A STUDY OF THE MEASUREMENT OF A CONTINUUM OF ALIENATION/INTEGRATION IN TERMS OF ITS FIVE ALTERNATE MEANINGS AS THESE ARE RELATED TO SELECTED SOCIOLOGICAL FACTORS

by

Thomas Frank Dooley, A.B., Ph.L.

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School, Marquette University, in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Of Master of Arts

Milwaukee, Wisconsin
June, 1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

This thesis will attempt to answer the question, recurrent in Sociology, "Is it possible to construct an empirically meaningful and significant measurement of the widely used term, 'alienation'?"

Until about twelve years ago, it seemed almost impossible to measure alienation because of the diversity of meanings attributed to it. It was at this time that Melvin Seeman (1959) organized and clarified the diversity. After examining the previous usages of alienation, he stated that basically there were five alternate meanings of alienation: meaninglessness, normlessness, powerlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement.

Accepting Seeman's taxonomy of alienation, Dwight Dean (1961) subsequently tried measuring three of the five components: powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation. This was the first attempt to measure empirically the multiple meanings of alienation as described by Seeman. He found that a low but statistically significant negative correlation existed among the three components and occupational prestige, education, income, and rural background.

A more basic question was asked of Dean by Lewis Feuer (1962). Feuer noted that Dean's measurements of alienation fell short because alienation can be found in all people. Although the measurement

scale includes, for example, the notion of powerlessness, alienation can be found in both the powerful and the powerless. In fact, alienation itself, Feuer claimed, ". . . lies in every direction of human experience. Its dimensions will be as varied as human desires and needs." (1962: 132-133)

The question, then, is "how can any attempt to measure alienation escape the pitfall described by Feuer?" If everyone carries alienation with him, is there any possibility of measuring it?

A possible answer lies in our basic understanding of what alienation really is. There is no reason why we have to think of alienation/integration as a simple dichotomy and of people as necessarily one or the other. Everyday experience, on the contrary, would justify our thinking rather of alienated and nonalienated as the opposite ends of a continuum, and this would entail the recognition that departure from either end may be "more-or-less" rather than "either-or."

This tack was taken in a study of alienation made by John J. O'Connell, S.J. (1967). In his consideration both of alienation and the five subscales of alienation, O'Connell always saw these notions as polarity points on continua. Thus O'Connell did not study alienation alone but the continuum on which alienation and its defined opposite, integration, were present. Also powerlessness was seen in relation to its polar opposite of power; the same held true of the other four subscales.

O'Connell (1967) rejected the dichotomy between "alienated" and "nonalienated" in favor of a continuum ranging from alienation to integration. He grounded and validated this alienation/integration scale and spoke of it as a continuum throughout his study. This is a major contribution in that it allows us to see subjects as more-or-less alienated or integrated. It also helps us recognize that a person can be highly integrated in one respect but quite alienated in another. Even in areas of relatively high integration, there exists the possibility of at least some degree of alienation. The use of the continuum of "alienation and/or integration" allows a more realistic measurement of the actual state of people.

O'Connell's main hypothesis stated that "The existence and degree of the individual's integration with and/or alienation from the organization is relative to selected sociological factors in the member's background." (1967: 34) The organization he chose for the study was the Wisconsin Province of the Society of Jesus. The subjects of the study were the members of the organization who were still in their formative training. The sociological factors analyzed were: organizational status, age, social class, personality type, informal group membership, family structure, nationality descent, urban-rural background, and family educational aspiration. The alienation/integration scale O'Connell used was a scale composed of the five alternate meanings of alienation (powerlessness, normlessness, meaninglessness, isolation, self-estrangement) as proposed by Melvin Seeman. (1959)

O'Connell (1967) used eight items to measure each of the five "alternative meanings" of alienation. Thus forty items made up the total scale. Each of the forty items could be answered in one of the six possible ways on a continuum ranging from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 6 ("strongly agree"). The scores on each of the forty items were totaled to achieve the final score. Since there were forty items, scores of individuals also could range anywhere on a continuum with end points of 40 and 240. A person achieving a score of 40 would then be said to be totally alienated in respect to all the particular dimensions, and a score of 240 would indicate the highest possible degree of integration in all the respective dimensions.

O'Connell's report pointed to the limitation of his approach and suggested areas for future study and refinement of his work.

> The first possibility is that the integration/alienation measure itself is too crude. By this is meant that the subcategories of powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation and self-estrangement, if analyzed separately and in comparison with each other, they would perhaps, give a more penetrating analysis and possibly consistent relationship by preserving the direction of the movement of process of integration and alienation, which does not appear when these five subcategories are combined in a single I/A Score, as in the present study. (O'Connell, 1967: 96)

He saw that, because all five of the alternative meanings were combined, relationships among the five might be obscured. Perhaps one or more of the meanings is not needed because it fails to be significantly discriminating. Perhaps there is a progressive

relationship among the five alternative meanings. Or the examination of the five alternative meanings may not yield any new information.

The purpose of this study is to investigate these questions. We will take O'Connell's data and break them down into the subscales of norm/normlessness, power/powerlessness, meaning/meaninglessness, incorporation/isolation, and self-fulfillment/self-estrangement. We will include these scores on individual scales and the total scores on all five scales. In this way, we will be able not only to see patterns in terms of the total score, but also to study the influence--if any--of each of the five subscales of alienation/integration.

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL ORIENTATIONS

Much has been written concerning the meaning and measurement of "alienation." Some clarification in the field of Sociology as to the meaning of the widely used term seems to be emerging. And while researchers have made initial studies measuring alienation, they call for further refined efforts and point to the direction these future studies should follow.

More than ten years ago Gwynn Nettler (1957) showed that the notion of alienation has had a variety of meanings. He stated that Hegel used the term to designate what happens to socialized man when he becomes detached from the world of nature. Nettler showed that Marx added the social aspect of alienation in the division of labor which created a conflict between the interest of the single individual and the common interest of all individuals. Nettler also showed that Marx distinguished the personal aspect of alienation where ". . . man's own accomplishments turn into a power alien and opposed to him, which come to subjugate him instead of being controlled by him." (1957: 671) Fromm, according to Nettler, sees alienation best exemplified as a "marketing orientation," in which one regards the world and himself as commodities to which monetary values may be assigned and which may be peddled.

To clarify his own notion of alienation, Nettler (1957) distinguished two closely related concepts: "anomie" and "personal disorganization." Following Durkheim, he stated that "anomie" refers to a societal condition of relative normlessness, but alienation refers to a psychological

state of an individual. Nettler contended that alienation and "anomie" are undoubtedly correlated insofar as it is difficult to conceive of any notable degree of anomie that would not result in alienation, but this is not a reason for confusing them nor for equating the two meanings.

Again, alienation is not to be equated or confused with "personal disorganization" (defined as intrapersonal conflict, personal goallessness). Rather one may conceivably be alienated either with or without personal disorganization.

> While alienation has an unfortunate psychopathological connotation from its association with "alienist," the concept itself says nothing about personal organization or disorganization, and its bearing on emotional sickness must be independently investigated. Contrary to the gratuitous association of alienation with personal disturbance, Maslow, in attempting to define a healthy personality, has held that some degree of alienation must be a characteristic of the fully functioning individual--at least in our society. (Nettler, 1957: 672)

Nettler quoted from many other writers showing that they all centered their notion of alienation around the feeling of isolation--the state in which individuals feel no sense of belonging to their community or nation. Nettler however wanted to follow Durkheim's distinction between anomie (referring to a societal condition of relative normlessness) and alienation (referring to a psychological state of an individual). Nettler (1957: 672) defined his notion of an alienated person as ". . . one who has been estranged from, made unfriendly toward, his society and the culture it carries." His operational definition of alienation was the feeling of estrangement from society.

Nettler (1957: 673) chose models of estranged persons from the psychological literature and then obtained people he thought approximated this alien orientation. Nettler developed items in his scale which he thought would be accurate descriptions of his "alienated" interviewees and measures of alienation in others.

His conclusions were that 1) alienation is related to creativity; 2) alienation is related to mental-emotional disorder; 3) alienation is related to altruism; 4) the alienated suffer a proclivity to suicide; 5) the alienated are prone to the chemical addictions; 6) the alienated are poor marriage risks; 7) their estrangement leads to criminal behavior.

Of the many questions that might be asked of Nettler, the following are pertinent for our investigation. Why did Nettler single out social estrangement? Is social estrangement the same as social isolation? Considering Nettler's data could we not also use self-estrangement or personal isolation as descriptive of alienation? Is it not true that the normally educated people of our culture would answer items in his scale which show alienation, e.g., holding unpopular opinions?

Melvin Seeman (1959) also went through the writings which dealt with the notion of alienation in an effort to understand the different meanings writers have given to this term. Seeman attempted two things: to present an organized view of the uses that have been made of this concept and to provide an approach that ties the historical interest in alienation to the modern empirical effort to measure alienation. Five alternative meanings of alienation are identified: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement. The

term "alienation" was used in past sociological writings when referring to one of these five logically different but related meanings. Seeman suggested that the present-day meaning of alienation includes all five of the different meanings. Thus, he sketched the derivation of these meanings from traditional sociological analysis and showed the necessity of making the indicated distinctions. In each case, an effort was made to provide a viable research formulation of these five alternatives.

1) Powerlessness. This notion of alienation originated in the Marxian view of the worker's condition in capitalist society. Seeman (1959) defined powerlessness as the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes or the reinforcement he seeks.

In this version of alienation the individual's expectancy for control of events is clearly distinguished from: a) the objective situation of powerlessness as some observer sees it, b) the observer's judgment of that situation against some ethical standard, and c) the individual's sense of a discrepancy between his expectations for control and his desire for control.

2) Meaninglessness. Here Seeman (1959) talked about the individual's sense of understanding the events in which he is engaged. High alienation in this sense is found when the individual is unclear as to what he ought to believe--when the individual's minimal standards for clarity in decision making are not met. Operationally, this might be expressed as a low expectancy that satisfactory predictions about future outcomes of behavior can be made.

The distinction between powerlessness and meaninglessness is that the former refers to the sensed ability to control outcomes, the latter refers essentially to the sensed ability to predict outcomes. Expectancies for personal control of events may not coincide with the understanding of these events. Thus, although these two forms of alienation are related, they are logically independent.

3) Normlessness. Seeman (1959) saw normlessness as a variant for Durkheim's description of anomie, denoting a situation in which the social norms regulating individual conduct have broken down and are no longer effective as rules for behavior. How, though, do we make this operationally clear? How do we conceptualize the events to which "anomie" is intended to point?

Following Merton's (1949: 128) lead, Seeman (1959) defined the anomic situation as one in which there is high expectancy that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve given goals. This meaning of alienation, the anomic situation, is distinct from the meanings of powerlessness and normlessness in that expectancies concerning unapproved behaviors presumably can vary independently of the individual's expectancy that his own behavior will determine his success in reaching a goal (powerlessness). It is also distinct from his belief that he operates in an intellectually comprehensible world (meaninglessness).

4) Isolation. Seeman (1959) defined this much the same as did Nettler (1957). Seeman said that the alienated in the isolated sense

are those who, like the intellectual, assign low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society.

Seeman maintained that although the "isolation" version of alienation clearly carries a meaning different from the first three versions discussed already, it may be used as an alternate meaning and profitably used in conjunction with the others in the analysis of a given state of affairs.

5) Self-Estrangement. Seeman used Fromm's description as a starting point:

> In the following analysis I have chosen the concept of alienation as the central point from which I am going to develop the analysis of the contemporary social character. . . . By alienation is meant a mode of experience in which the person experiences himself as an alien. He has become, one might say, estranged from himself. (Seeman, 1959: 789)

To further substantiate this, Seeman referred to C. Wright-Mills:

> Men are estranged from one another as each secretly tries to make an instrument of the other, and in time a full circle is made: One makes an instrument of himself and is estranged from It also. (Seeman, 1959: 789)

What do these writers and others mean when they say that man is alienated from himself (estranged)? To be self-alienated means to be something less than one might ideally be if the circumstances in society were otherwise--to be insecure, given to appearances, conformist.

Seeman (1959) admitted this meaning of alienation is difficult to specify, but the basic idea is the notion of intrinsically meaningful activity. Seeman (1959: 790) recasted this notion operationally as "the degree of dependence of the given behavior upon anticipated future rewards."

In conclusion, then, Seeman has taken the first step in an effort to make the term alienation more workable. It seems that his effort to define the many uses of alienation is quite accurate. He has given us a model or construct with which to work. We will look to later articles and research work to see if other sociologists agree with the operational definitions that Seeman has presented and, if so, to see what type of research others have done in the light of Seeman's work.

Clark (1959) was interested in defining alienation so that it could be empirically measured in a social system. His approach is in contrast with Seeman's. Clark recognized the variety of meanings alienation has been given in the recent history. He felt, though, that in these various meanings there was a common feature capable of isolation--"man's feeling of lack of means (power) to eliminate the discrepancy between his definition of the role he is playing and the one he feels he should be playing in a situation" (Clark, 1959: 849). Consequently he believed that a measure of alienation must be a measure of the discrepancy between the power man believes he has and what he believes he should have, i.e., his estrangement from his rightful role. He said that alienation is a psychological state of an individual.

> We are concerned here with the nature of that <u>something</u> that when present in the psychological make-up of man <u>may</u> result in his becoming estranged physically, mentally, or both, from aspects of social interaction. However, it <u>may not</u> result in separation from the social situation but in feelings of being manipulated and of meaninglessness.

> The individual can develop feelings of being socially isolated and even of being a different person in his behavior than the self he believes he should be were conditions different. (Clark, 1959: 849)

Clark felt that in previous studies of alienation, the situations in which men feel powerless, normless, and isolated were not specific nor possibly representative of total societal involvement. He felt that a more rewarding approach to the problem of measuring alienation might be the single unit approach, selecting for study only those whom we can establish to be involved in a single, well-defined unit, e.g., a social system. He chose an agricultural cooperative organization, noting that he thought that this organization met the requirements of the definition of a social system as stated by Talcott Parsons in The Social System:

> By studying alienation in a single social system, we have been able to measure both the extent of member alienation and the relationship among alienation, satisfaction, participation, and knowledge of the social system. With appropriate modification, the present alienation scale may be used in the study of other social systems. Researchers will need to devote further efforts, however, to the development of a measure of the more general dimension of alienation within society. (Clark, 1959: 849)

Clark (1959), like Seeman (1959), tried to look at the many different meanings which alienation has had in the recent past. In contrast to Seeman, Clark argues for simplifying the notion by combining the meanings into one "main" meaning--"the degree to which man feels

powerless to achieve the role he has determined to be rightfully his in specific situations." Clark's explanation raises the question of why explicitate a multidimensional taxonomy of alienation only to combine the various meanings of alienation into a univocal measure?

Even if it were true that all the past meanings attributed to alienation could be considered nothing more than the measure of powerlessness that Clark has explicated, it would seem quite advantageous to use the multiple meaning-approach of Seeman. By doing this one would reveal possible inter-relationships between the alternative meanings.

About two years after Seeman published his article, Dwight Dean (1961) also published an article dealing with alienation which took Seeman's work as a guide. (Dean's article can also be considered as a continuation of the work he began in his Ph.D. Thesis, as will be seen later.) Although acknowledging the encouragement and guidance which he says Seeman gave him, Dean did not actually follow the work which Seeman had done in distinguishing the different meanings of alienation.

Dean (1961) took three elements of Seeman's alienation scale: powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation. When discussing normlessness, he said that there are at least two rather distinct subtypes.

> The first subtype, purposelessness, has been noted by MacIver, who has described <u>anomy</u> as the absence of values that might give purpose or direction to life, the loss of intrinsic and socialized values, the insecurity of the hopelessly disoriented.

> The second subtype of normlessness may be considered as Conflict of Norms. DeGrazia has described at some length the contemporary conflict between the "Cooperative" and the "Competitive" Directives, and between the "Activist" and the "Quietist" Directives. Karen Horney, in similar vein, has described the difficulties of a person who incorporates in his personality conflicting norms such as the standards of Christianity versus the success imperative. (Dean, 1961: 754)

Dean started with 139 items and submitted them to judges to check whether the items actually did measure powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation. Of the 139 items, it was felt that 24 of the items were useful. The point of the study was to correlate the three "scales" of alienation and the combined score of these three scales with occupation, education, income, age, and community. The significance of this approach in sociological theory is that it was the first time that some of the scales or alternate meanings of alienation were used in conjunction with alienation. Because of the results that he got, Dean believed that it was quite feasible to consider the subscales as belonging to the same general concept. However, there appears to be enough independence among the sub-scales to warrant treating them as independent variables.

Although this study was reported almost two years after Seeman's (1959) article which classified the alternative meanings of alienation, Dean (1961) said that this study was done in writing his Ph.D. Thesis, which was written at least five years prior to his article and some three years, at least, before Seeman's work. This might explain why he acknowledged Seeman but then failed to measure alienation according to all the

five scales of Seeman. Also, Dean seemed to assume that the data he received from the study warranted the use of different factors, but he did not report any use of factor analysis to verify that the data received justified the three different subscales of alienation.

Dean's (1961) report of his work was a further step in trying to work out a measurement of alienation. It is important to note that he did try to measure subscales, even though he did not use all Seeman suggested. His study was the first to investigate whether alienation may be considered a general syndrome or whether the various components are somewhat discrete. He concludes by suggesting that:

> Further investigations should be made in regard to the syndrome of alienation. It may very well be that alienation is not a unitary phenomenon, but a syndrome. (Dean, 1961: 758)

Jan Hajda (1961) defined alienation as an individual's feeling of uneasiness or discomfort which reflects his exclusion or self-exclusion from social and cultural participation. It is an expression of non-belonging or non-sharing, an uneasy awareness or perception in its scope and intensity.

In his lengthy study Hajda first described what he meant by alienation and then tried to show what sources contribute toward it. While Hajda worked on the definition of alienation, the reader finds it very hard to follow Hajda's development. His definition of alienation seems too broad and lacks a firm grounding. The reader consistently finds himself asking the crucial question, "Alienation from whom or from what?"

Hajda at points talked about the general society. If this was his grounding for alienation, then this reader would like to suggest that this is unworkable and that Hajda was really talking about the personal uneasy feeling of alienated people without saying why they are uneasy.

Hajda's (1961) subjects for his study were students. In this it appears that Hajda was talking about the facet of alienation which Seeman (1959) called "isolation." Although Hajda said that the alienation which he found might be inevitable, he consistently treated it as something undesirable.

Much of Hajda's troubles in definition and explanation arose from the fact that he did not collect his own data. He used data collected by the National Research Opinion Center in November, 1958. He worked in a limited area because of the limited data, and he worked backwards by looking at the data and then making definitions of alienation which fit the limited data.

Seeman and Evans (1962) reported a study in which they took one of the five meanings of alienation which Seeman (1959) discussed. The one selected for their study is powerlessness: the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcome or reinforcements he seeks.

They chose a hospital situation because they felt it constituted a small, yet accurate, reflection of the larger social order. After sifting their samples for usable data, they tested the data both in regard to feelings of powerlessness and objective knowledge of the

patients' disease. The conclusion was that knowledge is significantly related to alienation. This finding bolsters the general belief that the individual's sense of personal control is a factor in determining the level of interest and the degree of knowledge he possesses concerning his affairs.

The value of the work by Seeman and Evans (1962) is that one form, at least, of alienation--powerlessness--was tested in terms of the ability of people to strive. The next step to be taken, of course, would be to test the other four aspects of alienation in this same way and then note the significance of relationships.

Neal and Rettig (1963) studied alienation in terms of two of Seeman's five components, i.e., powerlessness and normlessness. They saw their job as determining the empirical dimensions of the various forms of alienation. Is there a generalized dimension underlying the alternative meanings of alienation? Or is the problem one of making the alienation referents more specific?

> While Seeman argues for the conceptual independence of the different meanings of alienation, it becomes important to know if his position can be supported empirically. (Neal and Rettig, 1963: 59-60)

The main thing Neal and Rettig tried to do was to develop measures of powerlessness and normlessness and then to submit them to factor analysis tests for examination of dimensional orthogonality. They claimed that previous measures of alienation were inadequate for several reasons. 1) They lacked applicability beyond a specific organization; 2) they failed to distinguish between kinds of alienation; 3) they focused on empirical referents outside of political and economic events.

After setting up their plan for measuring alienation, Neal and Rettig (1963) found that powerlessness and normlessness emerged as separate and statistically unrelated dimensions. These findings provide support for Seeman's argument for an initial separation of the alternative meanings of alienation. Interestingly enough, the normlessness items were separated into two major orthogonal factors in both samples of manual and nonmanual workers. At first this might seem to support Dean's (1961) theory that there really are two different types of normlessness. However, upon inspection of the item content of these factors, it appeared that their independence manifests primarily a separation of normlessness in government from normlessness in business. The authors pointed out that the emergence of these separate normlessness factors may be accounted for by the mass media emphasis on the ethical faults of public officials while playing down those of businessmen.

The separation of the two factors for both the manual and nonmanual worker samples suggested that the a priori assumption of congruence among these dimensions of alienation is unwarranted. Also, the factors were submitted to a transformation analysis to determine the degree of similarity of these alienation dimensions for the manual as compared to the nonmanual workers. A basic similarity of the alienation factor structure for these two different groups was found. (Neal and Rettig, 1963: 606).

With this very valuable addition completed, Neal and Rettig (1967) suggested that the chief areas for future work would be to identify

the antecedent conditions from which powerlessness and normlessness stem and to determine the effectiveness of the alienation variable in predicting the extent and quality of participation in the various areas of social life.

Middleton (1963) reported the result of a study which went beyond the use of just one or two norms of alienation. He hypothesized that the different types of alienation were highly correlated with one another. Further, he hypothesized that each type of alienation is directly related to those disabling social conditions that limit or block the attainment of culturally valued objectives. This hypothesis was tested with regard to two of the most important disabling conditions in American Society: subordinate racial status and low educational attainment.

Before seeing what Middleton (1963) found, two possibly serious limitations of his study must be brought out: 1) His study of alienation constituted only a part of a larger cooperative survey of attitudes on a variety of subjects. So limited was his investigation of alienation that he had only one question measuring each of the different forms of alienation. Judging from the results of his study of alienation, it is possible that these lone questions were highly discriminatory and reliable. However, the use of just one response to decide that a person feels highly powerless, seems to be insufficient. 2) Middleton modified Seeman's types of alienation (1959) so that he had six rather than the five scales Seeman used. Instead of isolation and self-estrangement,

Middleton used cultural estrangement, social estrangement, and estrangement from work.

In his findings, Middleton (1963) said that cultural estrangement is not highly correlated with the other five forms of alienation. And, if cultural estrangement is excluded, the five remaining items constitute a Guttman scale with a coefficient of reproducibility of .90. Middleton then stated that there is an underlying unity or relationship between the different types of alienation.

Two articles to be considered deal with a discussion of factor analysis and the relationship between this process and the measurement of alienation. Cartwright (1965) claimed that Neal and Rettig (1963) erred in their application of factor analysis. In response Neal and Rettig (1967) tried to show that they were not attempting to locate the unidimensionality of alienation as Cartwright claimed. To look at the possible multidimensionality of alienation, Neal and Rettig (1963) chose orthogonality as their rotating criterion. All factors extracted were rotated toward maximizing simple structure by the varimax criterion. The Principal Axis Factor Analysis was used to extract the factors. Neal and Rettig tried to show that different methods depend upon what one is trying to work with; because one method is used does not mean that others are not good for other investigations.

> . . . a basic conceptual alternative confronting those doing research on correlates of alienation consists of the common scientific dilemma of choosing between parsimony and more precise description. The decision on which to use is

> determinative of how simple or how complex the theoretical model will be. The one kind of description does not invalidate the other, since the final decision rests on the purposes of the research in question. The special advantage of the multidimensional approach is that it permits a clearer specification of those alienation components which relate more efficaciously to the independent or dependent variables in question.

Neal and Rettig (1967) claimed that their study had shown that the factors are related empirically in that they belong to the same general dimension. However, within this dimension of alienation, the factors are different. They called for further study.

> The theoretical and methodological problems which beset research on alienation should not lead to the abandonment of empirical research in this area as some have advocated, but should rather act as incentives for additional work. Careful empirical studies of alienation should eventually provide a basis for synthesizing numerous sociological and psychological concerns with man and society, as well as permitting a fuller integration of some of the more historically-oriented concerns of sociology with the greater methodological emphasis of the contemporary period. (Neal and Rettig, 1967: 63-64)

Dodder (1969) reported his efforts to apply a factor analysis of Dean's alienation scale containing the three components of powerlessness, normlessness and social isolation. Dodder's factor analysis was basically the same as that suggested by Cartwright (1965). Dodder found evidence of the presence of a generalized dimension underlying the items in the scale. However, the factor analysis did not delineate separate factors for the three notions of social isolation, powerlessness, and normlessness. Dodder suggested that this might show emancipated latent dimensions other than the three <u>a priori</u> dimensions defined by Dean (1961).

Bonjean and Grimes (1970) examined the relationships between bureaucracy and alienation. While they did not find clear correlations between the two concepts, it is important to notice their method. Bonjean and Grimes defined the general notion of bureaucracy in terms of six characteristics or variables. Also, alienation was defined by the six components of powerlessness, normlessness, social isolation, general alienation, anomia, and self-estrangement.

Conclusion

After reviewing these studies it is apparent that the concept of alienation in the field of Sociology has developed quite extensively in the last two decades. Alienation is no longer an extremely vague, undefinable something. A taxonomy has been proposed, and operational definitions have been suggested. Possibly the most significant advancement made was the realization that alienation is not merely a feeling of frustration in the face of powerlessness.

In past sociological writing the term "alienation" was used to mean different things. Often the term "alienated" was applied to people who feel a sense of powerlessness. Some people, too, used "alienation" when referring to a sense of meaninglessness. Seeman (1959) sifted through the different usages and tried to show that the various usages of alienation has helped us refine the term. It seems as though most authors agree with Seeman that alienation is a complex term including several different but related notions. It is not a simple concept

but a syndrome of at least five different notions. The five-fold meaning of alienation as outlined by Seeman has generally been accepted as being very workable.

The next steps to be taken are to research this pattern of the five alternative meanings of alienation as Seeman (1959) proposed. He himself did this somewhat by taking two of them as points of interest in one study. All five must be used in a study to see the relationships between the five. This must be done in regard to definition and statistical approach.

At this point O'Connell's (1967) study takes a great importance. He integrated Seeman's five meanings of alienation into a single alienation/integration continuum and used this as a conceptual framework for his empirical study of alienation/integraton among members of the Wisconsin Province of the Society of Jesus. O'Connell's conceptual framework (including our alienation/integration continuum as well as Seeman's five elements) and his data provide fertile ground for further work. O'Connell studied his data under a single alienation/integration score. This study will attempt to go back over his data, studying the subcategories more specifically. Thus O'Connell's study will form an empirical and theoretical context in which fruitfully to pursue a number of the current sociological discussions of "alienation" and the methodology for its research.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

In Chapter II we have seen that Neal and Rettig (1963) worked with two basic theoretical factors (powerlessness and normlessness). Seeman (1959) worked with five theoretical factors (meaninglessness, powerlessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement). O'Connell (1967) used Seeman's five factors and made each of them stand by itself on its own continuum (meaninglessness/meaningfulness, powerlessness/powerfulness, normlessness/normfulness, isolation/incorporation, and self-estrangement/self-fulfillment).

The theoretical design of Chapter II is augmented in this chapter by a research design couched in the framework of that theory. This research design finds its focal point in the fact that an individual's relationship to his formal organization is measurable as a point on a continuum running from absolute integration at one end to absolute alienation at the other.

Based on the theoretical orientation presented in Chapter II, we believe that the alienation/integration continuum was designed as being a combination of five distinct factors: meaninglessness/meaningfulness, powerlessness/powerfulness, normlessness/normfulness, isolation/incorporation, and self-estrangement/self-fulfillment. To determine whether or not the responses to the research items actually do show these different factors, we will perform a factor analysis investigation. This will help us determine whether there are different factors, how many factors are present, and which items belong in the different factors.

We also believe that certain sociological facts bear upon the relationship and influence the degree of alienation/integration. These are described on pages 28-30.

Hypotheses

We hypothesize that a factor analysis, applied to O'Connell's (1967) data will not only test the multi-dimensionality of alienation/integration but will also confirm O'Connell's basic breakdown into five factors. It will further identify the specific items in O'Connell's research which relate to each factor.

1. Alienation/integration is not a unitary phenomenon but a syndrome* composed of five distinct but related factors.

2. The examination of the independent variables (v. pp. 28-30) will be more refined if the subcategories of the main continuum of alienation/integration are used than it would be if only the main continuum were used.

---

* O'Connell used the word "continuum" when referring to alienation/integration. In this thesis we used both "continuum" and "syndrome." The differences lie in the understanding of the term "alienation/integration" and its measurement. O'Connell uses only one measurement which is a combination of the five factors of alienation/integration. In the present thesis we not only have that measurement, but we also consider each of the five factors as having a continuum of its own. When we consider alienation/integration as the total of the continua of the five factors, we refer to it as a syndrome. This is done in an effort to show the multi-dimensionality of alienation/integration. When we use alienation/integration as one measurement in comparison to any of the continua of the factors, we use the word "continuum." Efforts were made throughout this thesis to maintain consistency in the usage of the words "syndrome" and "continuum."

Description of Data

The data for this thesis was gathered by O'Connell (1967) in his study of the personal adjustment of individuals within a religious order in terms of alienation and integration. The subjects of the study were the 301 members of the Wisconsin Province of the Society of Jesus who were still in their period of formation or training.

O'Connell (1967) conducted two pilot studies. The first was a questionnaire consisting of 109 items which was sent to 75 members of the Society of Jesus. There were 63 returns, or an 84 per cent response. O'Connell examined these returns for the reliability of the 109 items. As a result, the number of items was reduced to 64.

The second pilot study was administered to sixty members of the Society of Jesus who were selected by a panel of nine judges as representing the extremes of alienation and integration; thirty were judged to be the most integrated, and thirty to be the most alienated.

At the end of the two pilot studies O'Connell (1967) had eliminated all but forty questions which he said were statistically capable of distinguishing between the extent and presence of either integration or alienation. These forty questions consisted of a set of eight questions to measure each of the five subscales of alienation/integration.

The final forty questions were sent to all of the 301 members of the Wisconsin Province in the period of formation. Two hundred seventy-two (90.7%) were returned.

Independent Variables

The following sociological variables were singled out for examination in the present research pattern. These variables were chosen because O'Connell (1967) used them. By using the same variables we can 1) better determine the influence of the five factors by comparing these five scales with O'Connell's total score of the factors, and 2) more accurately determine which of these sociological facts are most important in determining the alienation/integration of the individuals.

1) Organizational Status

This variable refers to the position within the organization of the Wisconsin Province of the Society of Jesus which the member-in-training occupies. There are six possible positions: Novice, Junior, Philosopher, Regent, Theologian, and Tertian. Each of these six positions represents a successive step in training for the Jesuit priesthood.

2) Age

For the most part age is related directly to organizational status. However, there are instances in which members join the organization later than the majority. Also it was possible to have more categories with the variable of age than it was with that organizatonal status; this provided us with more refined information.

3) Social Class

There are two measures of social class. The first is a subjective measurement developed by Centers (1949). This deals simply with the social class the respondent feels his family to be in. The possibilities are upper, middle, working, or lower. The second measure of social class was developed by Hollingshead (1956) and is referred to as the objective measurement because Hollingshead attempted to develop objective criteria for a person's social position. The measurement is known as the Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position and is based on occupation and education.

4) Informal Groups

Friendship groups were used to measure informal group structure. Within a closed organization like the Society of Jesus friendship groups are the only groupings which have a relevance to the formal structure. Two types of friendships were used: 1) "dependent friends" who were the people who sought the member out for communication concerning matters which were personal and intimate; 2) "dependable friends" were the people to whom the member could relate his own personal and intimate experiences and needs.

5) Family Structure

This includes the member's rank in his family, the size of the family, his evaluation of his childhood of whether it was "happy" or

"unhappy" and his evaluation of his parents' marriage in the same terms of "happy" or "unhappy."

6) Nationality Descent

Both the paternal and maternal nationality as reported by the member were used.

7) Urban-Rural Background

This independent variable refers to the physical location in which the member lived prior to his entrance into the organization.

8) Family Educational Aspiration

The last independent variable is the member's family educational aspirations. This was included because it seemed that a member coming from a family with high educational aspirations would be under more pressure to "make good" in the religious organization than another member who did not experience strong educational drives in his family. The criteria used to determine the family educational aspirations were the actual and planned educational achievements of parents and siblings.

ctor Analysis*

We saw in Chapter II examples of how factor analysis was applied the study of meanings of alienation by Neal and Rettig (1963), twright (1965), Neal and Rettig (1967), and Dodder (1969). We saw rther the necessity of analyzing the factors of O'Connell's data (1967) determine whether or not there actually are different subscales of ienation. To be able to study the subscales of alienation, it is not fficient to assume that they are present just because theoretical udies have posited that alternate meanings of alienation exist. It necessary to take the actual data and see if, in fact, there are lated but distinct factors.

The first precaution in working with a factor analysis program that there is no simple mathematical technique for proving indisputably ther the exact number of factors or the components of any individual ctor. The job remains one of interpreting the chart of communalities th an eye to mathematical logic and sociological theory.

In a chart of communalities, a substantial drop in the Sum of uares tends to confirm the existence of the corresponding factors. nsequently, a small drop tends to indicate that the corresponding ctor is not significant. Therefore, when the discrimination tween the Sum of Squares is not large, there is no reason to believe at another factor is present. Conversely, a large difference points new material and bolsters the possibility of an added factor.

For a general introduction to factor analysis, refer to Blalock (1960: 383-390). For more detailed explanation see Thurstone (1947).

Table 1. Communalities Chart for Collected Data

Factor	Sum of Squares	Per Cent
1	12.51	31.27
2	3.32	39.57
3	2.39	45.53
4	1.57	49.46
5	1.28	52.46
6	1.20	55.65
7	0.97	58.09
8	1.00	60.59
9	1.12	63.40
10	0.97	65.82

The large drop in the Sum of Squares in Table 1 assures us that we have at least three factors. The fourth and fifth factors are possibilities and the sixth is doubtful because of the small drop (.08). However, there is a rise in the eighth and ninth factors. This could mean that we have eight or nine factors.

The rise in the percentages shows us that we have a possibility of from four to six factors. This is true because the increment is greater than 3.00 until the seventh factor. From these criteria it is possible to say that there may be three, four, five, eight, or nine factors. The factor analysis program was run for each of these possibilities. To include all of these analyses in this thesis would

unnecessarily complicate the discussion. However, a summary seems needed. When run for three or four factors, the analysis was considerably less discriminating than when run for five factors. Also, the items attributed to the different factors when the computer program was run for three and four factors were so mixed as to make it impossible to find any pattern.

When the analysis was run for eight or nine factors, it seemed that the factors were too loose to be meaningful. When the analysis was run for five factors, the factors were much more discrete than for any of the other analyses. Also when run for five factors, the computer arranged all but two items in the pattern to which they had theoretically been assinged by O'Connell (1967) when the questionnaire was drawn up.

Using only the first two criteria--the Sum of Squares and the per cent--is not sufficient to allow us to assert how many factors we have. However, the pattern of the items formed by the computer when working with five factors was so close to the originally hypothesized pattern that we have compelling evidence for using five factors in our analysis. The position and relative influence of the factors showed that normlessness/normfulness was the most influential factor--followed in order by: self-estrangement/self-fulfillment, powerlessness/powerfulness, isolation/incorporation, and meaninglessness/meaningfulness.

Normlessness occurs, according to Seeman (1959: 787), when norms regulating behavior have broken down or are no longer effective as rules for behavior. Normlessness exists when the individual accepts the confusion as such and then makes a volitional act to reject the norms of the organization. Merton (1949: 128) describes this as the point where the technically most effective procedure, whether legitimate or not, becomes typically preferred to institutionally prescribed conduct. There is a high expectancy that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve given goals.

Items According to Factors

The following is a list of the items which the factor analysis program identified as belonging to the normlessness/normfulness continuum. (The item numbers refer to the original numbered position of each of the original forty questions used.)

Item No.	Item Loading	Items
3	.77	Some rules are better observed by disregarding them.
33	.74	It is better to simply disregard a rule judged by myself to be useless than to labor to conform to it.
28	.73	To be an effective person I must do a certain amount of "bucking the system."
13	.71	Sometimes it is better to go ahead and do what you want, or feel you have to do, rather than try and get permission.
18	.70	"Seeing Christ in the superior"is used to cover mistakes or defend policies no one really believes in.

The following items were not identified as indicative of normlessness/normfulness although they were originally expected to do so:

23	.66	To achieve the goals I want, it is necessary to "play politics."
38	.60	The rules, directives and policies of superiors are realistic for me.
8	.42	I sometimes feel I am knocking my head against a wall to do the things I feel I must do and still abide by all the rules, directives, and policies of the Society.

Previously we suggested that further work could profitably be done in studying the factor analysis program. In connection with this, further investigation of the items which were so answered might also be done in order to allow them to be placed in this factor as contrasted with the three items which were not accepted as indicative of normlessness/normfulness. We suspect that this would also be profitable for the other four factors.

The second factor identified by the computer program was the one we called self-estrangement/self-fulfillment. Seeman (1959: 790) defined this as "a decrease or absence of any degree of dependency of the given behavior upon future rewards." The individual does not view activities he does as rewarding him; he does not relate in a meaningful way to the organization. To be self-alienated means to be something less than one might ideally be if the circumstances in society were otherwise--to be insecure, given to appearances, a conformist.

The following is a list of the three items and their loadings which the factor analysis program identified as belonging to the second factor, "self-estrangement/self-fulfillment."

Item No.	Item Loading	Items
31	.69	I feel that I am working to full capacity.
27	.66	I feel that "all of me" is committed to this life.
6	.63	My occupations in the Society have meaning for me.

The following items originally selected to measure the same factor were not significant in the factor analysis results.

11	.49	I feel that I am maturing as I should.
26	.47	My studies have meaning for me.
21	.43	I feel I am developing a sense of responsibility as a man.
36	.36	I feel that I am "spinning my wheels" till the day comes when I can really get out and do what I ought to be doing.
1	.26	I feel superiors are making use of the talents that I have to offer.
16	.21	Much of the training is useless.

The third factor is powerlessness/powerfulness. "The worker is alienated to the extent that the prerogative and means of decision are expropriated by the ruling entrepreneurs." (Seeman, 1959: 784). The member is restricted from communications with the organization's policymakers. Control of the organization is beyond the reach of the

individual so that the "expectancy or probability that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes or reinforcements he seeks." (Seeman, 1959: 784). The following items were selected as belonging to the powerlessness/powerfulness factor.

Item No.	Item Loading	Items
30	.69	In terms of really determining the behavior of the Society I feel that I am an effective and powerful person.
35	.66	I can influence the policy making of superiors.
40	.66	I could as a Scholastic become an effective influence in formulating policy in the Society.
15	.65	I feel that I am an important consideration in the planning of superiors.
10	.64	I have power in the Society.
5	.64	Superiors hold my own personl ideas and opinions on the operations of the Society to be important and significant.

The following items were found to be nonsignificant.

25	.57	Superiors are affected in policy making by the fact that I am a member of the Society of Jesus.
20	.48	I can determine future policy by the influence I now have over fellow Scholastics.

The fourth factor is isolation/incorporation. This occurs when the individual will "assign low reward value to goals or beliefs that

are typically highly valued in a given society" (Seeman, 1959: 789). The member rejects the goals and beliefs of the organization; he has no real internal commitment.

The following are the significant items in the isolation/incorporation factor.

Item No.	Item Loading	Items
17	.68	I get the kind and degree of strength that I need from the community.
2	.65	My values are the same as other Scholastics.
7	.61	My desire to communicate myself to others is satisfied within my community.
37	.59	The real me is known by my fellow Scholastics.
39	.58	Common life (community life) is a satisfactory response to my own personal wants and desires as a human being.

Nonsignificant items related to isolation/incorporation:

22	.36	I am the kind of Jesuit desired by the Society.
12	.33	The real me is known by superiors.
27	.28	I feel that "all of me" is committed to this life.
32	.19	I am personally convinced of the validity of the values and outlook that the Society is trying to develop in me.

The last factor is meaninglessness/meaningfulness. By this is meant that the "individual is unclear as to what he ought to believe--when the individual's minimal standards for clarity in decision-making are

not met." (Seeman, 1959: 786). Meaninglessness refers to the inability to predict behavioral outcomes. In powerlessness a person can foresee possible situations even though he might now have control of them. However, the state of meaninglessness refers to the inability even to predict.

The following are the significant items in the meaninglessness/ meaningfulness factor.

Item No.	Item Loading	Items
14	.60	The Society has taught me how to have a full and satisfactory life as a religious.
4	.60	What is expected of me in terms of rules and regulations is compatible with my own personal needs and wants.
34	.59	The Society has taught me how to have a full and satisfactory life as a man.
24	.57	The demands made upon me by superiors, rules, and regulations strike me as sensible.

Nonsignificant items.

29	.46	The way I am expected to act and function (according to superiors and the rules) seems intelligent and sensible to me.
19	.38	I experience confusion between what I am told to do, how I am told to live, and how I feel I must live in order to be human and satisfy my human needs and desires.
39	.30	Common life (community life) is a satisfactory response to my own personal wants and desires as a human being.
9	.18	I am somewhat confused as to what I ought to believe and hold as a Jesuit.

Conclusion

The factor analysis program selected twenty-eight of the original forty items. These items were grouped according to the five factors hypothesized by Seeman (1959) and O'Connell (1967). Those which were identified as being significant in measuring each of the factors were the same, except for two, as hypothesized by O'Connell. We therefore have 23 items to work with in our analysis of the five subscales.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF ORGANIZATIONAL STATUS, AGE, AND SOCIAL CLASS IN RELATIONSHIP TO ALIENATION/INTEGRATION

Twenty-three of the forty items (i.e., question) in O'Connell's (1967) study were found by factor analysis (Chapter III) to be significant measures of alienation/integration. "Normfulness/normlessness" had five items. These were the questions numbered 3, 33, 28, 13, and 18. "Self-fulfillment/self-estrangement" had three items (the questions numbered 31, 27, and 6). "Powerfulness/powerlessness" had six items (questions numbered 31, 35, 40, 15, 10, and 5). "Incorporation/isolation" had five items (questions numbered 44, 29, 34, 64, and 66). "Meaningfulness/meaninglessness" had four items (questions numbered 14, 4, 34, and 24).

Each of these twenty-three items was measured on a six-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). This was so arranged on each item that the highest score (6) signified total integration and the lowest score (1) signified total alienation. Becaused of the varying number of items in the factors, each factor will have a different range of scores delineating alienation and/or integration. Normlessness ranges from a possible score of 5 (because it has five items) to 30 (because of the possibility of getting 6 on each of the five items measuring normlessness). A score of 5 would mean total alienation, whereas 30 would mean total integration. As the score moves up from 5 we see indications of the subjects' being less alienated.

The mathematical midpoint is 17.5 where it will be said that a disjunction between being alienated and integrated takes place. When a group attains a score above 17.5 we say that the group is tending toward integration. The higher the score above 17.5 the more integrated. Obviously the midpoint of 17.5 on this factor and the midpoints on the other scales are all so designated by simple mathematical procedures.

This brings up a consideration which reoccurs throughout this study. Is it possible to use the mathematical midpoint of any continuum as a true disconjunction between alienation and integration? For example, if a person scores 18 on a continuum with the midpoint being 17.5 would we be justified in saying he is integrated? Or if he received a score of 17, would he be alienated? Or could there be a middle area such as from 16 - 18?

Because we are using a continuum, we are dealing with a situation in which we can only say that a person is more integrated or less integrated. However, the relationship between the mathematical continua and the actuality of alienation/integration would be material for future considerations.

The tables incorporated in this thesis show the independent variables as related to the dependent variables of alienation/integration. Within the alienation/integration scale we include seven measurements: five of these are the five scales measuring the alternate meanings of alienation as described earlier in this thesis. The other two are summary scores. One score is the

total of all forty items as combined by O'Connell (1967). We stated that a more refined understanding of the data would result from breaking up this total into its component factors. To be able to compare the two different methods, we are including both the summary score and the scores of the individual factors. The other summary score is based on the twenty-three items selected as significant by factor analysis. This is done to compare with the total of the forty items. If these really are the twenty-three most significant items, there should be little difference between the two total scores.

In analyzing these tables we will first compare briefly the scale of all forty items with the total score of the twenty-three factored items. Then we will compare the five other scales with these two to determine whether our main hypothesis is correct, i.e., that a more refined notion of the meaning of alienation/integration results from viewing the subscales.

ALIENATION/INTEGRATION AS RELATED TO ORGANIZATIONAL STATUS

The first independent variable is "Organizational Status." This refers to the position the individual has in the organization.

Table 2, which is based on the 23 factored items, is very similar to table 3, which includes all of the 40 items. This is consistent with our expectation, showing that the twenty-three items chosen by the factor analysis program are in fact the most significant items. First, looking at the t-scores within the two tables we

Table 2. Factored Items of the Alienation/Integration Continuum As Measured by Mean Scores and T-Values for the Variable of Organizational Status

	Novices	Juniors	Philosophers	Regents	Theologians	Tertians
Novices		N.S.*	.01	.01	.01	.01
Juniors			.01	.01	.01	.01
Philosophers				.01	.01	N.S.
Regents					N.S.	N.S.
Theologians						N.S.
Tertians						
Group Size	44	44	64	57	56	8
Mean Score**	102.4	98.7	90.5	82.0	78.7	85.0

* N.S. in this thesis always means non-significant at the .05 level
**Continuum midpoint is 80.5

Table 3. Total Items of the Alienation/Integration Continuum As Measured by Mean Scores and T-Values for the Variable of Organizational Status

	Novices	Juniors	Philosophers	Regents	Theologians	Tertians
Novices		N.S.	.01	.01	.01	.01
Juniors			.01	.01	.01	.01
Philosophers				.01	.01	N.S.
Regents					N.S.	N.S.
Theologians						N.S.
Tertians						
Group Size	44	44	64	57	56	8
Mean Score*	183.4	176.0	160.8	147.7	141.0	155.3

*Continuum midpoint is 140.0

have a pattern of definite significance. Of the 15 possibilities, ten are significant at the .01 level. This means that we can accept the fact that organizational status does in fact have a significant relationship to the extent of alienation/integration.

In table 2, the "N.S." notation below the category "Juniors" means that the Juniors as a group are neither alienated nor integrated within a statistically significant degree (.05) of certitude. The ".01" notation under "Philosophers" means that a pattern exists within the group so that the Philosophers' score lies on the alienation/integration factored items continuum within a 99 per cent level of certitude.

Next we look to the mean scores. The two tables again show relatively the same pattern. Table 2 deals with twenty-three items and therefore can range from a possible 23 (as extremely alienated) to 138 (extremely integrated). Table 3 deals with all 40 items and therefore can range from 40 to 240. Both tables show the Novices to be the highest. Each of the following groups except for the Tertians is lower than the previous one. The Theologians are lowest.

We shall now proceed to the tables dealing with the alternate meanings of alienation. Table 4 shows an almost identical pattern of t-scores as tables 2 and 3. This means that organization status does relate significantly to normlessness/normfulness. The mean scores in table 4 show a much lower pattern in the previous two tables. This scale--as will be true for all remaining scales

on normlessness-- has a range from 5 to 30 with the midpoint at 17.5. The highest score in table 4 is 23.6 registered by the Novices. The mean scores in table 4 were

Table 4. Normlessness/Normfulness As Measured by Mean Scores and T-Values for the Variable of Organizational Status

	Novices	Juniors	Philosophers	Regents	Theologians	Tertians
Novices		N.S.	.01	.01	.01	.01
Juniors			.02	.01	.01	.01
Philosophers				.01	.01	N.S.
Regents					N.S.	N.S.
Theologians						N.S.
Tertians						
Group Size	44	44	64	57	56	8
Mean Score*	23.6	22.1	19.7	15.5	14.6	16.1

*Continuum midpoint is 17.5

proportionately lower than in tables 2 and 3. This might be significant in hypothesizing that the subscales of alienation provide different information from the major alienation/integration scale. However, further substantiation of the possibility is needed.

Self-estrangement has three items in the scale and thus ranges in possible scores from 3 to 18 with the midpoint at 10.5. The t-score in table 5 is an extreme departure in that there is significance in only two of the 15 t-score values. The mean scores,

Table 5. Self-Estrangement/Self-Fulfullment As Measured by Mean Scores and T-Values for the Variable of Organizational Status

	Novices	Juniors	Philosophers	Regents	Theologians	Tertians
Novices		N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Juniors			N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Philosophers				N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Regents					N.S.	N.S.
Theologians						N.S.
Tertians						
Group Size	44	44	64	57	56	8
Mean Score*	13.1	13.9	13.5	13.1	12.4	12.8

*Continuum midpoint is 10.5

Table 6. Powerlessnes/Powerfulness As Measured by Mean Scores and T-Values for the Variable of Organizational Status

	Novices	Juniors	Philosophers	Regents	Theologians	Tertians
Novices		N.S.	.02	.01	.01	N.S.
Juniors			.05	.01	.01	N.S.
Philosophers				N.S.	.01	N.S.
Theologians					.05	N.S.
Tertians						N.S.
Group Size	44	44	64	57	56	8
Mean Score*	24.4	24.3	22.1	21.3	19.2	22.9

*Continuum midpoint is 21.0

too, fail to show the pattern of tables 2, 3, and 4. The score is practically the same for all the groups. Perhaps this should have been expected, since the t-scores show no significance. There is no one group which falls below the midpoint, nevertheless, the mean scores lie much closer to the midpoint than to the totally integrated point of 18.

The "powerlessness" scale (table 6) is a six item scale ranging from 6 to 36 with 21 as the logical middle. As can be seen from table 6, the t-score values depart significantly from

Table 7. Isolation/Incorporation As Measured by Mean Scores and T-Values for the Variable of Organizational Status

	Novices	Juniors	Philosophers	Regents	Theologians	Tertians
Novices		.05	.01	.01	.01	.02
Juniors			N.S.	.01	N.S.	N.S.
Philosophers				N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Regents					N.S.	N.S.
Theologians						N.S.
Tertians						
Group Size	44	44	64	57	56	8
Mean Scores*	22.0	20.3	19.1	17.6	19.1	18.5

*Continuum midpoint is 17.5

table 5. The Philosphers, Regents, and Theologians have significant feelings of powerlessness. Again, the mean scores are quite close to the midpoint between the extreme points of integration and alienation. The score of the Theologians goes below the midpoint. More than the others they felt a lack of the power to influence the policy of the decision makers.

The Regents stand out in the measurement of isolation in table 7. Their mean score is the lowest and is exactly in the middle between alienation and integration. This is the group which is teaching, whereas the other five groups are basically students. Perhaps the teachers feel more strongly than others that they are mere cogs in their respective schools, i.e., that they do not get the "kind and degree of strength that they need from the community."

Table 8. Meaninglesness/Meaningfulness As Measured by Mean Scores and T-Values for the Variable of Organizational Status

	Novices	Juniors	Philosophers	Regents	Theologians	Tertians
Novices		.05	.01	.01	.01	.01
Juniors			.01	.01	.01	.01
Philosophers				.02	.01	N.S.
Regents					N.S.	N.S.
Theologians						N.S.
Tertians						
Group Size	44	44	64	57	56	8
Mean Scores*	19.3	18.1	16.1	14.5	13.3	14.8

*Continuum midpoint is 14.0.

"Meaninglessness/meaningfulness" is measured by four significant items. Table 8 shows that this feeling of lack of meaning is high throughout the six groups. Again, we see the pattern of decline in mean scores from a high of 19.3 for the Novices to 13.3 for the Theologians and then a slight up-swing for the Tertians.

CONCLUSIONS

After looking at alienation/integration in relationship to the independent variable of organizational status in tables 2-8, what conclusions can be drawn?

1. The results in tables 2 and 3 are practically identical. Since table 2 was based on only 23 of the 40 items used to develop table 3, it seems logical to believe that these 23 items are the significant items and the remaining 17 items do not add any refinement of information. The factor analysis program has established the significant items.

2. Tables 4 through 8 represent the five subscales of alienation/integration. All five of these tables are different from each other and from the overall scores in tables 2 and 3. This would seem to show that one's understanding of alienation will be refined by considering the subcategories--or alternate meanings--of alienation than if one were simply to use the general notion of alienation/integration.

Alienation/Integration as Related to Age

The pattern of the t-scores in tables 9 and 10 show that the age

factor helps us understand where integration and alienation take place. The youngest members feel the least alienated; their mean scores are closest to the integration end of our continuum. The mean score rapidly decreases to a low of 79 in table 9 and 142.9 in table 10. This is close to the midpoint of the continuum.

Table 9. Factored Items of the Aleination/Integration Continuum As Measured by Mean Scores and T-Values for the Variable of Age

	18-20	21-23	24-26	27-29	30-32	33-35	36-38	39-41
18-20		.05	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	N.S.
21-23			.01	.01	.01	.01	.02	N.S.
24-26				N.S.	.02	.05	N.S.	N.S.
27-29					N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
30-32						N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
33-35							N.S.	N.S.
36-38								N.S.
39-41								
Group Size	40	71	57	43	29	27	5	1
Mean Score*	101.5	96.5	87.4	82.8	79.3	79.7	81.9	91.0

*Continuum midpoint is 80.5.

This low level is maintained for two groups, which means for six years. These are the six years during which most of the members are finishing their training in the organization and are beginning to

assume responsible positions. The oldest two groups show a slight up-swing in their mean scores; however, the sample is small.

Table 10. Total Items of the Alienation/Integration Continuum As Measured by Mean Scores and T-Values for the Variable of Age

	18-20	21-23	24-26	27-29	30-32	33-35	36-38	39-41
18-20		.02	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	N.S.
21-23			.01	.01	.01	.01	.05	N.S.
24-26				N.S.	.05	.05	N.S.	N.S.
27-29					N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
30-32						N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
33-35							N.S.	N.S.
36-38								N.S.
39-41								
Group Size	40	71	57	43	29	27	5	1
Mean Score*	181.8	171.5	156.1	148.6	142.9	143.3	150.8	165.0

*Continuum midpoint is 140.0.

Table 11. Normlessness/Normfulness As Measured by Mean Scores and T-Values for the Variable of Age

	18-21	21-23	24-26	27-29	30-32	33-35	36-38	39-41
18-20		.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	N.S.
21-23			.01	.01	.01	.01	.05	N.S.
24-26				.05	N.S.	.01	N.S.	N.S.
27-29					N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	.05
30-32						N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
33-35							N.S.	.05
36-38								.05
39-41								
Group Size	40	71	57	43	29	27	5	1
Mean Score*	24.1	21.5	17.4	15.5	15.8	14.4	16.8	25.0

*Continuum midpoint is 17.5.

Table 11 shows that the t-score values are slightly higher in significance than those found in tables 9 and 10. The mean scores show an extreme departure. Twice as many age groups are below the midpoint as are above it.

Table 12. Self-Estrangement/Self-Fulfillment As Measured by Mean Scores and T-Values for the Variable of Age

	18-20	21-23	24-26	27-29	30-32	33-35	36-38	39-41
18-20		N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	.05	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
21-23			N.S.	N.S.	.05	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
24-26				N.S.	.02	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
27-29					.05	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
30-32						N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
33-35							N.S.	N.S.
36-38								N.S.
39-41								
Group Size	40	71	57	43	29	27	5	1
Mean Score*	13.4	13.3	13.6	13.4	12.0	12.7	11.2	13.0

*Continuum midpoint is 10.5.

Table 12 shows that self-estrangement is not a real factor in explaining acceptance or rejection of the organization. The mean scores remain level in their pattern--although low. Nearly all the t-score values are insignificant. The t-score values for the age group of 30-32 would seen to be especially important for the Society of Jesus. All of these scores are significant, and it is this age group that is immediately preparing for ordination to the priesthood.

Table 13. Powerlessness/Powerfulness As Measured by Mean Scores and T-Values for the Variable of Age

	18-20	21-23	24-26	27-29	30-32	33-35	36-38	39-41
18-20		N.S.	N.S.	.01	.01	.01	N.S.	N.S.
21-23			N.S.	.01	.01	.01	N.S.	N.S.
24-26				.05	.01	.02	N.S.	N.S.
27-29					N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
30-32						N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
33-35							N.S.	N.S.
36-38								N.S.
39-41								
Group Size	40	71	57	43	29	27	5	1
Mean Score*	23.5	24.0	22.5	20.6	19.4	19.5	22.4	22.0

*Continuum midpoint is 21.0.

Table 13 shows that the t-score values for powerlessness are approximately the same as the overall alienation/integration scores in tables 9 and 10. Disregarding the age groups of 36-38 and 39-41 because of insufficient representation, we find that half of the members have low integration scores and the other half is actually below the logical cut-off point for integration.

Table 14. Isolation/Incorporation As Measured by Mean Scores and T-Values for the Variable of Age

	18-20	21-23	24-26	27-29	30-32	33-35	36-38	39-41
18-20		N.S.	.01	.01	.01	.02	N.S.	N.S.
21-23			N.S.	N.S.	.05	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
24-26				N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
27-29					N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
30-32						N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
33-35							N.S.	N.S.
36-38								N.S.
39-41								
Group Size	40	71	57	43	29	27	5	1
Mean Score*	21.3	20.2	18.7	19.0	18.0	18.9	18.2	14.0

*Continuum midpoint is 17.5

Powerlessness and meaninglessness (tables 13 and 15) have the same basic pattern as normlessness (table 11). Isolation follows the pattern of self-estrangement (tables 12 and 14).

In conclusion, we can say that the data in tables 9 through 15, which represent the relationship of our continuum of alienation/integration as related to age, go far toward substantiating our main hypothesis which states that an analysis of the individual alternate meanings of alienation will show patterns hidden by merely summing all the

Table 15. Meaninglessness/Meaningfulness As Measured by Mean Scores and T-Values for the Variable of Age

	18-20	21-23	24-26	27-29	30-32	33-35	36-38	39-41
18-20		.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	N.S.
21-23			.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	N.S.
24-26				N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
27-29					N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
30-32						N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
33-35							N.S.	N.S.
36-38								N.S.
39-41								
Group Size	40	71	47	43	29	27	5	1
Mean Score*	19.1	17.6	15.1	14.3	14.0	14.2	13.2	17.0

*Continuum midpoint is 14.0.

five meanings into one total score. The data point to the fact that half of the age groups feel a sense of normlessness, powerlessness, and meaninglessness. The remaining groups and the remaining two measures of alienation show that no group ranks in the upper fourth of the continuum, and of the groups remaining above the midpoint, most are only slightly above it.

Alienation/Integration as Related to Social Class

Tables for the consideration of social class have not been introduced because no sociologically significant relationships could be found between alienation/integration and the subjective or objective determination of social class. Ninety-four per cent of the t-score values were insignificant. The mean scores showed a consistent trend in all of the 14 charts. The highest scores correlated with the highest categories of social class, and scores declined as the determination of social class position tended toward the lower class. The highest scores were usually in the mathematical third quartile while the lower scores went below the logical middle point into the second quartile. Most mean scores were close to the midpoint on the continuum.

It would seem valuable for future studies to examine the scales which did not have mean score and t-score values of sufficient statistical significance for this study.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF INFORMAL GROUP CHARACTERISTICS, NATIONALITY, RURAL-URBAN BACKGROUND, SIBLING EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS, AND FAMILY STRUCTURE IN RELATIONSHIP TO ALIENATION/INTEGRATION

In the present chapter, we will analyze the relationship between the alienation/integration syndrome and selected sociological factors. We will verbalize the findings without the use of tables; this will be done to simplify the chapter. Even though actual tables will not be included in this chapter we will continue to call them tables both for the sake of continuity in this thesis and because the computer printouts are all in the form of individual tables. Many tables show no significant new data and most tables we will refer to have only limited areas of statistical significance. In the following chapter we will further discuss this and other limitations of the thesis.

1. Informal Group Characteristics

To determine the respondent's informal groups, he was asked to give the number of "groups you feel you can better unwind in, feel freer in speaking your mind, be more yourself, and so forth." The respondent had nine possible categories of response: none, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven or more, or no answer.

The mean scores on most of the five tables of the subscales of alienation/integration were similar to the main two scales. Two interesting points exist on all of these tables: 1) The respondents who claimed to have no informal groups had consistently high alienation/integration scores. 2) The respondents who had only one informal

group had consistently low scores. However, 95 per cent of the t-score values in the two major tables were non-significant, giving us no way to explain the difference between the two groups.

However, when we look at the table for isolation/incorporation, we find that the t-score values for the respondents with an informal group are highly significant. The significance of this divergence for the present thesis is that the subscale of isolation demonstrated clearly what was only hinted at in the major two tables on alienation/integration. The individuals with only one informal group have statistically significant t-score values in the table of isolation.

2. Dependable and Dependent Friends

Dependable friends were defined as those to whom the respondent could go with a weighty problem. The categories of possible responses were the same as for "Informal Group Characteristics." The pattern of mean scores is also similar. In six of the seven tables, almost all t-score values are non-significant. However, the table of isolation/incorporation again showed a pattern of high significance. The feeling of isolation was felt by the people who claimed "seven or more dependable friends."

Dependent friends are those people who could come to the respondent with similar weighty problems. The mean scores and pattern of t-score values was similar to those of the above category. However, the table of isolation/incorporation shows that the individuals who claimed either "five" or "seven or more" dependent friends have significant t-score values.

In terms of the hypothesis of this thesis we conclude that an examination of the subscales of alienation/integration discloses information that is hidden when all the subscales are combined into one grand total.

3. The Size of the Recreational Groups Preferred

The seven tables measuring alienation/integration in terms of the sociological factor of recreational group size lend no new information in testing our hypothesis. the mean scores are generally low and often fall into the lower half of a normal distribution table. There are no patterns of significance in the t-score values.

4. Degree of Happiness in Parents' Marriage

The individuals had a choice of six possible ways to describe the degree of happiness they thought their parents had in marriage: extremely happy, happier than average, average, not too happy, other,or no answer. All but nine chose to respond by using one of the first four categories.

Both main tables of alienation/integration showed that those who said their parents' marriage was "not too happy" had high significance in their t-score values.

An examination of the subscales shows that the notions of powerlessness, meaninglessness, and isolation do not have a pattern of statistical significance. The tables dealing with self-estrangement and normlessness show very high significance for those who claimed their parents' marriage was not happy. Five of the possible six t-score values are significant at the .01 level, and the other

registers at the .05 level.

These seven tables demonstrate an "averaging" dynamic. Three of the subscale tables show no significance, whereas two tables show high t-score values for one of the groups. The impact of these five tables is averaged out in the total score of alienation/integration which shows only moderate significance.

5. Duration of Family Background

We have twenty-one tables in the computer printouts dealing with the duration of the respondents' family background. Seven tables refer to each of the following three categories: 1) whether the respondent lived with both parents for the majority of early years, 2) reasons why the parents separated if they did, and 3) the age of the respondent when the separation took place.

The first seven tables show no significance in patterns of alienation/integration scores. This is due to two factors: 1) only two responses were possible, "yes" or "no", which probably did not allow sufficient variability to detect any pattern, and 2) the great majority (86%) of individuals responded that they had lived with both parents during their early years.

The thirty-one people who had not lived with their parents showed traces of statistical significance. The individuals who said that their mother had died or that their parents had separated or divorced registered feelings of powerlessness. There was only one individual who said both of his parents had died, but his mean score was very low throughout the seven tables.

At this point it is important to note that the fourteen tables described above have given us further reason to accept the main hypothesis of this thesis. The total scale of alienation/integration clouds valuable information obtainable through an examination of the tables of the subscales of alienation/integration.

The final seven tables deal with the age of the respondent when parents separated. There is no important variation in scores and the t-score values are non-significant in these tables. The explanation for this lack of statistical meaning is that the variable of when the parents of the respondents separated--for whatever reason--does not have any significant correlation with alienation/integration.

6. The Educational Level of the Respondents' Fathers and Mothers

The fourteen tables of the computer analysis measuring these two categories have very little statistical significance. The mean scores are rather stable and generally close to the midpoint of their respective continua. Individuals who said their mothers had only a Junior High School education had significant t-score values on the meaninglessness/meaningfulness continuum.

7. Number of Children in the Respondents' Families and Respondents' Rank in the Family.

Both sets of data on these two sociological factors lack statistical significance for this thesis.

8. Degree of Happiness During Childhood

Respondents were asked to respond to the degree of their childhood happiness by checking the category of extremely happy, happier

than average, average, or not too happy. It is interesting to note that while there were two categories for people who felt they were more happy than most, only one possible category was provided for those who felt they had less than average happiness in childhood.

The two major scales of alienation/integration register high statistical significance for those who said their childhood was "not too happy." All six t-score values are significant at the .01 level. The mean scores for these individuals are very low. The same pattern exists when this group was measured for the subscales of meaninglessness, isolation, and self-estrangement. However, the remaining two tables seem to say that feelings of powerlessness and normlessness do not have any correlation with the individuals feelings of happiness during childhood.

Again we see valuable information for anyone who would want to consider the feelings of alienation and/or integration of the individuals of the Wisconsin Province of the Society of Jesus. Feelings of alienation, meaninglessness, etc. do have statistical correlations with sociological factors in the background of the individuals.

These seven tables are also valuable to this thesis. Again we see that it is possible to delineate the general feelings of alienation or integration into subcategories. In the present consideration, alienation tends to be defined in terms of meaninglessness, isolation, and self-estrangement. These have high correlations with feelings of not having had a happy childhood.

.9. Nationality

Seven tables measure the alienation/integration of the respondents in terms of the nationality of their mother, and seven tables relate to paternal nationality. For each set of seven tables the respondent was given 10 categories by which to describe his parents' nationalities. Categories 11 and 12 provided for the responses of "other" and "do not know."

While mean scores and t-score values on all seven tables describing paternal nationality are steady and largely non-significant when measuring a definite nationality, all three of the t-score values on the normlessness/normfulness continuum are significant at the .05 level, and the other is significant at the .02 level.

The tables dealing with paternal nationality also have confusing information. The four people who used the category of "other" have an erratic pattern of significant t-score values. On the two scales of alienation/integration, six of their twelve values are significant. This is somewhat paralleled in the scales measuring meaninglessness, powerlessness, and normlessness. But the scales of isolation and self-estrangement have no significant similar patterns.

On the one hand this unusual pattern might be dismissed because only four people used the category "other." However, it would seem necessary to explain this phenomenon before further explanation could be made. For this thesis, suffice it to say that even when the population is very small, we can point to differences among the

five alternative meanings of alienation and between those meanings and the general continuum of alienation/integration. Also, this is not the first time we have seen the five subscales follow the pattern of a similarity between isolation and self-estrangement while the other three follow a different grouping.

The seven tables dealing with maternal nationality have an analogous pattern:

a) Mean scores and t-score values are steady and largely significant.

b) Half of the t-scores are significant at the .02 level for the individuals who have an Italian mother.

c) Six people used the category of "other," but the same erratic pattern of significance prevails for them.

10. Rural-Urban Background

The lack of significance in the statistical tools measuring the alienation/integration snydrome as related to rural-urban background seems to say that feelings of alienation and/or integration have no relationship to the type of area in which the respondents lived.

11. Sibling Educational Aspirations

The findings suggest that the desires of the respondents' brothers and sisters have no bearing on the respondents' feelings of alienation/integration.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this final chapter, we will deal with three concluding topics. The first will be a re-cap of the major divisions of the thesis. This will be a final summary of the methods and logic we followed. Secondly, the major conclusions will be emphasized, together with a few of their implications. Finally, we will clarify limitation boundaries, both positively in an effort to see what we have done and negatively so that it will be clear what we have not done. The main effort here will be to see what we can say about our original hypotheses.

1. Methodology

This thesis dealt with the measurement of "alienation/integration." We saw in Chapter I that there have been numerous discussions concerning the meaning and measurement of "alienation." Seeman (1959) clarified the notion of this concept when he proposed five alternate meanings. These meanings were obtained by sifting the past usages of alienation.

In Chapter II we looked at several studies in which one or another of the meanings of alienation was measured. All of these investigations called for further research in which all five of Seeman's meanings of alienation would be used. O'Connell (1967) designed a study and questionnaire in an effort to distinguish

between the five different meanings. However, when he analyzed his data, O'Connell combined all five scales into one so information as to the relationship between the different five alternate meanings of alienation was not provided.

O'Connell collected his data from the members of the Wisconsin Province of the Society of Jesus who were in their formative period. He was measuring their personal adjustment to their religious order in terms of alienation and integration. He measured their alienation/integration in terms of 21 selected sociological factors.

In Chapter III we discussed the contribution of the present thesis. We took O'Connell's (1967) data exactly as it was and used factor analysis to establish the number of factors and the items belonging to each of the factors. We hypothesized that the understanding of alienation/integration would be more complete if O'Connell's data were analyzed in relation to the factors of alienation as well as the main continuum of alienation/integration rather than using just the measurement of alienation/integration.

Chapters IV and V consisted in the analysis of the relationships which exist between the respective independent variables and the alienation/integration syndrome.

2. Findings

The main findings of this thesis deal with factor analysis and the interpretation of O'Connell's (1967) data using the five subscales of the syndrome of alienation/integration.

O'Connell (1967) developed his research instrument by assigning eight items to each of the five subscales of alienation/integration. His questionnaire consisted of 40 items, and his analysis of his data was done by combining all 40 items into one measurement. We used factor analysis on O'Connell's data to determine whether the data actually showed the existence of different factors and to discover what items belonged to the factors.

Our factor analysis showed that there were five factors and that 23 items were sufficient to interpret these factors. The items were assigned into one scale. We also had this scale of the total items. We also had one table measuring the 23 factors we found to be significant. We included one table for each of the five factors. Our contention was that our analyses would yield the same results using the 23 items as it would using all 40 items if the 23 items were indeed the significant items. This we found to be true throughout the thesis.

The body of Chapters IV and V of this thesis have substantiated the fact that an analysis of the data is more complete if we use the subscales of alienation/integration than if we were to use only the total combined scale.

We have seen almost countless patterns of significance and non-significance in the syndrome of alienation/integration in relationship to the 21 different sociological variables. Always

the 40 items-tables were identical with the tables based on the 23 items. Often we saw strong contrasts among the subscales of alienation/integration. Certainly the variety of combinations we have seen are strong arguments for accepting the hypothesis that the examination of the independent variables is more refined when the subscales of the main continuum of alienation/integration are used than if only the main continuum is considered.

3. Limitations

Finally we include some of the limitations of this thesis.

a) Because we used O'Connell's (1967) data exclusively, the positive and negative parameters of his data, variables, and definitions are also found in the present thesis. The added contribution of this thesis is that we examined O'Connell's data in an effort to extract the factors and then analyzed his data in terms of these factors.

b) An important consideration both in the description and analysis of the data of this thesis are the dimensions of alienation. In Chapter II we saw that many people have used the term "alienation" interchangably with such other terms as anomie, powerlessness, meaninglessness, isolation, etc. We followed Seeman's (1959) logic; he hypothesized that these terms were really not pointing to exactly the same reality. He convincingly concluded that alienation was not a unidimensional reality. Rather alienation consists of a syndrome with at least major subdimensions.

O'Connell (1967) added a further refinement when he said that neither alienation nor any of the five factors was pure. Rather they were all considered as more-or-less; each had its own continuum. Both in his dissertation and in personal discussions this researcher had with him, O'Connell insisted that his data were collected in terms of continua and that without explicit reference to these continua, his data were meaningless.

Thus this thesis has tried to recognize and test the multi-dimensionality of these terms and has attempted to include the two poles of any of the continua in discussions dealing with the measurement of these notions. Thus, we have not used simply "alienation" or "powerlessness," but "alienation/integration," "powerlessness/powerfulness," etc. This was done in recognition both of the dimensions of the subscales and of the fact that alienation/integration is a syndrome reaching out in many directions.

c) Discussion of the continua brings us to the next important consideration. We have often talked about the polarities of the continua, but nowhere did our data find respondents clustered at their polarities. Always individuals fell somewhere in between the two extremes. The question then is when can a person be considered alienated and when integrated? Is he integrated because his score falls a fraction of a point above the mathematical midpoint?

In an attempt to deal with this problem we have used such concepts as "normal distribution" and "continua midpoints" in our discussion,

but always with the assumption that differences represent "more-or-less" of each phenomenon. Consequently if one score was lower than another, we considered it as representing both low integration and high alienation.

Further discussion of this difficulty is needed before final statements can be made about the alienation and/or integration of the respondents in O'Connell's (1967) study. We have not handled this directly in the present thesis because we were more interested in the dynamics within the syndrome of alienation/integration than we were in judging people as alienated or integrated.

d) Because O'Connell's (1967) data was obtained by studying one province of the Society of Jesus, no general conclusions can be made with regard to other provinces or other religious orders. A replication of this study for other groups would certainly be valuable. This researcher thinks it would be extremely valuable for the same study to be given again to the same group. The sociological significance of the present thesis could be magnified by such a longitudinal study.

The above limitation suggests two positive additional steps which possibly would be valuable for the Wisconsin Province of the Society of Jesus. The first would be to use the tables and computer printouts of this thesis to determine the alienation and/or integration of individuals who originally participated in O'Connell's research. The second area of possible investigation concerns the original data.

In the five years since O'Connell's study, an unusually large number of young Jesuits have left the Wisconsin Province. The original data for the people who eventually departed the Jesuits could be compared with the data of those who still belong. Is there any pattern of alienation in the scores of the individuals who left? Perhaps the results of this investigation could be used both as predictions of future trends and as criteria for change within the Society of Jesus.

REFERENCES

Blalock, Hubert.

1960 Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bonjean, Charles M. and Michael D. Grimes.

1970 "Bureaucracy and Alienation: A Dimensional Approach". Social Forces 48(March) : 365-373.

Cartwright, Desmond S.

1965 "A Misapplication of Factor Analysis." American Sociological Review 30 (April) : 249-252.

Centers, Richard.

1949 The Psychology of Social Classes: A Study of Class Consciousness. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Clark, John.

1959 "Measuring Alienation Within a Social System." American Sociological Review 24(December): 849-852.

Dean, Dwight.

1961 "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement." American Sociological Review 26(October): 753-758.

Dodder, Richard A.

1969 "A Factor Analysis of Dean's Alienation Scale." Social Forces 48(December) 252-255.

Feuer, Lewis.

1962 "What is Alienation?: The Career of a Concept." New Politics 1(Spring): 670-677.

Hajda, Jan.

1961 "Alienation and Integration of Student Intellectuals." American Sociological Review 26(October): 758-777.

Hollingshead, August.

1956 Two Factor Index of Social Position. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Middleton, Russel.

1963 "Alienation, Race and Education." American Sociological Review 28(December): 973-977.

Merton, Robert K.

1949 Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Ill. Free Press.

Neal, Arthur, and Solomon Rettig.

1963 "Dimensions of Alienation Among Manual and Non-Manual Workers." American Sociological Review 28(August): 599-608.

1967 "On the Multi-Dimensionality of Alienation." American Sociological Review 32(February): 54-64.

Nettler, Gwyn.

1957 "A Measure of Alienation." American Sociological Review 22(December): 670-677.

O'Connell, S.J., John.

1967 A Study of Selected Sociological Factors in Personal Adjustment of Members to a Religious Order in Terms of Integration and Alienation. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Sociology, Loyola University (Chicago).

1971 "The Integration and Alienation of Religious to Religious Orders." Social Compass 17: 65-84.

Seeman, Melvin.

1957 "On the Meaning of Alienation." American Sociological Review 24(December): 783-791.

Seeman, Melvin, and R. Evans.

1962 "Alienation and Learning in a Hospital Setting." American Sociological Review 27(December): 772-782.

Thurstone, Louis.

1947 Multiple Factor Analysis. Chicago, Ill: University of Chicago Press.