1977).

The outstanding achievement of Hegel's phenomenology and of its final outcome, the dialectic of negativity as the moving and generating principle, is thus first that Hegel conceives objectification as loss of the object, as alienation and as transcendence of this alienation (Kaplan, 1976). Kaplan states that Marx criticizes Hegel to the effect that Hegel grasped labor as the essence of man - as man's essence in the act of providing itself, he sees only the positive, not the negative side of labor. Labor is man's coming to be for himself within externalization or as externalized man. Marx realizes that when the workers have little control over what they produce or the conditions under which they produce things, they become alienated. Since their products are directed from oustside themselves, and since they are themselves merely instruments, they have difficulty in identifying their products with themselves; therefore, "a key factor in worker alienation is the worker's powerlessness in the face of the industrial organization that governs production" (Klinger, 1977:209). Consequently, "the life which a worker gives to his product opposes him as something alien" (Marx, 1977:79). Feuerlicht (1978) challenges Marx's definition of labor.

Feuerlicht writes that Marx's explanation of alienation from nature is not on logical or psychological grounds. One is at least equally justified in saying that the worker can, or even must, experience that part of the outside world which is not the product of his work, and Feuerlicht (1978:131) says "that is the whole, rather than merely a part." In a quite different manner, as a contrast to the hated work, as a consolidation, as a relief. Feuerlicht claims that exploited workers may be extreme in the life of species in order to abolish all alienated labor. It has also been indicated that Marx's alternatives, namely socialism or communism, cannot solve the problem of work alienation (Althusser, 1969; Petrovic, 1967; Fromm, 1962).

However, Marx was not the only scholar who denounced the industrial type of work as alienating and dehumanizing. The social and psychological effects of the industrial revolution were too obvious and widespread. Mass production, the degrading conditions of work, and the use of machines and methods, which were getting more and more complicated, influenced the feeling, thinking, and living of millions in a terrifying way. Swados (1962) states that most of the work done before the industrial revolution was neither creative nor dignified. The Egyptian slaves, the Roman galley slaves and the Russian surfs hardly expressed in their work their creative urge and potential. Swados maintains that work has been a bitter experience historically. He maintains that for thousands of years, men and women, children and old people had groaned under the burden of work. Swados states:

> In fields and woods, on mountains and on the seas, in houses and in caves . . . in kitchens and in factories, people had suffered day and night, they sweated and cried, sickness, injury, and early death or violent death were frequent fruits of their labor. This work was mindless, endless stupefying, sweaty, filthy, noisy, exhausting and insecure in its prospects and practically without hope of advancement (1962: 111).

The dehumanizing effect of work has almost become a modern truism. Suffice to quote Keniston (1965:255-256): "Meaningful work," "joy in work," and "fulfillment through work" have become old-fashioned and quaint, because the most important parts of their personality - their hopes, feelings, aspirations and dreams - are systematically ignored in work. Similarly, according to Mills (1953:225), "alienation in work means boredom and the frustration of potentially creative efforts, of the productive sides of personality." The boredom of work and the alienation from work, which is the cause of the effect of the boredom, are not merely a personal phenomenon which can be viewed with deep compassion or slight derision but an important social, economic and political phenomon which seem to threaten the very foundation of bougeois society. It has been cited that the work alienation which affects not only the blue collar worker but all occupational levels up to and including managers. According to evidence, the discontent or dehumanized workers causes mental and physical sickness, low productivity, increasing absenteeism, wildcat strikes, industrial sabotage, and high job turnover rates. "The growing dissatisfaction with work also leads to drug abuse, alcohol addiction, and delinquency" (Work in America, 1973: XVI, 22, 30-31, 40; Hulin and Blood, 1968; David and Taylor, 1972; Walton, 1972).

These analysts' solutions to the self-estrangement are built on some well-known early work that incorporates the idea of intrinsic engagement as essential feature of acceptable work (Blauner, 1964; Turner and Lawrence, 1965; Herzberg, 1966). They share the conviction that the workplace must provide the worker with (a) tasks that are more self-fulfilling and self-respecting, and (b) a greater latitude of exercising personal control over the work itself. These analysts tend to share the conviction that these values concerning jobs are becoming more widespread and more intensely held especially among the younger workers (Aronowitz, 1973), and the absence of these qualities in work has serious consequences - i.e. that the worker's feelings of disrespect and impotence on the job generalize to his self-conception as a whole, his/her family life, social experience in the neighborhood, political participation, and the like (Sheppard and Herrick, 1972).

The investigations have been used to make the case for these important propositions are not precise. Sennett and Cobb (1972), have made attempts to examine the workers' attitudes toward work. Their findings reveal that there should be a low emphasis on the low control at work, on the denial of self-respect, on the importance of intrinsic satisfaction, and on symbolic rather than material rewards. Seeman (1976) contends that though the analysis is reasonable and sophisticated, nagging doubts remain concerning how much of that analysis is, so to speak, imposed from without via subtle interpretation - to what degree the profound and encompassing hurts described are, indeed, the worker's troubles. The understandable commitment of the scholars to more humanized work may cloud their visions concerning the requirements of empirical evidence.

The source of trouble arises from the failure to maintain with care some of the necessary distinctions. The source of alienated labor has two potential sources of trouble: (1) the absence of intrinsic fulfillment in the work, and (2) the lack of control at work. Singer (1970) insists that the cause of the French explosion of May 1968 was discontent in the workplace, whereas Seeman (1972b) indicates that the cause was the lack of intrinsic fulfillment in work. Goldthrope and colleagues (1968) contend that expectations concerning intrinsic rewards are not as important as economic goals in workers' attachment to the job, and that the instrumental attitude appears to function reasonably well in their study of British workers. Duncan, Schuman and Duncan (1973) have cited counterevidence from the strikes at Luton, Lordstown (Ohio) and Fiat (Italy). They indicate an increasing tilt toward intrinsic work vs control aspirations are involved. Drucker (1973) states that the researchers have regularly confused the intrinsic rewards and control demands. A part of the trouble lies in the fact that these two features are more difficult to separate empirically than conceptually. Decharms (1968) proposes that in fact the two are intimately tied: to experience personal causation is to be intrinsically motivated. Kohn and Schooler (1973) argue that occupational self-direction, which includes the closeness of supervision, routinization of work, and the complexity of it, is an important influence on self-esteem, leisure use, and others of elements of psychological functioning. But there is some mixture here too, of external control and the work itself. Consequently, generalization on one of them is quite limited.

If the emphasis is on the control element, as it directly is, for instance, in Pearlin's (1962) definition of work alienation might more properly be seen as another aspect of the powerlessness component of alienation, since it becomes simply a question of one more domain in which mastery or lack of it is manifested. Thus the "workers' control" movement in Yugoslovia has been identified with the problem of alienated labor, concentrate on effecting an increase degree of worker management of the enterprise rather than on substantial redirection of the work itself (Hunnuis, Garson and Case, 1973). To the degree that the movement is directed at the problem of powerlessness is no guarantee of improvement in the workers' attitudes about the nature of the work itself or about life outside the plant (Obradovic, 1970; Whitehorn, 1974), and is open to the charge that the modest transformation involved simply encourages the workers to form one's own satisfaction or approval. In this case, the term of self-estrangement is generally characterized as the loss of intrinsic meaning or pride in work. It becomes the view of the self-estranged that he/she is without the ability to find activities in which he/she is engaged as self-rewarding.

It has been suggested that work alienation can be reduced if workers participate in different phases of production, if they would train for other jobs, if they would be given more responsibility and autonomy (Work in America, 1973). To some extent, the proposals made in Work in America are also in line with the theory of young Karl Marx, "who saw in the division of labor and in private property the causes of alienation" (Feuerlicht, 1978:142). If work does not do justice to the creative potentials of the individual, and therefore, is called alienating, it is not done for its own sake and does not find its rewards in itself. Seeman speaks of the inability of people to find a self-rewarding activity. "The worker who only works for his salary, the housewife who only cooks to get over it with, the man who only acts because of the impression he makes on others are examples of self alienation" (Seeman, 1959:790). Paul Goodman (1970) writes that there is no end to common sense and self-respect if people go through motions and do not make sense to them and do not have their allegiance just for wages or other extrinsic rewards.

The work, however, may gain another kind of meaning in place of that lost. Morse and Weiss (1955) cites that work may satisfy a pride of craft or creativity, not only for artists or craftsman, but for any workers who take pride in doing good work, whether it be carpentry, stonemasonry, or driving a bus. Paletussing (1973) reminds that the job produces a product in which the worker takes pride, even his own role may be restricted, as, for example, where a person has a routine job in a factory where everyone believes nonetheless that his brand is best, or most useful, he identifies with it. This is the assumption of a communist country - that everybody is instructed and guided to see in work a service rendered to the whole community, to the country, and to socialism. In a nationalist and totalitarian country, work is an expression of patriotism, fulfillment of a duty toward the leader or nation.

Perhaps the crucial point in Marx's view of worker alienation is that industrial workers have lost control over their work. Research results indicate that power and control do indeed play an important role in work alienation. Those workers who hold highly structured, tightly controlled jobs express more alienation than freer workers

(Bonjean and Grimes, 1970; Kirsch and Lengerman, 1972). Scientists and engineers respond to directive supervision with considerable alienation (Miller, 1972). Porter and Steers (1973) reveal that workers whose jobs involve greater responsibility and autonomy are less likely to quit or be absent from their jobs. Sheppard and Herrick (1972) find out that work dissatisfaction was practically nonexistent among the self-employed. In 1964, Blauner published a study of the printing, textile, automotive, and chemical industries. He found that the automobile assembly line intensified "all dimensions of alienation." Blauner puts it:

> Thus in this extreme situation a depersonalized worker, estranged from himself and larger collectives, goes through the motions of work in the regimented milieu of the conveyor belt for the sole purpose of earning his break (1964:82).

In this context, it can be looked at in many other examples of work alienation. Thus, we have Kornhauser's (1965) study of the mental health of automobile workers in Detroit and his finding that there is a relationship between optimum mental health and the amount of skill required in the job; that is, the more skill required and the greater the opportunities for its exercise, the "better" the health of the workers. Yet, there is the report by Seeman (1967) that manual workers in a Swedish city are not alienated in the sense of powerlessness, and that this may have something to do with the conditions of life apart from the job in such a society.

Although power and control play a significant role in the workers' satisfaction or alienation in their jobs, the relevant factors are probably not power and control in and for themselves. Power probably is important insofar as it enables workers to design their work to be as satisfying as possible. For one thing, not all workers are put off by lacking control. Particularly, those workers who most believe in the validity and importance of authority relationships are far less alienated by highly structured and closely supervised jobs (Pearlin, 1962; Sheppard and Herrick, 1972). In general, it has been indicated that control over one's work is only one feature of work among many. The factors that produce satisfaction or alienation at work vary from one individual to another, depending on his or her values (Mobley and Locke, 1970). Although incentives can affect job satisfaction (Sheppard and Herrick, 1972; Porter and Steers, 1973), it has been revealed that the important factor here is not the worker's objective pay level but how well his or her pay compared with expectation, that is, if the pay level fails to match prior expectations - if it seems unfair - it is likely to alienate the worker (Pearlin, 1962; Porter and Steers, 1973). In addition, workers who do not expect to be promoted tend not to desire promotion, and those who expect promotion want it (Hahn, 1975). It has even been discovered that the threat of being without income was unnecessary to motivate workers to work (Klinger, 1977). It has been suggested that of these various job facets, the one most closely correlated with overall job satisfaction is being "given a chance to do the things I do best," followed by "interesting work"; "good pay" and "opportunity to develop my special abilities" are tied for third (Sheppard and Herrick, 1972:12).

The data indicate that workers expect self-fulfillment from their jobs; stimulation and personal growth are at least as important, on the average, as pay and security. This situation can become more evident at the level of professional. Scientists who feel that their company unduly restricts their choice of research projects insufficiently encourages their professional development significantly more alienation from their work (Miller, 1967).

It has been indicated that professors do not tend to characterize themselves as workers; hence, they cannot underestimate the bureaucratic organization of the university (Gross and Grambsch, 1968; Cohen, 1974). They have to follow their careers on the basis of regulations, although the university rules may be more flexible than other institutions. The literature of academic institutions suggests that professors desire to set the academic criteria through values shared by the professional criteria rather than the administrative community (Parsons, 1965; Abrahamson, 1967; Hill and French, 1966; Dykes, 1968). Consequently, when the administrative community sets the academic criteria through bureaucratic features, the professors may perceive work alienation (Udy, 1965; Scott, 1965; Katz and Kahn, 1960). It has been documented that the professional perceived work alienation intensifies when individual professionals do not share the organization's operating goals. This issue manifests itself in academic institutions, when faculty perceive that the bureaucratic criteria deny them the opportunity to pursue professorial careers according to their professional code (Gross and Grambsch, 1968; Cohen, 1974). Final, Ladd and Lipset (1973) conclude that the level of perceived work alienation is higher in senior colleges than others. Perhaps, the status of senior colleges provides the professors with higher professorial opportunities which the other colleges are not able to provide for their professors.

However, of the five types of alienation designated by Seeman, the one most closely approximating Marx's alienation from work is "self-estrangement." Seeman puts it:

> The second feature of self-alienation (self-estrangement) . . . is the aspect of self-alienation which is generally characterized as the loss of intrinsic pride in work, a loss which Marx and others have held to be an essential feature of modern alienation (1959:790).

Seeman (1967:275), however, elaborates the notion of work alienation as work which is "not intrinsically satisfying" by measuring it in terms of negative responses to questions ". . . asks whether the respondent finds his work engaging and rewarding in itself." Middleton (1963:974) has also measured alienation of employees. He used such a statement, "I don't really enjoy most of the work that I do, but I feel that I must do it in order to have the things that I need and want." The respondent's answered on the basis of agreement of alienation among the workers. Middleton, however, follows Seeman and the Marxian tradition in his research.

Miller (1967:759) has done an important study on work alienation among professionals in bureaucracy. He also follows Seeman's lead and measures the work alienation index ". . . consisting of statements referring to the intrinsic pride or meaning of work." Miller's aim of choosing this conceptualization and measure has been to recall and to correspond to the Marxian formulation of alienated "work which is not performed for its own sake, as an end itself." Miller (1967:759) additionally, has made a useful contribution to knowledge, he has clearly realized the difference between work alienation and job dissatisfaction. He states that "a person may be alienated from his work, yet still be satisfied with his job". Levine (1978:139) also follows the mentioned authors' procedures and measures work alienation among professors of Oklahoma State University by an index consisting of 25 Likert type statements. Levine's study consists of such statements as "My work is interesting nearly all the time.". Levine's implemented scale should be answered "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," "strongly disagree." Levine's study, then, is particularly appropriate for this study for two reasons: first, it deals with the alienation from work by professionals, which is the focus of this study, second, she logically, via Seeman, relates her concept of work alienation as job dissatisfaction, which has been mistakenly used as a measure of alienation. Of course, the credit of job dissatisfaction distinction belongs to Miller (1967).

Summary

The concept of alienation, as it is used in the contemporary social science has been traced back to Aristotle, then directly traced to Hegel. However, its different meanings and applications were presented. Much of the confusion surrounding the general term of alienation stems from the distinctions between Durkheim and Marx's formulations. As far as this research is concerned, Marxian tradition has exerted a strong influence on present research, because the aim of this study is to examine work alienation among professors in the colleges of education which is related to Marxian formulation. Therefore, this research mainly investigates work alienation as one consequence of the professional bureaucratic dilemma. However, the close approximation of the last category examined the Marxian formulation, will here be considered as corresponding to Seeman's fifth type of alienation, "self-estrangement," and defined as lack of intrinsic pride in or meaning of work.

Rationale and Hypotheses

In the literature review, work alienation was examined from the perspective of its theoretical formulation by Marx. Alienation according to Marx, is a consequence of the capitalist system because the product of labor becomes something external and independent of the worker. It faces him as an autonomous power. The life which he gives to his product opposes him as something alien and hostile. Work, therefore, is not part of his true self but outside of it. When work is not part of his own interests, it is neither free nor self-directed and lacks spontaniety. Only when man is engaged in a work activity that realizes, expresses and develops himself is he satisfying one of man's basic needs (Marx, 1963). Seeman (1959) derives self-estrangement originally from the Marxian depiction of work which has become an instrumentalized means rather than a creative end in itself. According to Seeman (1967:275), "man is alienated from his work when it is not intrinsically satisfying, engaging, rewarding and meaningful in itself."

It is the area of work experience that the idea of self-estrangement as nonintrinsic engagement has been most extensively applied. Concern about the dilemma of alienated labor, as identified in recent years, that concern being beautifully exemplified in the volume titled Work in America by Kerr et al., (1979), reinspired movement looking toward a radical designing of the job and the workplace (Hulin and Blood, 1968; Davis and Taylor, 1972; Walton, 1972).

These authors build the theory of alienation, of course, on some well known earlier work that incorporates the idea of instrinstic engagement as an essential feature of acceptable work (Blauner, 1964; Turner and Lawrence, 1965; Herzberg, 1966, Wilensky, 1964). They share this idea that the work place must provide the worker with: (a) tasks that are more self-fulfilling and self-respecting, and (b) a greater latitude for expecting personal control over the work itself. They also believe that these values concerning jobs are becoming more wide read (Aronowitz, 1973) and that the absence of these qualities in so important a domain as work has very serious consequences on all aspects of his social and his personal activities (Sheppard and Herrick, 1972). The consequence of satisfactory work on professional attitudes has been emphasized. For instance, Hall (1968) indicates that it is exactly work which is intrinsically rewarding and meaningful, which is done for its own sake and which i.e. self- and not other-directed, that is "central" to the professional model and relates directly to the preservation and continuation of a professional orientation. The significance of intrinsically meaningful and self-rewarding work for the professional is understood by Weber himself. Weber puts it:

> Whoever lacks the capacity to put on binders, so to speak, and to come up to the idea that the fate of his soul depends upon whether or not he makes the correct conjecture at this passage of his manuscript may as well stay away from science. He will never have what one may call the 'personal experience' of science. Without this strange intoxication, ridiculed by every outsider; without this passion, this 'thousands of years must pass before you enter into life and thousands more wait in silence' --- according to wether or not you succeed in this conjecture; without this, you have no calling for science and you should do something else. For nothing is worthy of man unless he can pursue it with passionate devotion (1946:135).

Kerr (1963) has realized the significance of work to faculty within the field of higher education. Kerr states that:

> Academic man is a case of the modern professional man in the organization, but he is in some respects an extreme and special case. Of all professionals, academic man needs rather extreme autonomy, for research that leads where he knows not, or for teaching that is unfettered by dictated dogma, or of scholarship that follows the rules of consistency and proof, that develop within a discipline (1963:11).

Baldridge (1973) elaborates the concept of faculty autonomy explicitly. He states that, not only does the professional want control over the core tasks of teaching, research, and service, it is imperative for him to determine the means by which these tasks are accomplished to decide work patterns, to actively participate in major academic decision-making, to have work evaluated by professional peers, and to be relatively free of bureaucratic regulations and restrictions.

The bureaucratic orientation toward work diverges sharply from the professional orientation. According to Weber an ideal type of bureaucracy has clear and explicit goals and purposes. Organizational rules, procedures, and regulations are derived from the goals in a manner that says, if this is the goal, then this is the most rational procedure for achieving it. The tasks to be performed in the achievement of the goal are subdivided among the members of the organization so that each member has a limited sphere of activity that is matched to his own competency. Meanwhile, the offices should be arranged in a pyramidal hierarchy, with each office having more authority than those below it. Decision making is based upon officially established rules that are attached to the position ". . . the person who fills the office or position is guided by the organizationally established normative order . . ." (Hall, 1972:266). Etzioni (1964) states that aim of bureaucratic organizations is to coordinate a large number of human actions to achieve the established goals efficiently and rationally.

Consequently, professional criteria are not in accord in a bureaucratic organization. It has been revealed that conflicts occur between bureaucratic and professional systems because of the differences in the two models of authority, and control, degree of autonomy and commitment to a specific work activity (Morrissey and Gillespie, 1975; Blau and Scott, 1962). Hall (1972) states that indeed, increased bureaucratization, which tends to make exactly those decisions concerning the work situation which the professional feels competent to make, has been demonstrated as a threatening and important variable of the professional model of autonomy. Hall's statement is true in higher education, too. It has been found out that the level of tendency of a professor in participating in decision making varies due to his/her expertise and relevancy of the area to him. For instance, the desire to participate in matters which are central to the core task of profession result in greater feelings of deprivation that the denial of the desire to participate in such matters as the designing of building facilities (Mulder, 1971; Alutto and Belasco, 1972). According to these authors' discussion, the lack of job involvement can be perceived as the cause of dissatisfaction or alienation in one area, while it may not be true in another case. Further, it may be alienating for one person, but it may not be alienating for another one.

Haplan (1966) recommends that it is necessary to change the close organizational climate to an open organizational climate. His idea originates from this assumption that traditional bureaucracy with a plethora of rules and regulations increases the level of alienation among the professionals. In this study, that assumption will be examined by analyzing relationships between two dimensions of organizations, namely; centralization and formalization with the degree of perceived work alienation among faculty of the colleges of education in Oklahoma.

Centralization is applied in this study as the degree to which members participate in decision making. This definition is smaller in part to that of Pugh and his associates (1963:518), "centralization has been defined as the locus of authority to make decisions which affect the organization". Two significant aspects of centralization have been identified by Hage (1967b). Hage defines these two aspects: (1) the degree of hierarchy of authority, and (b) the degree of participation in decision making. Organizations usually vary in the amount of specified tasks assigned to subordinates and the amount of freedom given to the subordinates to implement their tasks when tasks are assigned in such a way that subordinates have little latitude in making decisions to implement their tasks. This situation is called a high degree of authority. The second aspect of centralization, identified as the degree of participation in decision making, indicates the extent to which employees can participate in making decisions to set the goals and policies of the entire organization (Tannenbaum, 1956).

The centralization dimension of bureaucracy is reversely related to employee satisfaction. It has been found that organizations which are highly centralized and give little opportunity to their employees to take part in decision making, are likely to have a high rate of work alienation among their workers (Hage et al., 1967b; Blauner, 1964; Faunce et al., 1967). It has also been discovered that a relationship exists between rigid and impersonal authority structures with alienation among the employees of different organizations (Blau and Scott, 1962; Isherwood and Hoy, 1973). On the contrary, it has been revealed that increased job involvement and participation in decision making lead to greater job satisfaction and work achievement, as well as greater individual integration (Patchen, 1970).

Many researchers indicated a direct relationship between professionalization and decentralization. For instance, Pelz and Andrews (1966) found in a study of scientists employed by a research organization, that the personnel with a Ph.D. degree participate more often than their colleagues in decisions regarding their work. It has been found that the key scientists have more control over policies of their work than the others, too (Brown, 1954; Miller, 1967; Blau, 1968). Finally the findings of Dressel and his associates (1970) as well as those of Parsons and Platt (1968) and Blau (1973) suggest that research emphasis is positively related to decentralization of decisions concerning academic personnel in universities. Levine's (1978) findings indicate that highly perceived centralization has side effects on faculty.

Worthy (1950) states that centralization which provides the low job autonomy with suppression of personal judgement results in dissatisfaction among professonals. Therefore, the potential dissatisfaction among professors who perceive themselves as and are known as top professionals should be even greater than others (Whitehead, 1955; Goodle, 1977). According to Greenwood (1957), Barber (1963) professors are strong advocates of having autonomy in job performance and a strong voice in decision making and setting academic policies. Thus, it is rational to expect that when they are denied access to such power to achieve their objectives in the course of planning in organizational structure, they arrive at a static picture (Argyris, 1964).

It can be concluded that when professors perceive that centralization does not let them make decisions to make their work a vehicle through which they satisfy their needs for achievement and growth. They are forced to continue their careers, they might feel alienated.

This discussion leads us to the formulation of the first two hypotheses that guided this study:

H.1. When the level of professors participation in decision making in academic areas decreases, their perceived work alienation will increase.

H.2. When the level of hierarchy of authority increases in university, the perceived work alienation of faculty will increase.

According to the dimension of professional autonomy, the faculty expect to guide or regulate their careers with relative or complete freedom from outside control. Regulation should be established and controlled by colleagues rather than organization. When this function is performed by organization the professors may perceive their work alienating. In this study, the term of formalization will be implemented to measure the degree of alienation from work among professors. This term denotes the extent to which rules and procedures, instructions and communications are written (Hage et al., 1967b). Hage and Aiken elaborate the formalization. Hage and Aiken state:

> Formalization represents the use of rules in an organization. Job codification is a measure of how many rules define what the occupants of positions are to do, while rule

> observation is a measure of whether or not the rules are employed. In other words, the variable of job codification represents the degree to which the job descriptions are specified, and the variable, rule observation, refers to degree to which job occupants are supervised in conforming to the standards established by job codification. Job codification represents the degree of work standardization while rule observation is a measure of latitude of behavior that is tolerated from standards (1967b:79).

It has been found that highly bureaucratic formalized rules and close supervision are related to work alienation (Crozier, 1964: Aiken and Hage, 1966; Hall, 1972; Isherwood, and Hoy, 1973; Gouldner, 1954). Levine's (1978) findings in higher education support the views of mentioned authors.

In an organization which emphasizes adherence to regulation and close supervision, one might expect that such emphasis and supervision might be perceived by the professors as their violation of professional's autonomy. They might feel that their controlled work does not contribute to their job satisfaction. This discussion will lead to formulation of the second two hypotheses that guide this study:

H.3. When the degree of job codification increases, the perceived work alienation will increase among the professors.

H.4. The degree of increasing perceived work alienation is positively related to increasing rule observation among professors.

It was also mentioned that professors are advocates of shared authority, but existing decision making structure presented non-tenured professors only indirectly in areas of decision making (McConnel et al., 1971). This situation may persuade the non-tenured professors to think that they have no opportunity to influence the politics of their departments or of their institutions, that the administrations of their departments are very or somewhat autocratic, that non-tenured faculty members have little to say in the running of the department, and that a small group of tenured professors has disproportionate power in departmental decision making (Lindeman, 1976; Blau, 1973). This attitude of non-tenured faculty may lead to their frustration. This discussion leads to formulation of the fifth hypothesis:

H.5. Non-tenured professors will perceive more work alienation than tenured professors related to participation in decision making, hierarchy of authority, job codification, and rule observation.

It was also mentioned that doctoral granting universities grant more autonomy to their professors than the other ones in the review of literature. These universities are identified as those universities that have graduate colleges and grant doctoral degrees. Since these universities are usually research oriented, it is understood that professors need to pursue their careers with less work control, therefore, the professors of these types of universities should be less alienated than their counterparts in other colleges or universities, but findings do not support this assumption (Ross, 1977). It can be argued that the professors of these universities have independent power that allows them to threaten to leave the institution, if they perceive that their work is controlled, while professors of other universities might not have such power to threaten to leave and find another job. It can be concluded that the level of different expectations of professors in two different types of universities might neutralize the existing level of different autonomy of professors in those two mentioned different educational settings. This discussion leads to the formulation of the sixth and final hypothesis:

H.6. The doctoral and non-doctoral granting university professors will not perceive work alienation significantly different related to participation in decision making, hierarchy of authority, job codification and rule observation.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the research methodology used in this study. Specifically, the sampling techniques, the instrumentation, and the method of administering the instruments are described in this chapter. The chapter concludes with a description of the treatment of data.

Sampling

In order to test the hypotheses, faculty members of Departments and/or Colleges of Education from nine public universities in the state of Oklahoma were selected. The sample consisted of two doctoral granting universities and seven non-doctoral granting universities. The selected doctoral granting universities are the only public universities that grant Doctor of Education and/or Doctor of Philosophy degrees in several fields, whereas the others are pubic universities that grant Master of Education degrees in several fields in this state.

A list of all professors of these Schools of Education was obtained from the Oklahoma State University Library. Of the 376 professors, a total of 168 (50%) were randomly selected. The selected professors represented, on a proportionate basis, the ranks of assistant, associate and full professors.

The sample selection was limited to these universities for three reasons. First, they were the only public universities which grant Doctor of Education and/or Doctor of Philosophy degrees as well as Master of Education degrees in several fields in this state. Secondly, it was determined that these universities had a sufficient number of professors whose degrees were at the level of Master or higher to exhibit the structural characteristics of professionals studied in this research. Thirdly, these universities had large enough teaching components to permit the application of random sampling techniques in selecting full-time participants.

Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study contained 33 items which consisted of professional background information, work alienation (Forsyth, 1977), and organizational control measures (Hage and Aiken, 1967a). These three sections constructed to gather the following data: (1) the professional background information, (2) the perceived degree of work alienation, and (3) the perceived degree of hierarchy of authority, participation in decision making, job codification and rule observation pertaining to the immediate work environment.

The Variables

Professional Background Information

The index of professional background information consisted of four items which measured the level of every professor's education, experience, position and present status. The professional background information was necessary to compare the samples.

Alienation From Work

The index of alienation from work, developed by Forsyth, was used to measure the perceived work alienation. Forsyth developed an 11 item of work alienation index taking four items from George Miller, one from Seeman, and constructing the remainder himself (Forsyth, 1977). The four items taken from Miller had a coefficient of reproducibility (Good-enough Technqiue) = .91, a minimum marginal reproducity of .70, a coefficient of scalability of .69, and a .69 coefficient of sharpness (Miller, 1967). Price (1972) has evaluated the validity of Miller's index and noted that of the three predictions made by Miller, two were fully supported and one partially. Finally, Forsyth (1977) selected some of the Miller items and rearranged them in his own constructed index. Forsyth's rearrangement of this Likert-type index of eight choice items was pretested and has a Conbach's coefficient alpha of .91, suggesting a high degree of relibility.

Organizational Control Measures

Centralization and Formalization

Two specific measures of the organizational control are manifested in the centralization and formalization. Centralization denotes the degree of hierarchy of authority and degree of employee's participation in decision making in relevant areas, whereas formalization indicates the degree of job codification, rule observation and job specifity

(Hage and Aiken, 1967b). This study used a nine item index of centralization combined of a four item index of participation in decision making and five item index of hierarchy of authority. It also used a seven item index of rule observation. The 16 item index of centralization and formalization has been developed by Hage and Aiken (1967a), to measure the level of organizational control. This study did not use the index of job specifity because of its low reliability and validity (Dewar et al., 1980). But it used the indices of participation in decision making, hierarchy of authority, job codification and rule observation.

Hage and Aiken (1970) have reported that measurement of their indices of organizational control are highly correlated. Most coefficients are about .88, although the coefficient for hierarchy is .70 and for the job codification is .68. These two authors' data of 1964, 1967 and 1970, as well as Whetten's data of 1974, have been recomputed (Dewar et al., 1980). Dewar and his associates have reported a high reliability coefficient for all the Hage and Aiken scales. It has been demonstrated the coefficients range from very good (α = .70 to .85) to excellent (α > .85), but coefficients for Whetten's data are lower for their respective indices than those for Aiken and Hage. Seilder (1974) has mentioned that the number of informants per case influences reliability, and his suggestion is true in Whetten's case, because in Hage and Aiken's data the average number of respondents per case was 20, 23 and 30, while in the Whetten's case the average number of respondents was only 4.25 for the set of scales. Dewar and his associates (1980) have evaluated the validity of Hage and Aiken's data for both participation in decision making and hierarchy of authority indices.

They have stated that both set of items have high degrees of convergent and discrimination validity. The indices to validly indicate the sub-constructs for which they were intended. Dewar and his associates have also maintained that the index of rule observation have high interim correlations, the median off diagonal correlations indicate that they are also highly correlated with items in the scales of other constructs. The items indicating job codification have moderate to good reliability. Dewar and his associates' findings indicate that the centralization scale is reliable and valid. The rule observation scale is reliable but does not have a high degree of discriminant validity as the centralization scale does. Meanwhile, job codification is adequately reliable. But it has lower convergent and discriminant validity with regards to other scales.

Administration of the Instruments

The questionnaires, along with a stamped, self addressed envelope and an appropriate cover letter were mailed to the selected professors on April 21, 1981. (See Appendix A for the cover letter and Appendix B for the questionnaire.) Out of 168 questionnaires, 101 (60%) were received. Among the returned questionnaires, four were blank and five were incomplete.

A follow up mailing was sent after a three week lapse of time to encourage participation from those who did not respond to the initial mailing. A cover letter explaining that the respondent's contribution is vital to the purpose of this study and guaranteeing anonymity of response accompanied by second mailings too and is included in Appendix C.

The mailings, however, separately marked so as to discriminate between original responses and those obtained due to follow up.

After twice repeated efforts, by the end of May, 1981, 121 questionnaires (72%) were received. Of the 121 questionnaires, a total of 105 (63%) were usable, consequently, data processing began with 105 questionnaires.

Treatment of Data

Scoring of Instruments

Each of the completed questionnaires was scored according to its three major sections: (1) background information, (2) work alienation, and (3) organizational control measures. Responses from the background section were used to gain some additional information concerning the participants of the study. The work alienation section was used to obtain information about the perceived work alienation of the participants. Organizational control measures were used to glean the perceived degree of control of the participants.

When the questionnaires were used, the data were compiled according to the categories of the research questions. This information was then keypunched onto data computer cards for programming. The information was recorded onto 105 cards. The keypunch cards were then verified. The Chi-Square and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation were computed to test the first four hypotheses. Finally, a T-test was computed to test the final two hypotheses.

Statistical Tests

The nature of the data and study demanded both parametric and non-parametric tests. The model of the non-parametric statistic does not specify conditions about the parameters of the population from which the sample was randomly drawn. Though certain assumptions are associated with most non-parametric tests, i.e., the observations are independent and the variable under study has underlying continuity, these assumptions are fewer and much weaker than those associated with parametric tests (Siegel, 1965).

Non-parametric statistical tests such as Chi-square and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation were used to test the relationship of the first four hypotheses. The level of significance was arbitrarily set at the 0.05 level.

The parametric test assumes certain conditions about the parameters of the populations from which the samples are drawn. The population must be normal, have equal variance and the data must be at least interval in nature. It has been indicated that the parametric test gives fairly accurate results, even if these assumptions have been violated to a certain degree (Bartz, 1976). The T-test, which is a parmetric test, was used to examine the last two hypotheses data. It is imperative to provide some explanations about the Chi-square, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation and T-Test.

Chi-Square Test

It is a statistical technique which compares groups by distribution of individual sample scores rather than by means. The great advantage of this test is that it involves no assumption about the form of the original distributions from which the observation came (Mills, 1955). According to Blalock:

> The chi-square test is a very general test which can be used whenever we wish to evaluate whether or not frequencies which have been empirically obtained differ significantly from those which would be expected under a certain set of theoretical assumptions. The test has many applications, the most common of which in the social sciences are "contingency" problems in which two nominal scale variables have been cross tabulated (1960:212).

The function of the chi-square in this study was to determine whether a systematic relationship existed between two variables. In other words, by itself, chi-square helps us only to decide whether variables are independent or related. A part of the reason is that the sample size and table size have such influence upon chi-square, but several statistics which adjust for these factors strengthen its measurement (Nie et al., 1975).

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation

This technique for testing the extent of association or relation between two sets of attributes was deemed appropriate. Like other non-parametric statistical tests, this technique makes no assumption about the shape of the population of scores. It does not require underlying continuity in the variable analysis. It only requires nominal measurements of the variables. Because of this freedom of assumptions and requirements, it is often used to indicate the degree of relationship between variables (Siegel, 1956). This test was applied in this study to provide better grounds for chi-square findings.

T-Test

The t-test which is a parametric test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between two samples in the two final hypotheses in this investigation. There were three reasons for its applications; first, it is one of the most common comparison measures of central tendency; secondly, although it compares mean scores of two groups when their size is small to assume valid normal distribution, it can also be used to compare mean scores of two large groups; and, thirdly, the t-test, in effect, assumes a normal distribution between two non-normal groups by building a compensating amount of error into the statistical process and the interpretation (Nie, 1975). The level of significance for t-test was also set at the 0.05 level.

In summary the purpose of chi-square and correlation coefficient was to determine the degree of relationships or associations between two variables, whereas the goal of t-test was to determine whether the existence of difference between the means of two samples was significant in this study. According to Nie (1975) "significant" does not mean "important" or "consequence"; it is used to mean "indication of" or signifying a true difference between the two populations.

Summary

Chapter three has described the research design which guided this study. Included were a description of sampling procedures employed, information on the instrument employed in this study, and the methodology used for collecting data and analyzing data. Chapter IV will represent the analysis of data.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents the data which were used to test the hypotheses. The traditional .05 level of significance used to accept or reject the hypotheses.

Testing the Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

> A greater proportion of faculty, who have a high score on participation in decision making in academic areas, perceive more work alienation than a greater proportion of faculty who have a low score on participation in decision making in academic areas.[1]

For this hypothesis the computation of the chi-square yielded a x^2 of 13.070. With one degree of freedom, the x^2 of 13.070 was significant beyond the 0.0003 level. The computation of a correlation coefficient yielded a r of -0.4282 which was significant at the probability level of 0.0001. Although the degree of participation in decision making correlated with perceived work alienation, the relationship was in the opposite direction from that predicted. Therefore, the hypothesis was

---

[1]In order to use chi-square contingency 2x2 tables, all the variables (perceived work alienation, participation in decision making, hierarchy of authority, job codification and rule observation) were dichotomized into low and high groups at median line.

rejected. A summary of the relevant data in the testing of the hypothesis is presented in Table I.

TABLE I

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED WORK ALIENATION AND PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING

Perceived Work Alienation	Participation in Decision Making					
	Low		High		Total	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Low	18	17.1	35	33.4	53	50.5
High	36	34.3	16	31.2	52	49.5
Total	54	51.4	51	48.6	105	100

x^2 = 13.070 df = 1 p = 0.0003
r = -.4287 p = 0.0001

Hypothesis Two

> A greater proportion of faculty, who have a high score on hierarchy of authority, perceive more work alienation than a greater proportion of faculty who have a low score on hierarchy of authority.

To test this hypothesis, a chi-square and a correlation coefficient were computed. The computed chi-square yielded a x^2 of 4.215. With one degree of freedom, the x^2 of 4.215 was significant beyond the probability of 0.0401. Further, the computed correlation coefficient of 0.5543 was significant with a probability of 0.0001. Therefore, the hypothesis was supported. The findings suggest that there is a high association and relationship between perceived work alienation and hierarchy of authority. Data relevant to this hypothesis are summarized in Table II.

TABLE II

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED WORK ALIENATION AND HIERARCHY OF AUTHORITY

Perceived Work Alienation	Hierarchy of Authority: Low		High		Total	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Low	31	29.5	22	21.0	53	50.5
High	20	19.1	32	30.4	52	49.5
Total	51	48.6	54	51.4	105	100

$x^2 = 4.215$ df = 1 $p = 0.0401$
$r = 0.5543$ $p = 0.0001$

Hypothesis Three

> A greater proportion of faculty, who have a high score on job codification, perceive more work alienation than a greater proportion of faculty who have a low score on job codification.

This hypothesis was tested by computing a Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient and a chi-square. The result of the chi-square, 1.607 with one degree of freedom and the probability of occurence 0.0001 indicated a low degree of association between the perceived work alienation and job codification. The computed correlation coefficient of -0.2205 with the probability of 0.0001 indicated the opposite direction from that predicted. Therefore, it was concluded to reject the predicted hypothesis. The summary of the data relevant to this hypothesis is presented in Table III.

TABLE III

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED WORK ALIENATION AND JOB CODIFICATION

Perceived Work Alienation	Job Codification: Low No.	Low Percent	High No.	High Percent	Total No.	Total Percent
Low	23	21.9	30	28.6	53	50.5
High	29	27.6	23	21.9	52	49.5
Total	52	49.5	53	50.5	105	100

$x^2 = 1.607$ df = 1 p = 0.2048
r = -0.2205 p = 0.0238

Hypothesis Four

> A greater proportion of faculty who have a high score on rule observation, perceive more work alienation than a greater proportion of facutly who have a low score on rule observation.

For this hypothesis, a chi-square and a correlation coefficient were computed. The result of the chi-square with one degree of freedom and the probability of occurence 0.0001 was 15.366. The chi-square of 15.366 indicated a high level of association between perceived work alienation and rule observation. The computed correlation coefficient of 4940 with probability of 0.001 indicated a high relationship between perceived work alienation and rule observation. Therefore, the findings supported the predicted hypothesis. Data relevant to this hypothesis are summarized in Table IV.

TABLE IV

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED WORK ALIENATION AND RULE OBSERVATION

Perceived Work Alienation	Rule Observation					
	Low		High		Total	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Low	37	35.6	17	15.3	54	50.9
High	16	15.4	35	33.7	51	49.1
Total	53	51.4	52	49.0	105	100

$x^2 = 15.366$ df = 1 p = 0.0001
r = 0.4940 p = 0.0001

Hypothesis Five

> The non-tenured professors will perceive more work alienation than tenured professors related to participation in decision making, hierarchy of authority, job codification and rule observation.

A t-test was computed to test this hypothesis with 103 degree of freedom, a t value of 2.57 was needed for significance at the 0.05 level. The t value for perceived work alienation with probability of

0.7925 was -0.2637 which was not significant. The findings also indicated that there were not significant differences between the tenured and non-tenured professors' mean scores in regard to hierarchy of authority, job codification and rule observation. The t value of hierarchy of authority with probability of 0.5568 was -0.59, the t value of job codification with probability of 0.7274 was -.035 and the t value of rule observation with probability of .6454 was -0.46. But there was only a significant difference between the tenured and non-tenured professors' mean scores concerning the participation in decision making. The t value of this dimension of bureaucracy with probability of .0015 was 3.25. These findings did not indicate the existence of different perception of work alienation among two groups of professors. Therefore, the hypthesis was not supported. Data relevant to this hypothesis are summarized in Table V.

TABLE V

THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TENURED AND NON-TENURED FACULTY'S PERCEIVED WORK ALIENATION RELATED TO FOUR DIMENSIONS OF BUREAUCRACY

Dependent Variables	Mean Scores Tenure (No=80)	Mean Scores Non-Tenure (No=25)	T (df=103)	P
Perceived Work Alienation	2.69	2.75	-0.2637	0.7925
Participation in Decision Making	3.71	3.05	3.25	0.0015
Hierarchy of Authority	1.98	2.07	-0.59	0.5568
Job Codification	2.65	2.60	-0.35	0.7274
Rule Observation	1.51	1.58	-0.46	0.6454

Hypothesis Six

> The doctoral granting university professors will not perceive work alienation significantly different from non-doctoral granting university professors.

A t-test was used to determine if there were significant differences at the 0.05 level between the professors' mean scores. With 103 degree of freedom, a t value of 2.57 was needed for significance at the 0.05 level. The values of the calculated t were not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted. In other words, the status of universities did not create different perceptions between two groups of professors; data relevant to this hypothesis are summarized in Table VI.

TABLE VI

THE DIFFERENCES OF PERCEIVED WORK ALIENATION RELATED TO FOUR DIMENSIONS OF BUREAUCRACY BETWEEN DOCTORAL AND NON-DOCTORAL GRANTING UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS' MEAN SCORES

Dependent Variables	Mean Scores: Doctoral Granting University Professors (N=47)	Mean Scores: Non-Doctoral Granting University Professors (No=58)	T (df=103)	P
Perceived Work Alienation	2.83	2.60	1.22	0.2222
Participation in Decision Making	3.72	3.42	1.6679	0.0984
Hierarchy of Authority	2.00	2.00	0.0080	0.9936
Job Codification	2.76	2.54	1.9499	0.0539
Rule Observation	1.60	1.47	0.9548	0.3419

Summary

The major hypotheses of this research were tested and results were summarized in this chapter. The following chapter provides a detailed discussion of the study's results and relate these results to the dilemma of the bureaucratic and the professional models.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

In the beginning, it was stated that the study was primarily concerned with the relationship of faculty's perceived work alienation and two variables of centralization namely; participation in decision making and hierarchy of authority as well as two subcontracts of formalization namely; job codification and rule observation. Since the concept of alienation has attracted national as well as individual's attention, the study empirically examined the general attitudes of education professors who have been expected to perform a crucial role in constructing the attitudes of the new generation. The primary question which this study attempted to address was: How do individual professors perceive work alienation with regard to aspects of bureaucracy? The investigation was needed both for the development of the scientific fund of knowledge and as some standards by which to improve or eliminate dysfunctional aspects of bureaucracy which have some negative relationships with increasing perceived work alienation among the faculty members of this study. This chapter, however, presents a summary of findings. Also, several conclusions based on the study's results are presented, together with several implications and possible directions for further research.

Findings

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one stated that the faculty's perceived work alienation would increase when their participation in decision making in academic areas decreased. Even though the statistic calculation indicated such relationships between the perceived work alienation and level of participation in decision making, the hypothesis was rejected because the relationship was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

Hypothesis Two

A second presumption was that the faculty's perceived work alienation would increase when the level of hierarchy of authority increased. The empirical findings supported this hypothesis.

Hypothesis Three

The third hypothesis assumed that the faculty's perceived work alienation would increase when the level of job codification increased. This hypothesis was not supported by findings. The relationship was in the opposite direction from that predicted.

Hypothesis Four

It was hypothesized that the degree of faculty's perceived work alienation was positively related to the increase of rule observation. The results of statistic tests confirmed the fourth hypothesis.

Hypothesis Five

Hypothesis five stated that non-tenured professors would perceive more work alienation than tenured professors related to participation in decision making, hierarchy of authority, job codification, or rule observation. This hypothesis was not supported by the data.

Hypothesis Six

Hypothesis six stated that the doctoral and non-doctoral granting university professors would not perceive work alienation significantly different, related to participation in decision making, hierarchy of authority, job codification and rule observation. This hypothesis was supported.

Discussion

Homan states that:

> According to my lights, a last chapter should resemble a primitive orgy after harvest. The work may have come to an end, but the worker cannot let go all at once. He is still full of energy that will fester if it cannot find an outlet. Accordingly, he is allowed a time of license when he may say all sorts of things, he would think twice before saying in more sober moments, when he is no longer bound by logic and evidence but free to speculate about what he has done (1974:356).

Encouraged by Homan's recommendation we will consider each of the research questions and respective hypotheses which guided this study in the context of professional and organizational systems.

According to the review of literature, professors believe that their preparation enables them to make appropriate decisions regarding their work and work policies on the basis of professional criteria.

But the society may not believe that the professors should be eligible to make technically appropriate decisions completely. Therefore, the bureaucratic organizations are assigned to manage the affairs of the universities. It can be asserted that different sources of professional and bureaucratic models may be antithetical.

The analysis of the first hypothesis does not support the assumption that faculty's perceived work alienation increases when their participation in decision making in academic areas decreases. Predicted assumption might not be right. Meanwhile, one possible explanation may justify this finding. The result may have been produced by inappropriateness of the instrument. This instrument determines the level of participation in decision making in general educational policy without considering the following points specifically: first, the instrument should measure the desire of every faculty member to participate in decision making in academic areas which a professor has expertise in, or which are relevant to the professor. Another explanation seems plausible to be considered. For instance, this study did not include such variables as salary, workload and the like. These variables may influence the attitudes of faculty towards participation in decision making in academic areas. If these points are considered, the response of a professor might be different from what this study has yielded. However, the data of this study with its limitations suggest that a professor perceives less work alienation when a professor's degree of participation in academic areas decreases.

The second hypothesis offered support of the idea that the faculty's perceived work alienation increases when the degree of hierarchy of authority increases. Again, this assumption was based on the conflict of professional and bureaucratic models.

Professors consider themselves independent professionals, responsible primarily to themselves and their commitment is to their disciplines rather than to institutional hierarchy. While bureaucratic hierarchy gives each higher office authority to control the lower office, the bureaucratic arrangement creates the typical downward flow of communication that is the specific characteristic of bureaucracy. One considers that the superior has not only the ultimate responsibility for any application of rules in an organization, but the superior also has the right to tell the subordinate what to do and to obtain deference from the subordinate. The bureaucratic hierarchy of authority ignores the professional criteria that make the professors believe that their expertise and competence authorize them to perform their profession free from administrative interference. Consequently, the authority of professionals which rests on institutionally recognizable expert knowledge conflicts with administrative authority which is based on official positions. This investigation indicates that being told what to do has serious consequences for a specific professional type - university faculty. They become alienated from their work.

The third hypothesis assumed that when the degree of job codification increases, the faculty's perceived work alienation increases. The findings did not support the direction of prediction. Several rationales for rejecting the hypothesis can be identified. First, the university professors have a relatively high degree of freedom in their classroom activities. There are not many regulations that specify who is to do what, when, where, and why. There are no highly standardized rules to delimit, in great detail, all the functions of individuals. On the contrary, faculty members are relatively independent in their academic activities in the classroom and interaction with students. They are free to explore new educational approaches and deal with subjects closest to their academic interests and student evaluation. The university regulations concerning the academic activities do not specify the kind of decisions which are expected to be made. As a result, the professors do not lose the sight of the total picture according to the bureaucratic standardization.

Secondly, some of the bureaucratic standardization, such as standardized salary raise or promotion, increase the professors' job satisfaction rather than their preceived work alienation. For instance, the salary advancements based on recommendations compared with a standardized system engender dissatisfaction, invidious comparisons, and distrust. The lesser jealousies and distrust of faculty member under a standardized system salary increasement may decrease the dissatisfaction. A more direct effect of standardized salary increments is that they make salary increments independent of recommendations of chairmen and deans. Thirdly, although the promotions of professors from assistant to associate or associate to full professor depend on the agreement of administrators, the promotions are not arbitrary. Therefore, the unique professorial positions decrease some aspects and justify other aspects of job codification. These examples may indicate that there is not a high degree of job codification in the university settings, or at least the professors do not perceive that bureaucratic standardization limit their professional autonomy. Consequently, they perceive that job codification decreases their perceived work alienation.

The fourth hypothesis addressed the fourth research question posed in this study by examining the relationship between the faculty's perceived work alienation and rule observation. This hypothesis predicted that the degree of perceived work alienation was positively related to the degree of rule observation among professors. The contention that the greater perceived work alienation would be associated with the increasing rule observation was confirmed. Rule observation is a measure of whether the rules are employed. In other words, it refers to the degree to which job occupants are supervised in conforming to the standard established by job codification, whereas according to the feature of professional autonomy the faculty expect to guide or regulate their careers with relative or complete freedom. Regulations should be controlled by colleagues rather than by an organization. When this function is performed by an organization, the professors may perceive their work alienating. The professors may feel more alienation from their work when their supervisors use directive, rather than participative or laisser faire, supervisory practices. This investigation indicates that perceived work alienation is related to the professors' perception that only their colleagues are competent to evaluate their work. Therefore, when the professors perceive that the bureaucratic organization of the university controls their work policies and limit their autonomy, they presume that their professional autonomy has been usurped by an inappropriate source of control, namely; bureaucracy. The feeling of the low job autonomy and the suppression of personal judgement and free communication lead to the faculty's dissatisfaction, and the faculty gradually take decreasing pride in what they do and no longer considering their work to be as intrinsically interesting and satisfying in itself. The cause of this dissatisfaction is highly related to the faculty's perception that they have been deprived of the professional autonomy to achieve their objectives in the course of professional planning in organizational structure. This perception leads them to static picture which creates or enhances their perceived work alienation.

The fifth hypothesis stated that non-tenured professors would perceive more work alienation than tenured professors related to their participation in decision making, hierarchy of authority, job codification, or rule observation. This hypothesis was not supported. It was assumed that a senior faculty may enjoy more power and stature on the campus and may obtain more favorable outcomes for personnel cases originating from the department as a consequence of this greater influence and visibility on the campus, independent of any effect of power. However, faculty seniority also probably denotes experience with campus politics and policies. Over a period of time, faculty members learn how to prepare personnel cases to maximize the likelihood of a more favorable response. They may learn how to apply pressure to perform their work on the basis of professional criteria in the most favorable way. In addition, the tenure status supports the senior faculty: (1) freedom of teaching, research and extrmaural activities; and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability (Hofstadter, 1970).

While non-tenured professors, who have insufficient voice in academic policies and less job security than tenured professors, may have perceived their job alienating (Ladd et al., 1973). This assumption that the low scholarly prestige, financial resources, and job security of untenured professors would have led to their perception of higher work alienation than tenured professors was not confirmed. Some explanations may support the rejection of this hypothesis: first, declining enrollments, rising unemployment, excess teacher supply, pressure to employ racial and ethnic minorities, and rising school costs may have negative impacts on both groups of professors. These stringencies especially put in danger the scholarly prestige, financial resources, and job security of tenured professors. They insist upon professorial accountability regardless of their status. Secondly, the more scholarly productive, non-tenured professors may tend to center on research, investigation, and instruction seriously in order to acquire intellectual achievement as reflected in national and international peer judgment, rather than focus on the differential status of tenured and untenured professors. In short, a young professor may regard the professorial work as a desirable one and try to perform it innovatively to acquire professional achievements.

The analysis of the sixth hypothesis confirmed the idea that there were no significant differences in perceived work alienation related to participation in decision making, hierarchy of authority, job codification, or rule observation between doctoral and non-doctoral granting university professors' mean scores.

According to the review of literature, the assocation between faculty power and the scholarly standing of universities is documented. The professors at "doctoral granting" universities are much less "employees" and much more the controlling force in their institutions than their colleagues in non-doctoral granting universities. In the upper reaches of academia, the faculty have acquired almost the power to pursue their career with less control. They do not view the university administrators as their employers, in a fashion comparable to the way those working in non-doctoral granting universities look upon their top administrative hierarchies. Doctoral granting university professors have possessed a significant measure of the independence and self-control characteristic of professional cohort (Blau, 1973).

The administrators of doctoral universities are more likely to be inclined to meet the professional criteria in order to attract research grants and consulting contracts in order to maintain the status of their universities (Baldridge, 1973). These privileges provide the doctoral granting university professors with independent power that allows them to threaten to leave and find another job, while professors of non-doctoral granting universities might not have such power to threaten to leave (Blau, 1973). The different positions of the two types of universites shape the professors' attitudes. It can be assumed that the unique status of doctoral granting university professors make them expect to view existing practices in university governance more critically than their peers in other universities. They are more inclined to perceive and object to bureaucratic or insufficiently democratic modes of decision making, hierarchy of authority, job codification, or rule observation than their colleagues at non-doctoral granting universities. Therefore, the doctoral granting university professors may not see themselves totally powerful to influence the policies of their institutions, while their colleagues at other types of universities do not see themselves completely powerless in this respect. Consequently, the two groups of professors did not manifest different overall dissatisfaction with their occupational situations.

In other words, the status of the two types of universities from the point of bureaucracy did not have a significantly different impact on professorial perceptions of work alienation.

Conclusions and Implications

Based on the findings of this study, several conclusions and implications can be identified. Control of the work environment and the intrinsically rewarding and meaninful work appear to be the key variables in this study. Every individual professor seems to relate himself or herself according to his/her own interpretation of himself/herself and of his/her present perception of job conditions. It has been shown that perceived highly organizational structures such as hierarchy of authority and rule observation are characterized by enhancing or creating work alienation among the professors. Specifically, the perceived work alienation is related to the perceived insufficient autonomy in some academic policies. The perceived work alienation was manifested where there were strict rules governing jobs on the basis of bureaucratic hierarchy. The origin of this dilemma has been related to bureaucratic features which are expected to enhance rationality and the professional guidelines which are expected to provide professors with autonomy. It is the degree of congruence between the professional guidelines and the needs of an organization for the fulfillment of its tasks that is creating the dilemma. It seems that progress might be made if university administrators and professors make efforts to reconcile.

Because of the importance of perceived control of the environment and the democratic nature of the university, the schools or departments fall within the administrative domain and are capable of alteration.

It is possible that increased satisfaction and success can be generated by the employment of democratic management principles. The administration should not focus only on rules, procedures, and measurements. It should stress improving the faculty's morale and motivation and maintaining that they are improved when the faculty perceive themselves as professionals. This situation can be productive when administrator's objectives are very close to those of the professors.

The professors should also realize that the increased public cost of higher education and the loss of public confidence in how they run the affairs have driven them more and more to justify practices that they once assumed the public should and would accept. Promoting an understanding of productive faculty involvement requires painstaking effort because the public assumes that in bureaucratized situations administrators make personnel decisions while professors who desire autonomy from administrators are individuals who receive fees directly from clients and the public. Therefore, if the faculty desire to enjoy the professional criteria in the context of bureaucracy, they should be able to assure the society that its interests are best met by professional strategies.

If the administrators want to attain the university goals, they should know that professors are not simply employees. The administrators should liberate the will to work, not to control it. If the committed professionals and experts are expected to meet the increasing needs of the society, the professors should enjoy the opportunities to set the policies and strategies which are related to academic goals without irrational intervention of the administration. In this case, the faculty members are in the best position to evaluate instruction and research. Their peers are the most competent people to judge the professorial work. Therefore, the reconciliation of professional objectives and organizational goals can be the key factor in eliminating or decreasing faculty perceived work alienation and enhancing the public support of the university in the creation of a new type of university governance which leads to professional development and organizational evolution naturally.

Directions of Future Research

The dearth of studies of this nature indicates a need for future work in this area. Further study should be attempted in the area of multiple causation of alienation. Additionally, because of the relatively small number of Schools of Education and associated departments surveyed in this study, it seems desirable that future research test the relationship found between perceived work alienation and centralization and formalization. By extending research efforts to other schools, universities, and even public universities, a broadening of the data base, and thus the applicability of the results obtained could be achieved.

Future research should also make efforts to establish the best possible means of measuring which are applicable to the university settings and can easily be applied to the specific natures of institutions being studied. The validity and reliability of the currently available instruments have been well-documented and were discussed previously in this study. Although these instruments were used in higher education institutions before, they were primarily used in the industrial settings and were woefully insufficient when applied in the educational settings. The application of such terms as "Boss," "Supervisor" and the like, may demand a constant effort to develop appropriate instruments.

Although the purpose of this study was to measure the faculty's perceived work alienation, it is desirable that future research makes efforts to consider what really exists. The subjective nature of instrument is deemed weak. The instrument requires that the subject makes perceptually based judgements in responding to the questions, and this could be too large a source of measurement error. That is, at times there can be significant differences between what a person perceives and what actually exists. Perhaps, the inclusion of an overall greater degree of objective criteria of the instrument would help to improve its validity. This suggestion revolves around what is basically a source problem of alienation criteria, as discussed in the literature, involving the issue of whether objective criteria of alienation is preferable to subjective criteria which is based on personal perceptions. The literature shows relatively strong opinions voiced for each type of criteria.

In the same line, the development of new techniques for collecting data is essential for solid findings, because higher education systems and their faculty have been so innundated with survey research that even the most careful researcher is tempted toward imperfect research techniques in order to collect sufficient data to warrant analysis and permit generalizability.

It is also necessary to study specifically how the expertise of administrators and faculty come into conflict.

Another area for further research might be a study of how work alienation actually affects the faculty research, teaching effects, and relationships with peers, students, etc.

As a final note, it should be pointed out that a whole host of other variables need to be considered when examining work alienation (e.g., faculty workloads, a low ebb of public confidence, cutbacks and retrenchment on campus, sex, race, age, salary, structural peculiarities, material status and the like). In short, it can be concluded that since not all bureaucratic procedures are disadvantageous to higher education and not all of professional procedures are advantageous for it as much as we would like to think they are. It becomes imperative to investigate further to identify those variables which enhance or create perceived work alienation in both models and make efforts to find alternatives.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Abbot, Max G. "Hierarchical Impediments to Innovation in Educational Organizations." In Max G. Abbot and John T. Lowerll (Eds.) Change Perspectives in Educational Administration. Auburn: School of Education, Auburn University, 1965.

Abrahamson, M. The Professional in the Organization. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.

Adams, Walter. "The State of Higher Education: Myths and Realities." AAUP, 60 (1974), 119-125.

Aiken, M. and J. Hage. "Organizational Alienation: A Comparative Analysis." American Sociological Review, 31 (1966), 497-507.

Althusser, Louis. For Marx. Trans. Ben Brewster. New York: Pantheon, 1969.

Alutto, Josepha A. and J. A. Belaco. "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction." Educational Administration Quarterly, 8 (1972), 155-159.

Alvarez, Alfred. The Savage God: A Study of Suicide. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971.

Anderson, Carl B. "Selected Bureaucratics and Student Alienation in the Public High Schools." (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1970.)

Anderson, G. L. "The Organizational Character of American Colleges and Universities." In T. F. Lunsford (Ed.) The Study of Academic Administration. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1963.

Anderson, James G. "Bureaucratic Rules: Bearers of Organizational Authority." Educational Administration Quarterly, 2 (1966), 7-33.

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

Argyris, C. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Aron, Raymond. Progress and Disillusion. New York: F. A. Praeger, 1968.

Aronowitz, S. False Promises: The Shaping of American Working Class Consciousness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Averbach, Jerold S. Unequal Justice: Lawyer and Social Change in Modern America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Axelos, K. Alienation, Praxis, and Techne in the Thought of Karl Marx. Trans. Ronald Bruzina. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1976.

Bakke, E. Bonds of Organization. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Baldridge, B. "The Impact of Institutional Size and Complexity on Faculty Autonomy." Journal of Higher Education, 44 (1973), 332-347.

Barber, Barnard. "Some Problems in the Sociology of Professions." Daedalus, 92 (1963), 669-678.

Barber, Barnard. "Control and Responsibility in the Powerful Professions." Science Quarterly, 93 (1978-1979), 559-617.

Barnard, C. I. The Function of the Executive. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Barr, A. and J. Goodnight. A User's Guide to Statistical Analysis System. Raleigh: SAS Institute, Inc., 1976.

Barrett, William. "Homeless in the World." Commentary, 61 (1975), 40-49.

Bartz, A. E. Basic Statistical Concepts in Education and the Behavioral Sciences. Minnesota: Burgess Publishing Company, 1976.

Barzun, Jaques. The American University. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Becker, Carl. Process and Power. Stantford, Calif.: Stantford University Press, 1936.

Bell, Daniel. The End of Ideology. Glencoe, ILL: Free Press, 1960.

Bell, Daniel. "The Debate on Alienation." In L. Labedz (Ed.) Revisionism. New York: Praeger, 1962.

Bell, Daniel. "Sociology: A Guide to Modern Usage." American Scholar, 35 (1966), 699-705.

Bell Daniel. The Cultural Contradiction of Capitalism. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Ben-David, J. "Professions in the Class System of Present Day Societies." Current Sociology, 2 (1963), 227-230.

Bendix, R. "Bureaucracy: The Problem and Its Setting." American Sociology Review, 12 (1947), 493-507.

Bendix, R. Kings or People. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Bendix, R. and Roth Guenther. Scholarship and Partisanship: Essays on Max Weber. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961.

Bennis, Warren G. Changing Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Berlant, Jeffrey L. Profession and Monopoly: A Study of Medicine in the United States and Great Britain. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.

Berman, Ronald. America in the Sixties. New York: Free Press, 1968.

Bernstein, R. J. Praxis and Action. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971.

Bernstein, Saul. Alternatives to Violence: Alienated Youth and Riots Race and Poverty. New York: Association Press, 1976.

Bidwell, Charles E. "The School as Formal Organization." In James G. March (Ed.) Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Blalock, Hubert M. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Books, Inc., 1960.

Blau, Peter M. The Dynamics of Bureaucracy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Blau, Peter M. "Theories of Organizations." In D. L. Sills (Ed.) International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, 2. New York: The Macmilliam Company and The Free Press, 1968.

Blau, Peter M. "The Hierarchy of Authority in Organizations." American Journal of Sociology, 73 (1968), 453-467.

Blau, Peter M. The Theory of Organization of Academic Work. New York: Wiley, 1973.

Blau, Peter M. On the Nature of Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1974.

Blau, Peter M. and W. R. Scott. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.

Blau, Peter M. and M. W. Meyer. Bureaucracy in Modern Society. (2nd Ed.) New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Blauner, R. Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker and His Industry. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1964.

Blumer, Herbert. Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Bonjean, C. M. and M. D. Grimes. "Bureaucracy and Alienation: A Dimensional Approach." Social Forces, 48 (1970), 365-373.

Brown, P. "Bureaucracy in a Government Laboratory." Social Forces, 32 (1954), 259-268.

Bucher, R. and A. Struss. "Profession in Process." American Journal of Sociology, 66 (1961), 325-334.

Budig, Gene A. What Faculty Expects. Academic Quicksand: Some Trends and Issues in Higher Education. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators and Publications, Inc., 1973.

Calhoun, D. Professional Lives in America, Structure and Aspiration, 1750-1850. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1965.

Camus, Albert. The Rebel. Trans. Anthony Bower. London: H. Hamilton, 1953.

Caplow, Theodore and R. J. McGee. The Academic Marketplace. New York: Basic Books, 1958.

Carlson, A. J. "So This is the University." AAUP, 24 (1938), 9-18.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The More Effective Use of Resources. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Governance-Return to Consensus or Adjustment to Conflict? New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Carpenter, Harrel H. "Informal Organizational Structure Factors and Perceived Job Satisfaction of Classroom Teachers." Administrative Science Quarterly, 16 (1971), 460-465.

Cherns, Albert A. and Louise Davis. The Quality of Working Life. New York: Free Press, 1975.

Chomsky, Noam. "The Responsibility of Intellectuals." In Charles H. Anderson and John D. Murray (Eds.) The Professors: Work and Life Styles. Cambridge, Mass: Schenkman Publishing Company Inc., 1971.

Clark, B. R. "Organizational Adaptation to Professionals." In H. Vollmer and D. Mills (Eds.) Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Clark, B. R. "The New University." American Behavioral Scientists, 11 (1968), 1-5.

Clark, B. R. "The Role of Faculty Authority." Paper presented at President's Institute, Harvard University, 1963, Ed. 026 947.

Clark, J. M. "Report on Methods of Recruiting the Teaching Profession." AAUP, 4 (1918), 10-12.

Clark, J. P. "Measuring Alienation within a Social System." American Sociological Review, 24 (1959), 849-854.

Clark, L. W. "Alienated and Coercion in Selected Secondary Schools: A Study of Relationships." (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1972.)

Cohen, Michael D. and James D. March. Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education. Faculty Tenure, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Coopersmith, S. The Antecedents of Self-Esteem. San Francisco: Freeman, 1967.

Cotgrove, S. "Alienation and Automation." British Journal of Sociology, 23 (1972), 437-451.

Coulter, J. M. "Report on Methods of Recruiting Teaching Profession." AAUP, 4 (1918), 11-12.

Crew, Henry. "Address of President Crew." AAUP, 14 (1928), 167-168.

Crozier, Michael. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1964.

Crozier, Michael. The World of the Office Worker. Trans. David Landau. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Cuzzort, Ray P. and E. W. King. 20th Century Social Thought. (Third Ed.) New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1980.

Dahl, R. A. Who Governs? New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.

Dahl, R. A. Modern Political Analysis. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Davis, F. J. Society and the Law: New Meaning for an Old Profession. New York: Free Press, 1962.

Davis, L. E. et al. "Improving the Quality of Work: Socio-Technical Case Studies." In J. O'Toole (Ed.) Work and the Quality of Life. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1973.

Davis, L. E. et al. Design of Jobs. London: Penguin, 1972.

Dean, D. "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement." American Sociological Review, 26 (1961), 735-768.

Decharms, R. Personal Causation. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Deibler, F. S. "The Determination of Policy Under the Present Form of Collegiate and University Government." AAUP, 28 (1942), 32-45.

Denise, Theodore D. "The Concept of Alienation." In Frank Johnson (Ed.) Alienation, Concept, Term, and Meaning. New York: Seminar Press, Inc., 1973.

Denny, J. V. "President's Address," AAUP, 10 (1924), 18-28.

Devries, David L. "The Relationship of Role Expectations to Faculty Behavior." Research in Higher Education, 3 (1975), 111-131.

Dewar, R. D., D. A. Whetten and D. Boie. "An Examination of the Reliability of the Aiken and Hage Scales of Centralization and Formalization and Task Routineness." Administrative Science Quarterly, 25 (1980), 120-128.

Dimock, M. E. Administrative Vitality: The Conflict with Bureaucracy. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Drabeck, Thomas E. and J. Eugene Hass. "Laboratory Simulation of Organizational Stress." American Sociological Review, 29 (1969), 222-236.

Dressel, P. L. et al. The Confidence Crisis. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Drucker, Peter F. "Hysteria Over the Work Thing." Psychological Today, 7 (1973), 87-91.

Drucker, Peter F. "The Big Power of Little Ideas." Harvard Business Review, 42 (1964), 6-8.

Duncan, O. D. et al. Social Change in a Metropolitan Community. New York: Russell Sage, 1973.

Durkheim, Emile. Suicide, a Study in Sociology. Trans. John A. Spaulding and George Simpson. George Simpson (Ed.) Glencoe: Free Press, 1952.

Durkheim, Emile. Professional Ethics and Civil Morals. Trans. G. Brookfield. London: Routledge and Paul, 1957.

Duryea, E. D. "Evolution of University Organization." In James A. Perkins (Ed.) The University as an Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1973.

Dykes, A. R. Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making. Washington, D.C.: American Council in Education, 1968.

Elliot, P. The Sociology of the Professions. New York: Herder and Herder, 1972.

Ellul, Jaques. The Technological Society. Trans. John Wilkinson. New York: Vintage Books, 1964.

Ellul, Jaques. Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes. Trans. Kornard Kellen, A. Lerner. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.

Esterson, C. "The Association: Its Process and Possibilities." AAUP, 30 (1944), 176-195.

Etzioni, Amita. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Etzioni, Amita. The Active Society: A Theory of Societal and Political Processes. New York: Free Press, 1968.

Etzioni, Amita. The Semi-Professional and Their Organization. New York: Free Press, 1969a.

Etzioni, Amita. A Sociological Reader on Complex Organization. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969b.

Ewen, Start. Captain of Consciousness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976.

Faunce, W. et al. "Professionalization and Stratefication, Patterns in an Industrial Community." American Journal of Sociology, 27 (1967), 341-350.

Feuer, L. S. "The Elite of the Alienated." New York Times Magazine (March 26, 1967), 22-23.

Feuer, L. S. Marx and the Intellectuals: A Set of Post Ideological Essays. (1st Ed.) Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1969.

Feuer, L. S. Ideology and the Ideologists. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

Feuerlicht, Ignance. Alienation From the Past to Future. London: Greenwood Press, 1978.

Flexner, Abraham. "Is Social Work a Profession?" Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, Chicago, 1915.

Forsyth, P. B. "Isolation and Alienation in Educational Organizations." (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Rutgers State University, 1977).

Forsyth, P. B. and T. J. Danisienwicz. The Socialization of Professional Students: A Comparative Study." (Unpub. Research Proposal Submitted to the Oklahoma State University Institutional Board, Stillwater: Oklahoma State University, 1979.)

Forsyth, P. B. and T. J. Danisienwicz. Professional Autonomy Scale. Stillwater: Oklahoma State University, 1978.

Fox, R. C. "Training for Uncertainty." In Robert K. Merton et al. (Eds.) The Student Physician. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Francies, Roy G. and Robert C. Stone. Service and Procedure in Bureaucracy. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1965.

Freeman, Richard B. The Overeducated America. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Freud, S. An Outline of Psycho-Analysis. James Strachey (Trans. and Ed.), New York: W. W. Norton, 1970.

Friedson, Elliot. Professional Dominance. New York: Atherton, 1970.

Freidson, Elliot. "Professions and the Occupational Principle." In E. Freidson (Ed.) The Professions and Their Prospects. Beverley Hills: Sage, 1973a.

Freidson, Elliot. "Professionalization and the Organization of Middle-Class Labor in Post-Industrial Society." In P. Halmos (Ed.) Professionalization and Social Change. Sociological reveiw Monograph 20, Keele England: University of Keele, 1973b.

Freidson, Elliot (Ed.). The Hospital in Modern Society. New York: Free Press, 1976.

Fromm, Erich. The Sane Society. New York: Reinhart, 1955.

Fromm, Erich. Beyond the Chain of Illusion: My Counter with Marx and Freud. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1962.

Fuchs, R. A. "A Profession in Quest of Itself," AAUP, 48 (1962), 104-109.

Gerth, H. H. and W. Mills (Eds., Trans.). From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Geyer, F. R. and D. R. Schweitzer. Theories of Alienation. Leiden: Nijhoff Social Sciences Division, 1976.

Gilb, C. R. Hidden Hierarchies the Professions and Government. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Glaser, Barney G. Organizational Scientists. New York: Bobbs-Merril, 1964.

Goldthrope, J. H. et al. The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behavior. London: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Golembiewski, Robert. "Personality and Organizational Structure." Academy of Management Journal, 9 (1966), 217-233.

Good, Carter V. et al. (Eds.) Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.

Goode, W. "The Theoretical Limits of Professionalization." In A. Etizioni (Ed.) The Semi-Professions and Their Organizations. New York: Free Press, 1969.

Goodle, Rae. The Visible Scientists. Boston Little, Brown, 1977.

Goodman, Paul. New Formation. New York: Random House, 1970.

Goss, Mary A. Pattern of Bureaucracy Among Hospital Physicians." In Elliot Freidson (Ed.) The Hospital in Modern Society. New York: Free Press, 1963.

Gouldner, A. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles." Parts I and II, Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (1957) and (1958), 281-306, 444-480.

Gouldner, A. W. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. Glencoe, ILL.: Free Press, 1954.

Gouldner, A. W. "Organizational Analysis." In Jaisingh Ghoropade (Ed.) Assessment of Organizational Effectiveness Issues/Analysis/Readings. Pacific Palisades, Calif.: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., 1971.

Gouldner, A. W. The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology. New York: Equinox Books, 1970.

Grander, John W. Self Renewal. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Greenwood, Ernest. "Attributes of a Profession." Social Work, 2 (1957), 45-55.

Gross, Edward and Paul Grambsch. University Goals and Academic Power. Washington, D.C.: American Council of Education, 1968.

Gross, Edward. Work and Society. New York: Crowell, 1958.

Gurn, G., J. Veroff and S. Fled. Americans View Their Mental Health. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Gustard, J. "Community Consensus and Conflict." Educational Record, 47 (1966), 439-451.

Haas, J. E. et al. Complex Organizations: A Sociological Perspective. New York: Macmillan, 1973.

Hackman, T. Richard and I. L. Suttle. Improving Life at Work: Behavior Science Approaches to Organizational Change. Santa Monica, CA.: Goodyear, 1977.

Hage, Jerald. "An Aximotic Theory of Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly, 10 (1965), 289-320.

Hage, Gerald and M. Aiken. "Program Change and Organizational Properties: A Comparative Analysis." American Journal of Sociology, 72 (1967a), 503-519.

Hage, Gerald and M. Aiken. "Relationship of Centralization to Other Structural Properties." Administrative Science Quarterly, 12 (1967b), 72-92.

Hahn, D. K. "Why Don't Workers Want to be Promoted?" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychologist Association, Chicago, 1975.

Haire, M. "Biological Models and Empirical Histories of the Growth of Organizations." In M. Haire (Ed.) Modern Organization Theory. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Hall, Richard. "Professionalization and Bureaucratization." American Sociological Review, 32 (1968), 903-912.

Hall, Richard H. Organizations Structure and Process. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Hall, R. H. "Some Organizational Consideration in the Professional-Organizational Relationship." Administrative Science Quarterly, 12 (1967), 461-478.

Hall, R. H. Occupations and The Social Structure. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Hall, R. H. "The Concept of Bureaucracy: An Empirical Assessment." American Journal of Sociology, 69 (1963), 32-40.

Hall, R. Occupations and the Social Structure. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Halpin, A. W. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: Macmillan, 1966.

Halsey, A. H. et al. The British Academies. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Haskins, Charles H. The Medieval Professor. New York: Cornell University Press, 1957.

Hausler, Arnold. Mannerism: The Crisis of the Resistance and the Origin of Modern Art. Trans. Eric Mosbacher. London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1965.

Havighurst, Robert J. and L. Stiles. "Statement of National Policy for Alienated Youth." Phi Delta Kappa, XLII (1961), 283-291.

Heinman, F. H. Existentialism and the Modern Predicament. New York: Harper, 1958.

Herzberg, F. Work and Nature of Man. Cleveland: World Book, 1966.

Hickson, Donald J. "A Convergance of Organization Theory." Administrative Science Quarterly, 11 (1966), 224-237.

Hill, H. W. and W. L. French. "Perception of the Power of Departmental Chairmen by Professors." Administrative Science Quarterly, 11 (1966), 548-574.

Hofstadter, Richard. Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. New York: Knopf, 1970.

Homans, G. C. Social Behavior: The Elementary Forms. (Revised Ed.), New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanich, Inc., 1974.

Horkheimer, Marx. Critical Theory. Trans. Matthew O. O'Connell. New York: The Seabury Press, 1972.

Horowitz, Irving L. "Young Radicals and Professional Critics." In Charles H. Anderson and John D. Murray (Eds.) The Professors. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Hughes, Everett C. Men and Their Work. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1958.

Hughes, Everett C. "Professions," In Kenneth S. Lynn (Ed.) The Professions in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965.

Hulin, C. L. and M. R. Blood. "Job Enlargement, Individual Differences and Worker Responses." Psychol. Bull., 69 (1968), 41-55.

Hummel, Ralph P. The Bureaucratic Experience. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1977.

Hunnuis, G., G. P. Garson et al. (Eds.). Worker Control: A Reader on Labor and Social Change. New York: Random, 1973.

Hutchins, Robert M. The Learning Society. New York: Praeger, 1968.

Huxley, A. Brave New World Revisited. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1958.

Isherwood, G. and W. K. Hoy. "Bureaucracy, Powerlessness, and Teacher Work Values." The Journal of Educational Administration, 11 (1973), 124-138.

Israel, J. H. Alienation from Marx to Modern Sociology. Boston: Allyn and Beacon, 1971.

Jackson, J. (Ed.). Profession and Professionalization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Jackson, J. H. and C. P. Morgan. Organization Theory a Macro Perspective for Management, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978.

Jamous, H. and B. Peloill. "Changes in the French University-Hospital System." In J. Jackson (Ed.) Profession and Professionalization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Jencks, C. and D. Reisman. The Academic Revolution. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968.

Johnson, Frank A. "Alienation: Overview and Introduction." In F. Johnson (Ed.) Alienation, Concept, Term and Meaning. New York: Seminar Press, Inc., 1973a.

Johnson, Frank. "Psychological Alienation: Isolation and Self Estrangement." In F. Johnson (Ed.) Alienation, Concept, Term and Meaning. New York: Seminar Press, Inc., 1973b.

Johnson, Terence. Professions and Power. London: Macmillan, 1972.

Johnson, Terence. "The Professions in the Class Structure." In R. Scase (Ed.) Industrial Society: Class Cleavage and Control. New York: St. Martin's, 1977.

Joughin, Louis (Ed.). Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Handbook of the AAUP. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

Kadish, S. H. "The Theory of the Profession and its Predicament." AAUP, 58 (1972), 120-125.

Kahn, R. L. "The Meaning of Work: Interpretation and Proposals for Measurement." In P. E. Campbell et al. (Eds.) Human Meaning of Social Change. New York: Sage, 1971.

Kahn, Robert L. et al. Organizational Stress. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Kaplan, H. R., C. Tausky, and B. S. Bolaria. "Job Enrichment." Personnel Journal, 48 (1969), 791-798.

Kaplan, Morton A. Alienation and Identification. New York: Free Press, 1976.

Katz, D. and R. L. Kahn. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley, 1960.

Kaufman, H. G. The Limits of Organizational Change. Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1971.

Kaufman, H. G. Obsolence and Professional Career Development. New York: Amacom, 1974.

Kaufman, W. "The Inevitability of Alienation." In R. Schact. Alienation. New York: Doubleday, 1970.

Keats, John. The Sheepskin Psychosis. New York: Dell, 1963.

Keniston, K. "The Sources of Student Dissent." Journal of Social Issues, 23 (1967), 108-113.

Keniston, K. The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in American Society. New York: Harcourt Brace and World, 1965.

Kenneth, P. The Faculty in University Governance. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1971.

Kerr, Clark. The Uses of the University. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Kerr, Clark et al. (Eds.). Work in America: The Decade Ahead. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1979.

Kirsch, L. J. et al. Soviet Wages: Changes in Structure and Administration Since 1965. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1972.

Klegon, D. "Lawyers and the Social Structure: A Historical Analysis of the Role of Professionalization among Lawyers in the United States." (Unpubl. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1975.)

Klinger, Eric. Meaning and Void. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977.

Kohn, M. L. and C. C. Schooler. "Occupational Experience and Occupational Functioning: An Assessment of Reciprocal Effects." American Sociological Review, 38 (1973), 97-118.

Kon, I. S. "The Concept of Alienation in Modern Sociology." The Sociological Research, 34 (1967), p. 253-261.

Kornhauser, A. Mental Health of the Industrial Worker. New York: Wiley, 1965.

Kornhauser, W. Scientists in Industry. Beverley: University of California Press, 1962.

Krause, E. Power and Illness: The Political Sociology of Health and Medical Care. New York: Elsevier, 1977.

Kuhn, Thomas S. The Structure of Scientific Revolution. (2nd edition) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Kumar, Krishan. Prophecy and Progress. England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1978.

Ladd, E. C., Jr., and S. M. Lipset. Professors, Unions. Washington, D.C.: American Higher Education, 1973.

Laing, R. D. Sanity, Madness and the Family. New York: Basik Books, 1965.

Larson, Magall S. The Rise of Professionalism. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.

Laski, H. J. "Bureaucracy," in E. R. A. Seligman and A. Johnson (Eds.) Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 15 (1930, 1935), 70-74.

Lawler, E. E. "What Do Employees Really Want?" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, 1973.

Levi, A. W. "Existentialsim and the Alienation of Man." In E. N. Lee and M. Mandle (Eds.) Phenomenlogy and Existentialism. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1967.

Levine, S. A. "The Professional-Bureaucratic Dilemma: Alienation from Work Among University Professors." (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1978.)

Lewis, L. and Michael Dyan. "The American Professoriate and the Movement Toward Unionization." In Altbach (Ed.) Comparative Perspective on the Academic Freedom. New York: Peager Publisher, 1977.

Lindeman, Lynn W. "Instructional Goals and Faculty Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations." Research in Higher Education, 3 (1975), 205-215.

Livingston, J. C. "Faculty and Administrative Role in Decision Making." In G. K. Smith (Ed.) Stress and Campus Response. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Lobkawicz, Nikolaus. Theory and Practice: History of a Concept From Aristotle to Marx. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1967.

Lodahl, Thomas M. and Mathilde Kijner. "The Definition and Measurement of Job Involvement." Journal of Applied Psychology, 49 (1965), 24-33.

Louis, Health G. The Hot Campus: The Politics that Impede Change in the Technology. New Jersey: The Scarrow Press, 1973.

Lovejoy, Arthur O. "Report on the Committee on Pensions and Insurance." AAUP, 5 (1919), 10-40.

Lucas, George. History and Class Consciousness. Trans. R. Livingston. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1971.

Ludz, P. "Alienation as a Concept in the Social Sciences." Current Sociology, 21 (1973), 8-39.

Ludz, Peter C. "Evolution of the Theory and Concept." In R. Felxi Geyer and David R. Schweitzer (Eds.) Theories of Alienation. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Social Sciences Division, 1976.

Luecke, David S. "The Professional as Organizational Leader." Administrative Science Quarterly, 18 (1973), 85-94.

Lukes, S. "Alienation and Anomie." In P. Laslett, and W. G. Runciman (Eds.) Philosophy and Politics and Society. Oxford: Blackwell, 1967.

Lunsford, T. F. "Authority and Ideology in the Administered University." The American Behavioral Scientists, 11 (1968), 5-14.

Macare, Duncan Jr. "Science and Formation of Policy in a Democracy." Minerva, XI (1978), 243-262.

Mannheiem, Karl. Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1940.

Marcson, S. "Decision Making in a University Phsyics Department." Amer. Behav. Scientists, 6 (1962), 37-48.

Marcuse, H. One Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.

Marcuse, H. Eros and Civilization. Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.

Marx, Karl. Early Writings. Ed. and Trans. T. B. Bottomore. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Marx, Karl. Selected Writings. Ed. and Trans. David McLellan. London: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Maslow, A. H. "A Theory of Motivation." Psychological Review, 50 (1943), 370-396.

McClung, A. L. "An Obituary for Alienation." Social Problems, 20 (1972), 121-127.

McConnel, T. R. "Faculty Unionism and Faculty Senates." In T. R. McConnel (Ed.) The Redistribution of Power in Higher Education. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1971.

McConnel, T. R. and Kenneth P. Moretimer. The Faculty in University Governance. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1971.

McGlohin, W. J. The Professional Schools. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1964.

McGregor, D. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

McNulty, James E. "Organizational Change in Growing Enterprises." Administrative Science Quarterly, 7 (1962), 1-12.

Mead, George H. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press, 1968.

Merton, Robert K. "Bureaucracy, Structure and Personality." In Robert K. Merton and others (Eds.) Reading in Bureaucracy. Glencoe, Ill: Free Press, 1958.

Merton, Robert K. The Sociology of Science, Theoretical and Empirical Investigations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

M-Szaros, I. Marx's Theory of Alienation. London: Merlin, 1970.

Middleton, R. "Alienation, Race and Education," American Sociological Review, 22 (1963), 670-677.

Miles, R. H. "Role-Set Configuration as a Predictor of Role Conflict and Ambiguity in Complex Organization." Sociometry a Journal of Research in Social Psychology, 40 (1977), 2135-2141.

Miller, G. A. "Professions in Bureaucracy: Alienation: Alienation Among Industrial Scientists and Engineers." American Sociological Review, 32 (1967), 755-768.

Miller, G. T. Replenish the Earth: A Primer in Human Economy. Belmount, California: Wadsworth Pub. Co., 1972.

Millet, John D. "Faculty": The Academic Community. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

Mills, C. W. White Collar. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Mills, C. W. The Power Elite. London: Oxford University Press, 1956.

Mills, Wright C. "The Cultural Default." In Charles H. Anderson and John D. Murray (Eds.) The Professors Work and Life Styles Among Americans. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishers Company, Inc., 1971.

Mills, Frederick C. Statistical Methods. New York: Henryholt and company, 1955.

"Minority Report and Recommendation Regarding Membership Policy." AAUP, 51 (1965), 202-209.

Mobley W. H. and E. A. Locke. "The Relationship of Value Importance to Satisfaction." Organizational Behavior and Human Performances, 5 (1970), 463-483.

Moore, W. E. The Professions: Roles and Rules. New York: Rusell Sage Foundation, 1970.

Morrisey, E. and D. D. Gillespie. "Technology and the Conflict of Professionals in Bureaucratic Organizations." The Sociological Quarterly, 16 (1975), 319-352.

Morse, N. C. and R. C. Weis. "The Function and Meaning of Work and the Job." American Sociological Review, 20 (1955), 191-198.

Moretimer, K. P. et al. Collective Bargaining: Implication for Governance. Park: Center for the Study of Higher Education, Penn. State University, 1971.

Moretimer, K. P. et al. "Faculty Participation in University Governance." In C. E. Kruy T. Bosch and S. Messinger (Eds.) The State of the Univeristy: Authority and Change. Beverley Hills: Sage, 1970.

Mulder, Hauk. "Power Equalization Through Participation." Administrative Science Quarterly, 16 (1971), 31-39.

Mumford, E. M. "Social Behavior in Small Work Groups." Sociol. Ref., 7 (1959), 137-157.

Naville, Pierre. "Alienation and the Analysis of the Modern World." Review, 4 (1962), 54-56.

Nisbet, R. A. Community and Power. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Nisbet, R. A. Emile Durkheim. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Obradovic, J. "Participation and Work Attitudes in Yugoslavia." Ind. Relat., 9 (1970), 161-169.

Ohlin, Lloy E. "Confirmity in American Society Today." Social Work, 3 (1958), 58-66.

Oken, Donald. "Alienation and Identity." In F. Johnson (Ed.) Alienation: Concept, Term and Meanings. New York: Seminar Press, Inc., 1973.

Oncken, Gerald. "Organizational Control in University Departments." Technical Report, 17-20. Department of Psychology: University of Washington, 1973.

O'Neill, J. Sociology as a Skin Trade, New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Page, Terry G. et al. International Dictionary of Education. London: Nicholas Publishing Company, 1977.

Parker, S. The Future of Work and Leisure. New York: Praeger, 1971.

Parsons, T. "Suggestions for Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (1965), 225-239.

Parsons, T. "Professions." In Daivd Sills (Ed.) International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 12 (1968), 536-546.

Parsons, Talcott. "The Mental Hospital as a Type of Organization." In Milton Green Blatt et al. (Eds.) The Patient and the Mental Hospital. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957.

Parsons, T. "The Social Structure of the American Family." In R. Ashen (Ed.) The Family: Its Function and Destiny. New York: Harper, 1942.

Patchen, Martin. Participation, Achievement and Involvement on the Job. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Peabody, R. L. "Perception of Organizational Authority: A Comparative Analysis." Administrative Science Quarterly, 6 (1962), 463-482.

Pearlin, L. I. "Alienation From Work: A Study of Nursing Personnel." Am. Sociolo. Rev., 27 (1962), 314-326.

Pierson, G. W. The Governance of the Faculty. London: Oxford University Press, 1952.

Perrow, Charles. Organizational Analysis: A Sociological Review. Belmont: Wardworth Publishing Company, 1970.

Perrow, Charles. "A Framework for the Comparative Analysis of Organizations." American Sociological Review, 32 (1967), 194-208.

Petrovic, Gajo. "Alienation." Encyclopedia of Philosophy. New York: Macmillan and Free Press, 1967.

Plasek, Wayne. "Marxist and American Sociological Concept of the Alienation Implication for Social Problem Theory." Social Problems, 21 (1974), 316-328.

Platt, G. M. and T. Parsons. "Decision Making in the Academic System: Influence and Power Exchange." In C. E. K. Bosch et al. (Eds.) The State of the University Authority and Change. Beverley Hills: Sage Publication, 1970.

Plez, D. C. and F. M. Andrew. Scientists in Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Podhoretz, Norman. Making It. New York: Farrar, Straus, 1967.

Porter, L. W. and R. M. Steers. "Organizational Work and Personal Factors in Employee Turnover and Absenteeism." Psych. Bull., 80 (1973), 151-176.

Prethus, Robert V. The Organizational Society. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.

Prethus, R. V. "Authority in Organizations." In S. Mailick et al. (Eds.) Concepts and Issues in Administrative Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Price, James. Handbook of Organizational Measurement. Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1972.

Pugh, D. S. et al. "A Conceptual Scheme for Organizational Analysis." Administrative Science Quarterly, 8 (1963), 289-315.

Putnam, Alvin R. "Alienation Students in General Education as Compared to Vocational Education." (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1978.)

Rainwater, L. Behind Ghetto Walls: Black Family Life in a Federal Slum. Chicago: Aldine, 1970.

Reingold, Anthan. "Definitions and Speculations: The Professionalization of Science in America in the Nineteenth Century." In A. C. Oleson et al. (Eds.) Knowledge in the Early American Republic. Balt." John Hopkins University Press, 1976.

Reisman, David. "The Academic Procession." In David Reisman (Ed.) In Contrast and Variety in American Education. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1958.

Rice, G. H., Jr. et al. Conceptual Model of Organization. New York: Meredith Corporation, 1971.

Ringer, Fritz. The Decline of the German Drains: The German Academic Community, 1890-1933. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Rose, R. "Dynamic Tendency in the Authority of Regimes." World Politics, 21 (1969), 602-628.

Rosenberg, H. "It Can Happen to Anyone." New York Times Book Review. (December 20, 1964), 14-15.

Ross, R. D. "Decentralization of Authority in Colleges and Universities." Research in Higher Education, 6 (1977), 97-124.

Roszak, Theodore. "On Academic Delinquency." In H. Anderson and J. D. Murray (Eds.) The Professors: Work and Life Styles Among Academicians. Cambridge, Mass.: Shenkman Publishing Co., 1973.

Rourke, F. E. Bureaucracy, Politics and Public Policy. Boston: Little Brown, 1969.

Ruschemeyer, D. Lawyers and Their Society: A Comparative Study of the Legal Profession in Germany and the United States. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Satre. J. P. Anti-Semite and Jew. New York: Schocken, 1948.

Schact, R. Alienation. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1970.

Schact, R. "New Conceptual and Theoretical Approaches." In R. F. Geyer and D. R. Schweitzer (Eds.) Theories of Alienation. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Social Sciences Division, 1976.

Schuman, H. et al. "The Impact of City on Racial Attitudes." American Journal of Sociology, 76 (1970), 213-261.

Scott, M. B. "The Social Sources of Alienation." Inquiry, 6 (1963), 57-69.

Scott, W. G. et al. Organization America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1979.

Scott, W. R. "Professionals in Bureaucracies, Areas of Conflict." In Volmer, H. M. et al. (Eds.) Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Scott, W. R. and R. Scott. "Reactions to Suerpvision in a Heteronomous Professional Organization." Administrative Science Quarterly, 10 (1956), 65-82.

Scott, R. "Field Methods in the Study of Organizations." In J. G. Marcit (Ed.) Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Sebring, Robert H. "The Five Million Dollar Misunderstanding: A Perspective on State Government-University Interorganizational Conflicts." Administrative Science Quarterly, 22 (1979), 505-523.

Seeman, Melvin. "On the Meaning of Alienation in Work." American Sociological Review, 28 (1959), 785-791.

Seeman, Melvin. "On the Personal Consequences of Alienation in Work." American Sociological Review, 32 (1967), 273-285.

Seeman, Melvin. "Alienation and Engagement." In A. Campbell et al. (Eds.) The Human Meaning of Social Change. New York: Russel Sage, 1972a.

Seeman, Melvin. "The Symptoms of '68: Alienation in Pre-Crisis France." American Sociology Review, 37 (1972b), 385-402.

Seeman, Melvin. "Current Research Findings in Theories of Alienation." In R. F. Geyer et al. (Eds.) Theories of Alienation. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Social Sciences Division, 1976.

Seeman, M. "Status and Identiy: The Problem of Inauthentity." Pac. Sociol. Review, 9 (1966), 67-73.

Seeman, Melvin et al. "Community and Control in a Metropolitan Setting." In P. Orleans (Ed.) Race, Change and Urban Society. Los Angeles: Sage, 1971.

Seligman, Edwin R. A. "Our Association - Its Aims and Its Accomplishments." AAUP, 8 (1922), 6-26.

Selzinck, Philip. TVA and the Grass Roots. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

Selzinck, P. TVA and the Grass Roots. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Semple, W. T. "Address of President Semple at the Annual Meeting." AAUP, 4 (1928), 162-166.

Sennett, R. and J. Cobb. The Hidden Injuries of Class. New York: Vintage, 1972.

Sheppard, Harold L. and Neal Herrick. Where Have All the Robots Gone: Worker Dissatisfaction in the 70's. New York: Free Press, 1972.

Shryock, R. H. "The Academic Profession in the U.S." AAUP, 38 (1952), 32-70.

Siegel, Sidney. Non-Parametric Statistics For the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.

Simon, H. Administrative Behavior. New York: Free Press, 1959.

Simon H. et al. Public Administration. New York: Knope, 1959.

Singer, D. Prelude to Revolution: France in May 1968. New York: Hall and Wang, 1970.

Smith, R. E. "Changes in Locus of Control as a Function of Life Crisis Resolution." J. Abnorm. Psycol., 75 (1970), 328-332.

Snizek, W. E. Halus. "Professionalism Scale: An Empirical Reassessment.' American Sociological Rev., 37 (1972), 109-114.

Spinks, Robert L. "The Relationship Between the Level of Bureaucratization and the Level of Professionalism and School Climate." (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1980.)

Stinchombe, A. L. "Bureaucratic and Craft Administration of Production." Administrative Science Quarterly, 4 (1959), 168-187.

Stinchombe, A. L. Rebellion in a High School. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964.

Straus, G. and E. Bosenstein. "Workers' Participation: A Critical View." Ind. Relat., 9 (1970), 197-214.

Swados, Harvey. "The Myth of the Happy Worker." In E. Josephson and M. Josephson (Eds.) Man Alone. New York: Free Press, 1962.

Tannenbaum, R. and I. R. Wechsler et al. Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Thompson, J. D. Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Thorne, Barrie. "Professional Education in Medicine." In Hughes, J. M. et al. (Eds.) Education for the Profession of Medicine Law, Theology and Social Welfare. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Touraine, A. The May Movement, Protest and Reform. New York: Random House, 1971.

Turner, A. N. and P. R. Lawrence. Industrial Jobs and the Workers: An Investigation of Response to Task Attributes. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Tussing, G. Dale. "Alienation and the U.S. Economic Future." In Frank Johnson (Ed.) Alienation: Concept, Term and Meaning. New York: Seminar Press, 1973.

Udy, Stanley H., Jr. "Bureaucracy and Rationality in Weber's Organization Theory." Administrative Science Quarterly, 4 (1959), 168-186.

Udy, S. H., Jr. "The Comparative Analysis of Organizations." In J. G. March (Ed.) Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1965.

Veysey, Laurence. The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Vollmer, H. M. et al. Professional Organization. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1966.

Walton, R. "How to Counter Alienation in the Plant." Harvard Bus. Rev., 50 (1972), 70-81.

Walton, R. E. "Criteria for the Quality of Working Life." In Albert A. Charles et al. (Eds.) Quality of Working Life. New York: Free Press, 1 (1972), 91-104.

Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Trans. A. M. Henderson and T. Parsons. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations. Trans. J. C. B. Mohr, Rev. by Wickleman. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1965.

Weber, Max. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. H. H. Gerth and Wright Mills (Trans. and Eds.), New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Weber, Max. Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology. (Eds.) G. Roth and C. Wittich, Trans. Fischoff et al., New York: Bedminster Press, 1968.

White, Robert W. "Motivation Reconsidered: The Concept of Competence." Psychological Review, 66 (1959), 297-335.

Whitehead, Alfred N. "Workers' Self-Management: Socialist Myth or Prognostigation?" Presented at 54th Annual Meeting Am. Polit. Sco. Assoc. Chicago, 1974.

Whyte, W. H., Jr. The Organization Man. New York: Simon and Schuster Rockfeller Center, 1956.

Wilensky, Harold. "The Professionalization of Every One?" American Journal of Sociology, 70 (1964), 137-158.

Wilensky, H. Intellectual in Labor Unions: Organizational Pressures on Professional Roles. New York: Free Press, 1956.

Wilensky, H. L. "Varieties of work Experience." In H. Brown (Ed.) Man in A World of Work. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964.

Williams, W. A. American Confronts a Revolutional World. New York: Morrow, 1976.

Wilson, J. Q. "The Urban Unease." Public Interest, 2 (1968), 25-39.

Wilson, R. A. "Anomie in the Ghetto: A Study of Neighborhood Type, Race and Anomie." Am. J. Sociol., 77 (1971), 66-88.

Wingmore, John H. "To Members of Association," AAUP, 2 (1916), 8-10.

Woodward, Helen. "Through Many Windows." Quoted in Stuart Eweng Captain of Consciousness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1926.

Work in America; Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1973.

Worthy, J. C. "Organizational Structure and Employee Morale." American Sociological Review, 24 (1971), 169-179.

Worthy, J. C. "Organizational Structure and Employee Morale." American Sociological Review, 15 (1950), 169-179.

Wright, Quincy. "The Universities and the World Order." AAUP, 33 (1947), 43-44.

Wriston, Michael J. "Indifference of Bureaucracy." Public Administration Review, 40 (1980), 179-183.

Zollschan, G. K. and P. Gibeau. "Concerning Alieantion." In G. K. Zollschan and W. Hirsch (Eds.) Explorations in Social Change. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964.

Zuckerman, H. "Noble Laureates in Science Patterns of Productivity, Collaboration and Authorship." American Sociological Review, (1967), 391-404.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
309 GUNDERSEN HALL
(405) 624-7244

April 2, 1981

Dear Professor:

We are soliciting your assistance and cooperation in a research project. The study is an attempt to determine faculty perceptions toward the organizational aspects of formalization and centralization and the impact these variables may have on alienation.

We are hopeful that you will take a few minutes from your busy schedule and respond to the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the self addressed stamped envelope. Your cooperation will be most deeply appreciated, and you may be assured that your response will remain confidential. We would appreciate receiving your completed questionnaire no later than May 11, 1981.

Should you have any questions or desire more information, contact Dr. Anderson at 624-6254 or Mr. Samuri at 624-9170.

Sincerely,

Carl R. Anderson

Fereydoon Samuri

APPENDIX B

PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION,

ALIENATION FROM WORK AND

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTROL

MEASURES

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please check the appropriate answer.

1. How many years have you been employed by this university?

_____ 0-3 years

_____ 4-6 years

_____ 7-10 years

_____ 11-15 years

_____ 15 plus years

2. What is the most recent degree you have earned?

_____ B.A. or B.S.

_____ M.A. or M.S.

_____ Ed.D. or Ph.D.

_____ Other

3. Do you hold tenure?

_____ Yes

_____ No

4. Are you a full-time professor?

_____ Yes

_____ No

The following series of questions contains a set of alternative answers for each question. These alternative answers form a continuum from one extreme at the left end to the other extreme at the right. A series of descriptive terms is used to define, broadly, four positions along the continuum. To members under each position give eight choices for each question. Please indicate your choice by circling one number in the category that best describes your view of that question.

	Agree Strongly		Agree		Disagree		Disagree Strongly	
5. My work is interesting nearly all the time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
6. My work gives me a feeling of pride having done the job well.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
7. My work does little in the way of tapping my expertise and know-how.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8. I really don't feel a sense of pride of accomplishment as a result of the type of work that I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9. If I had it to do again, I would choose the same work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
10. I very much like the type of work that I am doing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
11. My work is always changing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
12. My work rarely gives me a chance to do the things that I do best.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
13. My work never gives me a sense of accomplishment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
14. In general, I feel that I have a lot to say or influence on what goes on in my job situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

	Agree Strongly		Agree		Disagree		Disagree Strongly	
15. In general, I feel I can influence the decisions of my immediate superior regarding things about which I am concerned.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
16. In general, my immediate supervisor asks my opinion when a problem comes up that involves what I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
17. In general, if I have a suggestion for improving or changing part of my work situation in some way, it is easy for me to get ideas across to my immediate supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

The next series of items consist of a series of questions about perceived the degree of organizational control. Please indicate your choice by circling one number in the category that describes your view of the question.

(1) Centralization

(a) Participation in Decision Making

	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Always
18. How frequently do you usually participate in decisions on the adoption of new programs?	1	2	3	4	5
19. How frequently do you usually participate in decisions on the adoption of new policies?	1	2	3	4	5

	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Always
20. How frequently do you usually participate in decisions on hiring of new staff?	1	2	3	4	5
21. How frequently do you usually participate in the decisions on the promotion of any of the professional staff?	1	2	3	4	5

(b) Hierarchy of Authority

	Definitely False	More False Than True	More True Than False	Definitely True
22. There can be little action taken here until a supervisor approves a decision.	1	2	3	4
23. A person who wants to make his own decisions would be quickly discouraged.	1	2	3	4
24. Even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.	1	2	3	4
25. I have to ask my boss before I do almost anything.	1	2	3	4
26. Any decisions I make has to have my boss's approval.	1	2	3	4

(2) Formalization

(a) Job Codification

	Definitely False	More False Than True	More True Than False	Definitely True
27. I feel I am my own boss in most matters.	1	2	3	4
28. A person can make his own decisions without checking with anybody else.	1	2	3	4
29. How things are done here is left up to a person doing the work.	1	2	3	4
30. People here are allowed to do almost as they please.	1	2	3	4
31. Most people here make their own rules on the job.	1	2	3	4

(c) Rule Observation

32. The employees here are constantly being watched for rule violations.	1	2	3	4
33. People here feel they are constantly being watched to see that they obey all the rules.	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW UP LETTER

Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
309 GUNDERSEN HALL
(405) 624-7244

May 12, 1981

Dear Faculty Member:

We sought your assistance in a study on relationship of centralization and formalization to perceived work alienation among higher education faculty. We know how easy it is for mailings to be misplaced or lost, so we are sending you another questionnaire in case you did not have an opportunity to fill one out.

Please help us in this effort to determine the degree of this relationship. Your input is vital and you may be assured it will remain anonymous.

We need your response by the end of May, 1981 so that we may have sufficient time to analyze the findings.

Thanks again for your help.

Sincerely,

Carl R. Anderson

Fereydoon Samuri

ν

VITA

Fereydoon Samuri

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE RELATIONSHIP OF CENTRALIZATION AND FORMALIZATION TO PERCEIVED WORK ALIENATION AMONG HIGHER EDUCATION FACULTY

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: A citizen of Iran, born in Zabol, Sistan and Baloochestan Province, Iran, on September 23, 1940, the son of Mr. Darvishali Samuri and Mrs. Mahtab Mehdi Azad.

Education: Graduated from Pahlavi High School, Zabol, Sistan and Baloochestan in June 1959; received Bachelor of Arts degree from Teachers College in September, 1963; received Master of Education degree, majoring in system development and adaptation from Boston University in September, 1979; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1981.

Professional Experience: Teacher, Foroughi High School in Saravan, 1962-65; Principal, Foroughi High School, 1965-68; Teacher, Zahedan High Schools, 1968-71; Principal Zahedan No. 2 Junior High School, 1971-1973; Teacher, Zahedan High Schools, 1973-1975; Lecturer, Zahedan Teacher Training College, 1975-present.