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The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between social integration and alienation among college faculty members from two universities. All full-time arts and sciences professors were mailed questionnaires designed to measure their degree of integration into both the academic subculture and the community at large. Four attitude scales designed to measure community alienation, professional alienation, political liberalism, and social tolerance were also included in this research.

The findings indicate that professors who are more structurally integrated into society by means of organizational participation and family ties are less likely to feel alienated, as measured by Frankl's "purpose in life" test. They are also less likely to tolerate deviant behavior and less likely to be politically liberal. Those professors who are more integrated into the academic subculture--as indicated by prestige level of the institution, years of teaching experience, highest earned degree, and scholarly productivity--are less likely to be attitudinally alienated from it.

Finally, whereas professional status factors such as highest degree held, academic rank, and teaching experience were inversely related to professional alienation, they had no relationship to community alienation.
ALIENATION AMONG COLLEGE FACULTY MEMBERS
CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AREA

Durkheim (1897) as translated by Spaulding and Simpson (1951) stated that in traditional society, its members are culturally integrated because they share similar norms, values, and beliefs. Religious, community, and family ties are interrelated so that each member develops a sense of belonging to society as a whole. Social and cultural change brought on by industrialization and urbanization result in a breakdown of the old order. The increased division of labor, geographic mobility, and heterogeneity of the population contribute to a condition of rootlessness and anomie or deregulation and a reduction in mechanical solidarity.

In a landmark essay, Merton (1938) revived interest in the study of social integration by developing an explanatory model of social normlessness, or anomie. Here, Merton considered: "how some social structures exert a definite pressure upon certain persons in the society to engage in nonconformist, rather than conformist conduct [ p. 672 ]." As a function of social structure, Merton saw anomie as stemming from the disjuncture in individual adjustment to goal-directed behavior.

Along these lines, Faris (1940) theorized that the threat of social disorganization increases as society becomes more industrialized. Faris addressed himself to the "urban pathology,"
in which he related evidence of increased mental illness, suicide, eccentricity, aloneness, and other extreme manifestations of anomie, with increasing urbanization.

A few years later, Fromm (1944) discussed the interaction between psychological and sociological factors that threaten man in contemporary American society. Here, the increasing freedom from traditional forms of social control generates insecurity and isolation, resulting in feelings of anxiety and powerlessness among members of society. In a later work Fromm (1955) further developed this concept. Emphasizing the high degree of powerlessness, self-estrangement, and helplessness which the individual is more likely to feel in a highly mechanized society, Fromm refers to the: "alienation between man and man [p. 139]." Alienation, then, is seen to result from the loss of social bonds which characterized most earlier societies.

By the mid-1950s, alienation was generally regarded as the psychological consequence of social malintegration, and was associated primarily with those elements within the social structure through which social integration may be provided. For example, social participation in voluntary associations (a major means of integrating the individual into the larger society) was shown to be inversely related to alienation (Bell, 1957; Srole, 1956).

Generally, then, many observers of modern American society see individuals being confronted with the loss of traditional values, combined with the breakdown of older patterns of family and community
activity, thus giving rise to a greater degree of social disorganization. With rapid social change, increased structural differentiation, and decreased social integration, individuals are seen as being more likely to feel detached, or alienated from society. In addition, recent research has emphasized the association between the nature and type of occupation with the individual's integration into the dominant social structure (Kornhauser, 1964; Wilensky, 1964). Further, it seems that occupation is rapidly coming to play the most important role in effecting the integration of adult members of society into the general culture (Gouldner, Wilensky, Noll, & Bradburn, 1960). Moreover, as individual attitudes are strongly influenced by the norms and values held by the general culture, these attitudes may be significantly modified by one's occupational role in the social system and its degree of isolation from the general culture. Consequently, the nature of the sociological function of a specific occupation may be one of the most significant factors accounting for individual variation in degree of social integration in contemporary American society.

The purpose of this research is to study the relationship between social integration and alienation within a specific occupation, that of college faculty members. Here the role of the full-time college professor will be considered in relation to the nature of his integration into the society at large and also into the academic subculture. This research will focus primarily on the professional and community involvement of the individual college
faculty member, and the relationship of this involvement to professional and community alienation. An attempt will also be made to determine the correlation, if any, between degrees of alienation, political liberalism, and social tolerance.

Other factors related to the faculty members' professional and/or community status need to be considered to the extent that they may affect the main relationships of concern in the study. The professionally related variables include institutional type, academic discipline, academic rank, highest degree held, years of teaching experience, and professional organizational participation. Community-related variables include age, sex, family visitation, and political participation.

In developing a conceptual framework from which to study alienation among college faculty members, it is necessary to consider their involvement in both the academic subculture and the community at large. Within the past 10 years or so, a number of studies have been directed toward this general area. As they relate to, and have influenced this project, a discussion of their findings is warranted here.

To the casual observer, a good deal of current research would indicate that college faculty members, by the nature of their occupational role, would be less inclined to experience alienation. For example, research by Kornhauser (1965), from a study regarding various occupational levels and individual attitudes, demonstrated a direct relationship between higher occupational status and job
satisfaction. Further, Kornhauser found that the perceived intrinsic value of the particular occupation had the greatest effect on individual attitudes. By consistently ranking among the highest in prestigious positions (Duncan, 1961; North & Hatt, 1947), college professors may be more likely to experience feelings of personal happiness, satisfaction, and a degree of contentment with their role in society.

Converse and Robinson (1969) found that higher occupational status is positively associated with personal satisfaction. Among college professors, this feeling was reflected in their expressions of having a sense of job security, an opportunity to use their skills, and being happy with the kind of people with whom they work. In addition, professional occupations have been associated directly with general emotional security. Clark (1949) found that, while professionals rank highest in occupational prestige, they rank among the lowest in emotional disturbances.

However, occupational status or prestige may not in itself be enough to positively influence the integration of the individual into the social structure. This may be particularly true among college faculty members when other factors are considered.

Wilensky (1964) studied several occupational categories (professional, clerical, skilled blue-collar workers) and their relationship to the degree of social integration (alienation, attachment, indifference). A number of his findings demonstrate the effect of occupation on alienation from the general culture.
In addition, some researchers have indicated that a chief occupational characteristic of college faculty members--intellectualism--may give rise to social malintegration and alienation (Bowman, 1956; Hajda, 1961). Here, those within the academic environment experience the effects of social distance from the dominant society, with intellectuals generally becoming alienated from the less scholarly dominant culture. Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958), for example, found that college faculty members tend to regard themselves as an occupational minority which significant sectors of the community hold in contempt.

Consequently, the previous discussion indicates that with increased professionalism, through greater degrees of commitment, involvement, and participation in the occupational arena, college faculty members become more integrated into their academic subculture. More important, this may occur regardless of the degree of integration into the community at large. Accordingly, this means that while an individual may be malintegrated in regard to the general culture, rejecting its attitudes and values, he may feel a sense of well-being and belonging in his relationship with the professional subculture.

Therefore, in studying alienation among any persons or groups located within a subcultural position in the social milieu, the general term "social integration" loses its adequacy, operationally, without more specific referents.

As a result, in developing a conceptual framework from which to regard the relationship between college faculty members and
alienation, a distinction shall be made between subcultural, or "professional" integration, and cultural or "community" integration.

In this research, the individual college faculty member will be regarded from his position in both his subcultural setting, and the society at large. His relative degrees of alienation, as compared with social and professional integration, will be considered. Further, two basic cultural attitudes--political liberalism and tolerance of deviant behavior--will be measured and correlated with the main independent and dependent variables.
CHAPTER II

VARIABLES AND THEIR MEASUREMENT

In this chapter, the main independent and dependent variables will be presented, along with a discussion of the development of questionnaire items designed to measure their occurrence. Two facets of the main independent variable--social integration--are seen to exist, professional integration into the academic subculture, and community integration into the society at large. Corresponding dependent variables of alienation from each cultural milieu are to be studied, as well as the effect of a variety of background information, and political and social attitudes.

Social Integration

For the purpose of this research, professional integration will be regarded in terms of the faculty member's occupational involvement, his contribution to his particular academic field, and his professional attitude. In measuring the degree of occupational involvement, a close look was taken at the individual's participation in professional organizations. While the total number of memberships in professional organizations may be indicative of relative professionalism, those who hold offices or belong to committees of these organizations would be more active. A further distinction will be made among those who present papers at their respective organizational
conventions, as well as the frequency of attendance. The following items were developed in order to measure professional involvement (Part III of the questionnaire, see Appendix for this and further questionnaire quotations):

1. **How many** professional organizations are you a member of (such as the American Historical Association)?

2. Do you hold any offices or belong to any committees in any of these associations?
   - Yes
   - No

3. **How many** times during the past academic year did you attend conventions of professional associations?

4. How many papers did you present at the conventions during the past three semesters (1969-70; and Fall, 1970-71)?
   - None
   - 1 or 2
   - 3 or more

Finally, in defining and measuring professional integration, a look was taken at the individual faculty member's recent published contributions. The participants were asked (Part III of the questionnaire):

5. **How many** of the following have you published in the last five years? (In each of the spaces below write in the appropriate number. If "none" write "0." Include co-authorship or co-editorship.)
   - Books
   - Articles in professional journals (Do not include newspaper articles, instructional material published only for your classes, book reviews, and short notes of less than one page.)
   - Editorship of professional journal
   - Art pieces, patents, and other creative works of a major nature, especially if exhibited or sold for large sums.

Initially, then, an attempt will be made to give some
structural definition to the academic environment, locating the individual faculty member within the professional setting by considering his occupational involvement, and his degree of academic productivity.

Community integration will be seen in terms of the faculty member's organizational involvement and commitment within the community, and the relative strength of his family ties. A comprehensive scale was devised in order to measure involvement in community organization. Here, an attempt was made to provide the respondent with an opportunity to list his membership in a range of possible organizations. In addition, space was provided to enumerate the frequency of attendance and the number of offices held, if any.

While direct organizational involvement has consistently been shown to serve as a: "bulwark against the development of alienation [Neal & Seeman, 1964:216 ]," active political participation seems also to characterize those who feel less alienated from the society at large. For example, Templeton (1964) found that alienated respondents expressed little interest relative to their nonalienated peers in politics, and tended to withdraw from the political process. Eckhardt and Hendershot (1967) also found greater degrees of political apathy among alienated persons, particularly at the national level.

It seemed clear, then, that in research of this nature some measurement of political activity was necessary. In an effort to check more intensive political involvement, as opposed to voting, attending rallies, et cetera, the following question was presented on
Part III of the questionnaire:

8. Have you given money or done other things to help in campaigns for local political office in your community within the past year?
   ______ Yes
   ______ No

Here, it would be anticipated that faculty members whose responses suggest greater alienation would be less likely to experience such political involvement.

Another indicator of one's social integration concerns the strength of family ties. Long regarded by sociologists as the most effective socializing agent, family ties are expected to vary inversely with alienation from the community. Without continued family relationships, individuals seem less inclined to adhere to role expectations once they have acquired them, and will experience increasing dissatisfaction with themselves and in the society (Etzioni, 1968).

Yet, in contemporary society, many observers see the decline of family autonomy, resulting in a lack of effective social control (McClosky & Schaar, 1965; Srole, 1956). Closeness of family ties is measured by this question (see Part III of the questionnaire):

10. On the average, how often do you get together with relatives— that is, your kin— other than those living with you? (Check the nearest time interval.)
   ______ More than once a week
   ______ Once a week
   ______ Few times a month
   ______ Once a month
   ______ Few times a year
   ______ Never

The nature and degree of personal interaction of the college
faculty member, differentially, in the academic subculture and in the community is measured by the following question (see Part III of the questionnaire):

9. With whom do you spend most of your leisure time: (a) with people mainly from your department, (b) from another department, (c) from the faculty generally, (d) or from the community?
   _____ Mainly from my own department
   _____ Mainly from another department (please specify):_____
   _____ From the faculty generally
   _____ From the community

In summary, a review of the literature would suggest that with increased professionalism and greater degrees of commitment, involvement, and participation in the occupational arena, college faculty members tend to become more integrated into the academic subculture. More important, this may occur regardless of the degree of their integration into the society at large.

Alienation

As early as 1955, an attempt was made to develop an objective technique for investigating the nature and types of alienation. Davids (1955) designed a questionnaire to be used in a study measuring different dimensions of the concept. Here, alienation was defined by five dispositions: egocentricity, distrust, pessimism, anxiety, and resentment.

Another significant study of this period was developed by Srole in 1956, in which an attitude scale was devised in order to measure "anomia." For Srole, anomia is the result of the individual's inability to become integrated into society, by becoming negatively
oriented toward out-groups in general, and minority groups in particular, which he regards as "self-to-others" alienation.

Subsequently, a number of studies were done in which Srole's anomia scale was applied toward contrasting specific variables. Bell (1957) showed a significant relationship between economic status, voluntary association participation, and age. Bell pointed out a tendency for older people to become relatively socially isolated.

The uses of the term gave rise to a good deal of conceptual confusion as a problem of definition continued to plague researchers. However, during the late 1950s, with the increasing emphasis on alienation within the field of sociology and its continuing definitional problem, two significant papers attempted to provide an organized view of alienation. The development of a more comprehensive definition was presented from the results of independent studies done by Clark in 1959, and an essay by Seeman (1959) attempted to: "provide an approach that ties the historical interest in alienation to the modern empirical effort [p. 785]."

In considering Clark's (1959) study, it is important to note his emphasis on the lack of means, or power, of an individual and its relation to his conception of the adequacy in fulfilling the role he is playing. Clark defines alienation as the: "degree to which man feels powerless to achieve the role he has determined to be rightfully his in specific situations [p. 849]." In other words, it is the result of the discrepancy between the amount of power a person believes he has, and the amount he believes he should have. In using a scale
which he developed to study associated factors of alienation, Clark measured the individual's satisfaction with his accomplishments, his participation in organizational role expectations, and his knowledge of information concerning related social organizations.

Seeman (1959) treats alienation from the social-psychological point of view, establishing five associated conditions:

1. **Powerlessness:** The expectancy held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes he seeks.
2. **Meaninglessness:** 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.
3. **Normlessness:** A high expectancy that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve given goals.
4. **Isolation:** When low reward value is assigned to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society.
5. **Self-Estrangement:** The degree of dependence of the given behavior upon anticipated future rewards [p. 783-789].

In developing this elaborate conceptual definition, Seeman refers to a large portion of research previously done, evaluating the results, and subsequently offers a: "more useful conception [p. 783]," as nearly all conceptual definitions in the literature fall within his model.

A review of the previous literature revealed that the main components of alienation are seen to be feelings of meaninglessness, purposelessness, normlessness, and estrangement. However, while these conditions emphasize individual alienation from the larger society, they do not measure alienation from a specific subculture within society, as alienation may well be generated by different social conditions. Clearly, this would be the case among college faculty
members, as their societal frame of reference may be either the community at large, their profession, or both. Having considered this in making distinctions between "professional" integration and "community" integration, it follows that a similar distinction concerning alienation is in order. Just as alienation may be a result of rejecting values and goals of society, if one's frame of reference is his profession, then he may come to feel alienated from the values and goals prescribed by his profession. With this in mind, a distinction must be made concerning the specific forms of alienation. As a result, a distinction shall be made regarding occupational, or "professional" alienation (Alienation_p), and "community" alienation (Alienation_c).

In measuring Alienation_c, a 20-item scale, developed by Victor Frankl and used in a study by Crumbaugh (1968), should tap feelings of meaninglessness, normlessness, purposelessness, and estrangement. The scale was slightly modified for use in this research (discussed in Chapter V), and consists of the following items:

1. I am usually exuberant and enthusiastic.
2. Life to me seems completely routine.
3. In life, I have very clear goals and aims.
4. My personal existence is very purposeful and meaningful.
5. Every day is constantly new and different.
6. If I could choose, I would prefer never to have been born.
7. After retiring, I would do some of the exciting things I
have always wanted to.

8. In achieving life goals I have made no progress whatever.

9. My life is running over with exciting good things.

10. If I should die today, I would feel that my life has been very worthwhile.

11. In thinking of my life, I often wonder why I exist.

12. As I view the world in relation to my life, the world completely confuses me.

13. I am a very irresponsible person.

14. Concerning man's freedom to make his own choices, I believe man is completely bound by the limitations of heredity and environment.

15. With regard to death, I am prepared and unafraid.

16. With regard to suicide, I have often thought of it seriously as a way out.

17. I regard my ability to find a meaning, purpose, or mission in life as very great.

18. My life is in my hands and I am in control of it.

19. Facing my daily tasks is a painful and boring experience.

20. I have discovered clear-cut goals and a satisfying life purpose.

However, while an individual faculty member may feel alienated in regard to the society at large--rejecting its attitudes, values, and norms--he may feel a sense of well-being and belonging within the academic subculture. Conversely, an individual may feel alienated
from the attitudes, values, and norms of his profession even though he is well-integrated in the society at-large.

Research by Faia (1967) supports this contention. Here, the major dimension of alienation among college faculty members was associated with the belief that: "day-to-day endeavors of one's colleagues are for the most part irrelevant, incompetent, and immaterial [p. 400]" with respect to reaching the objective goals of the academic world. He found alienation positively related to perceived "structural inadequacy" in that alienated faculty members regarded the organizational system to be structured in such a way as to: "make it difficult, if not impossible [p. 401]" for them to attain the goals they desire. In addition, faculty members whose answers reflected greater alienation tended to perceive themselves as lacking academic ability, proficiency, and experience. In this sense, professionalism may be seen as being inversely related to alienation.

In measuring Alienation, the following Likert-type questions were chosen from Faia's (1967) study, in which self-estrangement (or alienation from work) among faculty members was considered (Part II of the questionnaire):

1. American colleges and universities are probably among the best in the world in terms of encouraging initiative, creativity, and independence of mind.
7. In American society, the "scholarly life" is one of the most satisfying life styles.
12. By the time students reach college, it is almost impossible, for a number of reasons, really to "educate" them in the broadest sense of the term.
17. Americans place far too much faith in higher education as a means of improving society.

27. Nowadays, it is almost impossible for academic people to avoid becoming "alienated" from the academic world.

Considering the implications of previous research concerning the relationship between alienation and social integration, it is hypothesized that:

1. An inverse relationship will exist between the professional integration factors and \( \text{Alienation}_p \); and

2. An inverse relationship will exist between the community integration factors and \( \text{Alienation}_c \).

There is evidence to suggest that within the professional subculture, individuals may vary significantly in their organizational integration and feelings of professional alienation. Miller (1967), in studying alienation among professionals, considered specific professional characteristics related to alienation, including length of professional training, degree of organizational control, and professional climate. Miller found that those professionals who had received the Ph.D. degree have considerably more professional loyalty and identifications than those persons with M.A. or M.S. degrees. Further, the data demonstrated that research freedom and a favorable professional atmosphere are considerably more important in reducing alienation than are somewhat less professional organizational qualities, such as incentives to produce, and the degree of direct supervision. The results of Miller's study suggest that a greater degree of professionalism among those members of a university
environment will be positively associated with organizational satisfaction, and negatively associated with alienation of the academic subculture.

Alienation is seen to be greater among those who experience blocked mobility, restrictive control over their work situation, and a good deal of authority over them, even among professionals. Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958) found supporting evidence for this theory, in that those faculty members of higher rank seemed to fit the following pattern: they experienced higher prestige, or professional status, were more fully integrated in their profession, were able to devote more time successfully to their academic work, and were more permissive, or socially tolerant.

Other Variables

Several professional organizational status characteristics (hereinafter referred to as "Professional Status Factors") are expected to be related to the individual faculty member's integration into the academic subculture. These are highest degree held (Question 4), academic rank (Question 5), number of years of full-time college teaching (Question 6), number of years of full-time college teaching at current institution (Question 7), and tenure status (Question 8) (Part I of the questionnaire, see Appendix).

Another variable--academic discipline--will also be considered in relation to both types of alienation, and the attitude cluster. Specifically, the particular fields of study have been shown to influence attitudes and values; for instance, the faculty members studying social sciences are characterized by a greater degree of
social tolerance and political liberalism (Lipset & Ladd, 1970).

With this in mind, academic disciplines were rank ordered as to their relative degree of interest in the behavioral sciences. The question which was adapted from Lipset and Ladd (Part I of the questionnaire) was presented:

3. Department:
   _____ Social Sciences
   _____ Humanities
   _____ Fine Arts
   _____ Education
   _____ Physical Sciences
   _____ Biological Sciences
   _____ Business
   _____ Engineering
   _____ Other

It is expected that faculty members in those disciplines which have as their subject matter the study of man and his behavior (social sciences, humanities, and fine arts) will score higher on the Alienation<sub>c</sub> scale. Conversely, faculty members in those disciplines which have as their subject matter the study of nonhuman and inanimate matter (physical and biological sciences) or a vocational orientation (engineering, business, and education) would score lower on the Alienation<sub>c</sub> scale.

The effect of institutional prestige will also be correlated with the main variables. Following the work of Brown (1957), and the related research of Reisman (1958), the professional attitude of individual faculty members was measured as it related to their academic and educational values and opinions. Their research was developed from a measurement of "Local-Cosmopolitan" attitudes, a
scale which provided a list of items generally characterizing the more significant factors related to the educational and occupational setting of a college as a work place. In this research a modified "Local-Cosmopolitan" scale was used to determine the relative importance to the participants of the following factors (Part III of questionnaire):

6. How important is each of the following in your current position with the college or university? (Check once in each row.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS RELATED TO UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>VERY IMPORTANT</th>
<th>IMPORTANT</th>
<th>IMPORTANT</th>
<th>IMPORTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congeniality of colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency of colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of school among those in field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research facilities and opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, it is anticipated that those with an unstable work history, low degree of cosmopolitanism, and association with low institutional prestige would be positively associated with alienation from their professional subculture.

Also in this research, items in the questionnaire regarding attitudes and values were chosen from two major areas: tolerance of social deviance and political ideology. Here, an attempt was made to develop questions which would effectively measure attitudes toward three specific forms of social deviance (drug use, sexual permissiveness, and improper dress), and political ideology (degree of political
Concerning attitudes of tolerance of social deviance, the following questions were constructed by this researcher (Part II of the questionnaire):

10. Conventional rules and customs concerning sexual behavior in marriage are much too restrictive.
21. I would approve of the private use of marijuana and other mild hallucinogenic drugs.
30. I would disapprove of people attending formal public events dressed in an unkempt manner.

Political ideology was measured by the following five-item scale (Part II of the questionnaire):

4. It is the responsibility of government to insure a good standard of living for all.
14. The traditional capitalistic system provides for the best possible distribution of wealth.
19. In general, full economic security is harmful; most men wouldn't work if they didn't need the money for eating and living.
24. Student activist groups should become stronger and have more influence.
33. The principles of "freedom" and "equality" are closer now than in the past to being realized in American society.

Attitudes concerning social deviance and political ideology would be expected to be less in conformity with the surrounding society for those who are more "community" alienated.

And finally, an "Extra Professional Status Factor" cluster, consisting of age and sex will be considered.

Hypotheses

Specifically, with regard to the social integration model illustrated in Chart 1, it is hypothesized that:

1. When correlated with factors within the community at large, Alienationc will be
Chart 1. Social integration model.
a. Inversely related to the community integration factors.
b. Unrelated to the professional status factors.
c. Inversely associated with institutional prestige.
d. Directly related to those disciplines which study man and his behavior.
e. Inversely related to age.
f. Lower among women.

2. When correlated with factors within the professional environment, Alienation will be

a. Inversely related to the professional integration factors.
b. Inversely related to the professional status factors.
c. Inversely associated with institutional prestige.
d. Inversely related to those disciplines which study man and his behavior.
e. Inversely related to age.
f. Higher among women.

3. With respect to political liberalism and tolerance toward social deviancy, these cultural sentiments will be

a. Inversely related to Alienation
b. Inversely related to Alienation
c. Directly related to those disciplines which study man and his behavior.
d. Inversely related to age.
e. Lower among women.
The data for the study were obtained by means of a mail questionnaire (see Appendix). While the questionnaire was a rather long seven pages, it was necessary given the scope of the project. Though a large number of questions was presented, the highly structured design minimized the length of time required to complete it.

Visual improvements were considered also, particularly when arranging the questions and developing the format. It was felt that the first section should not contain decisive, sensitive, or thought-provoking questions. Just possibly, that might cause initial displeasure on the part of the participant, ultimately resulting in fewer responses and a bias from selective refusals. Therefore, Part I, "Background Information," contained fairly routine questions such as sex, age, discipline, and the "Professional Status Factors" (degree held, rank, years teaching at the college level, years teaching at this university, and tenure). Categories under each question were listed and required only a check mark in an appropriate space provided for the respondent. Hopefully, once engaged in filling out the questionnaire, it would be less likely for the participant to decide against completing it.

Part II, "Academic and Community Life," was somewhat more
involved, as it contained the four attitude scales. Here the modified Frankl scale measured Alienation (20 items); the Faia scale measured Alienation (five items); and the two cultural sentiment scales devised by this researcher measured political liberalism (five items) and social tolerance (three items). Although there are 33 items in this section, relating to four general areas, they were arranged in a random order in an effort to preclude the occurrence of bias. Each item provided a choice among five Likert-type responses ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." Finally, to avoid a response set bias, 16 of the items were reversed before random ordering.

Part III, "Occupational and Community Involvement," contained the most thought-provoking questions, requiring the respondent to reflect on virtually the whole range of his professional and community life. Here, professional and community integration factors were considered. The more involved questions were at the beginning of this section, rather than at the end of the questionnaire when the respondent would have been answering for an estimated 20 to 30 minutes and would presumably be somewhat tired. Again, even fairly lengthy questions were presented in a highly structured fashion, requiring less effort on the part of the participant and providing a more sensitive and organized set of responses.

Part IV, "Some Hypothetical Situations," was the final part of the questionnaire. This section contained the following four
conjectured situations, each logically related to the four attitude scales, and requested the participant's reactions (see questionnaire in Appendix for this and further questionnaire quotations):

The following instances involve specific activities which one might encounter in American society. However, many people would differ as to their reactions to these situations. Please check the response nearest to your own opinion.

1. John Leonard, a graduate student, was arrested for possession of marijuana. Although, at his trial, the judge agreed John was not a "pusher", he sentenced him to six months in jail. Regarding this outcome, what is your opinion?
   ____ Strongly Approve
   ____ Approve
   ____ Indifferent
   ____ Disapprove
   ____ Strongly Disapprove

2. A colleague and friend of yours who has been in the teaching profession for a number of years (since the beginning of his professional career) recently expressed reservations about his choice of occupations. Specifically, he mentioned that the educational system in America was now organized in such a way as to preclude the attainment of its values and goals. Then, just yesterday, he told you that he was quitting the academic profession, and accepting a position in the business world. Regarding this outcome, what is your opinion?
   ____ Strongly Approve
   ____ Approve
   ____ Undecided
   ____ Disapprove
   ____ Strongly Disapprove

3. The President of the United States came to speak at the convocation of your college or university. In cancelling classes for that day, the administration made it clear that student attendance was mandatory. However, a number of students organized and attended a separate rally at that time. They also featured a radical speaker who advocated reforming the government even if it meant revolution. On the following day, they were suspended from school. Regarding this outcome, what is your opinion?
   ____ Strongly Approve
4. Richard Smith, a long-time friend and neighbor, had become more and more detached from social and community life within the past year. In a discussion with him, you found he felt that living in American society had become extremely frustrating, and that he only found meaning in his work. Then, just yesterday, he told you that he had had enough; he was moving himself and his family to another country in an attempt to regain purpose and meaning in life. Regarding this outcome, what is your opinion?

These questions function as an indicator of the questionnaire's internal validity with respect to the four attitudinal scales:

Question 1--Test for validity of the "Tolerance of Social Deviance" scale

Question 2--Test for validity of the "Alienation" scale

Question 3--Test for validity of the "Political Liberalism" scale

Question 4--Test for validity of the "Alienation" scale

Data Collection

In gathering data for the use in testing hypotheses, the questionnaire was administered to all full-time members at the College of William and Mary (Wm & Mary) and those at Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU). However, only those associated with the arts and sciences, education, and business were contacted. Several departments were not included, for they only existed at one of the schools.
Further, in an effort to ensure that all respondents would currently have potential access to both professional and community structure, only those who were actively engaged in the role of full-time college faculty members were contacted.

Purposefully omitted were those in:

1. Military Science
2. Medical Science
3. Marine Science
4. Emeriti, visiting professors, lecturers, or adjunct faculty
5. Faculty members who were primarily in administrative positions.

Initially, current issues of the college handbook from each school were used in determining those to be included in the population. However, more up-to-date information was obtained from the Office of Academic Affairs at VCU and the Dean of Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Wm & Mary. Information made available included: faculty member's name, rank, discipline, office location, student/teacher ratio, and sex. The final lists of those to be used consisted of 305 faculty members from the College of William and Mary, compared to 487 from Virginia Commonwealth University, for a total of 792.

Prior to mailing the questionnaire, however, a pretest was administered in an effort to determine beforehand if there were any problems or errors in its design. There were 12 faculty members selected at Christopher Newport College, in nearby Newport News, Virginia, who were sent the questionnaire. Eight were returned and
were completed with no apparent difficulty.

Also, in an attempt to add professional credibility to the project, the researcher contacted Professor Lewis Dianna, Chairman of the Department of Sociology, VCU, and Professor Anthony L. Guenther of the Sociology Department, Wm & Mary. Both agreed to furnish cover letters to accompany the questionnaires at their respective institutions, urging their colleagues to participate in this research.

The method of distributing the questionnaires was by college mail; mail rooms at each institution received the questionnaires for distribution on March 20, 1971—a date so chosen so the faculty members would have more than a full work week prior to Spring Break to respond. The cut-off date for usable responses was set for May 1, 1971.

To each full-time faculty member was sent:

1. A letter of introduction by a colleague, in which the purposes and goals of the research are outlined, and which urges the professor to participate;

2. The questionnaire, also containing a letter of introduction by this researcher; and

3. A stamped, self-addressed envelope, available for use in returning the questionnaire.

All addresses were handwritten and stamps were used in order to convey a more personal feeling to the respondent. In a final effort to ensure the speedy receipt of the questionnaire, this researcher visited the mail rooms at both VCU and Wm & Mary each day during the
following week, in order to make sure each envelope had up-to-date addresses and was properly distributed.
CHAPTER IV

PROFESSIONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STATUS FACTORS

A description of the responding college faculty members according to their professional status characteristics will be presented in this chapter for each institution. As of May 1, 1971 (the cut-off date for accepting returned questionnaires), the response rate from each institution was remarkably similar. Of the 487 questionnaires mailed to VCU professors, 308 were returned (63.2 percent). Of the 305 mailed to Wm & Mary professors, 190 were returned (62.3 percent). However, not every returned questionnaire was used. Those not completed in their entirety were culled, as were those with confusing or indecisive responses. In all, 38 were discarded (13 from Wm & Mary, and 25 from VCU), leaving 58.0 percent from Wm & Mary and 58.1 percent from VCU for a total usable response rate of 58.07 percent.

It appears, then, that the respondents are proportionately representative of their respective institutions. Refusals were not concentrated in any particular group and comparisons of frequencies with the total population revealed little bias as to sex composition at each institution. White males comprise the majority in both schools; the female population is significantly larger at VCU
(Table 4-1). The distribution of age groups was similar at VCU and Wm & Mary, as Table 4-2 indicates.

Both faculties are characterized by a predominance of younger members (68 percent are 40 or younger), with the median age being somewhere around the mid-30s. There was, however, a tendency for faculty members at Wm & Mary to be slightly older. The distributions for "Degree Held" and "Rank" at the two institutions are given in Tables 4-3 and 4-4.

Table 4-3 reveals large differences in the highest degree earned in the two institutions. Whereas the model degree category at Virginia Commonwealth University is "M.A., M.S.," the Ph.D. degree category is by far the most typical at the College of William and Mary. The distribution among respondents parallels that of "Degree Held." Here, the VCU respondents had 31.1 percent who were "Instructors" to Wm & Mary's 9.6 percent, while Wm & Mary had nearly twice as many "Full Professors" (18.1 percent to 9.9 percent).

Further illustrating the variance between the prestige factors at the two institutions, both occupational mobility and cosmopolitanism were found to be in the expected direction. In addition to being characterized by a lower student/faculty ratio and higher proportion of Ph.D. degrees, faculty members at Wm & Mary were found to have been teaching longer at their present institution than their colleagues at Virginia Commonwealth University (V = .176; p = 0.014). Also, a significantly higher degree of cosmopolitanism existed at Wm & Mary, as Virginia Commonwealth University professors tended to be more
Table 4-1

Faculty Sex Composition by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Virginia Commonwealth University</th>
<th>College of William and Mary</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-2
Age by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Virginia Commonwealth University</th>
<th>College of William and Mary</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 plus</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-3
Degree Held by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Virginia Commonwealth University</th>
<th>College of William and Mary</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Science</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All but dissertation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>Total Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
localistic in their orientation ($\lambda = .222; p = 0.006$).

There were some 25 different academic disciplines at both institutions, with a number of them only at one of the schools. Consequently, even though information was obtained specifying the number of faculty members in each department, it seemed of little value in comparing the total population at each school; especially since they were combined into general categories. Table 4-5 offers a breakdown of the nine specified categories presented in the questionnaires. The majority of faculty members were from those disciplines which study man and his behavior (56.3 percent). Yet, while there were only 14 respondents in the total population from engineering and physical education departments, they were deleted from the study when academic discipline was used as a variable.

Concerning teaching experience, the characteristics of the respondents in relation to both length of time they have been teaching and length of time spent teaching at the present institutions are studied here. Table 4-6 shows that Wm & Mary's faculty members have significantly more teaching experience, and also that the great majority of respondents from both schools have been teaching 10 years or less.

Table 4-7 indicates that faculty members at Wm & Mary have been teaching at their present location for a significantly longer time.

Finally, responses to question Number 8 about tenure were culled, as VCU officially abandoned their program just prior to data
Table 4-5
Academic Discipline by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Discipline</th>
<th>Virginia Commonwealth University</th>
<th>College of William and Mary</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-6
Years of Teaching Experience
by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Virginia Commonwealth University</th>
<th>College of William and Mary</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Num-</td>
<td>Per-</td>
<td>Num-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ber</td>
<td>cent</td>
<td>ber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 plus</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>Total Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 plus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, the response rate was reasonably high given the scope of this project. Also, it seems the general characteristics of the respondents as a group are proportionally representative of the larger population. As well as can be determined, refusals were not clustered in any particular group. A number of fundamental institutional differences are clear, however. Wm & Mary had significantly fewer women in comparison to VCU. Faculty members at Wm & Mary were somewhat older. Yet, perhaps the most striking contrast was the difference between institutions when responding faculty members were categorized according to rank and degree held. The vast majority of faculty members at Wm & Mary held Ph.D. degrees, nearly twice as many as those at VCU. There were also nearly twice as many faculty members ranked "Full Professor" at Wm & Mary in comparison to VCU. The full range of academic disciplines was represented, although most (66.3 percent) were from the behavioral sciences.

Finally, even though nearly four of five faculty members had been teaching 10 years or less, those at VCU had significantly less teaching experience, and had been at their present institution fewer years than those at Wm & Mary.

From the presentation of this cross-sectional view of the respondents as a group, analysis of the data may be begun and hypotheses may be tested from a more accurate perspective.
CHAPTER V

COMMUNITY ALIENATION

In this chapter, a look will be taken at the results of the community alienation scale. Scaling methods of the index itself will be discussed prior to presenting data related to the faculty members' integration into the community. The role of institution, as well as effects of academic discipline, age, and sex will also be considered.

One of the most difficult problems in the measurement of subjective data, such as attitudes or opinions, is that of ordering the information for comparative analytical use. In this research, prior considerations that were made in both scale construction and testing for reliability and validity, helped to provide a greater degree of confidence in the use of the scales in this study.

For example, the 20-item Frankl scale, designed to measure purpose in life, seemed qualified to tap the various dimensions of alienation from the community at large (powerlessness, normlessness, purposelessness, and estrangement). In its original form, respondents are asked to circle a number along a scale between two seemingly opposite opinions for each item. For example, item 6 is as follows:

If I could choose, I would:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

44
Prefer never to have been born
[ Robinson & Shaver, 1969:189 ].

Like nine more lives just like this one

This format seemed somewhat confusing, however, as participants were asked to choose between two positions which logically could not be exact opposites. Particularly among the more critical population involved in this research, the original format seemed too imprecise. The scale was used, however, by forming each item into a complete statement. Item 6 then read: If I could choose, I would prefer never to have been born. Here, then, the faculty member was asked to indicate a response along a Likert-type continuum from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree."

Numerical values were later assigned for each item, giving a quantitative score on the Alienation scale for each respondent.

Yet, prior to final acceptance of the data from the Frankl scale as the indicator of Alienation, tests were made to determine both its internal and external validity as it was used in this research. Basically, two questions were considered:

1. To what degree did each item measure what the scale as a whole purported to measure; and

2. To what degree did the scale as a whole measure what it was intended to measure.

To answer the first question, a test was made between the mean score of each item, and the mean score of the total scale, giving the item/total score correlation coefficient of that relationship
as shown in Table 5-1.

There were a number of fairly low correlations, so in an attempt to improve the scale's reliability, those items which had a correlation coefficient of less than .35 at either school were culled. Three items were rejected: questions number 11, 23, and 29. A closer look at the questions may offer an explanation for their unrelatedness (Part II of the questionnaire, see Appendix for this and further questionnaire quotations):

11. After retiring, I would do some of the exciting things I have always wanted to.

Due to the somewhat youthful characteristic of the respondent, it is plausible that this question holds little general relevancy. It would seem to be a more reasonable question to put to those, say above 50, who are already looking forward to retirement, rather than those below 40 (the majority of the respondents), who would be less likely to plan so far into the future (Part II, questionnaire).

28. Concerning man's freedom to make his own choices, I believe man is completely bound by the limitations of heredity and environment.

29. My life is in my hands and I am in complete control of it.

Both of these questions may have little consistent relevancy to a college faculty member population, because of (1) their lack of sophistication, and (2) that a response in either direction would be antithetic to an inherent philosophical commitment by faculty members to the learning process as a significant means toward goal achievement.
Table 5-1

Correlation Coefficients of the 20-Item Alienation Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Virginia Commonwealth University</th>
<th>College of William and Mary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5-1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consequently, a 17-item scale was used to measure Alienation\textsubscript{c}. The revised scale was then tested for internal validity, as Table 5-2 indicates.

In a check of external validity, a response was asked for a hypothetical situation in Part IV of the questionnaire, logically devised to indicate one's alienation from the larger society.

4. Richard Smith, a long-time friend and neighbor, had become more and more detached from social and community life within the past year. In a discussion with him, you found he felt that living in American society had become extremely frustrating, and that he only found meaning in his work. Then, just yesterday, he told you that he had had enough; he was moving himself and his family to another country in an attempt to regain purpose and meaning in life. Regarding this outcome, what is your opinion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Approve</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>Strongly Disapprove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_ _ _ _ _</td>
<td>_ _ _ _</td>
<td>_ _ _ _</td>
<td>_ _ _ _</td>
<td>_ _ _ _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, a strong positive correlation was exhibited between degree of Alienation\textsubscript{c}, and approval of the situation ($p = 0.050$; $V = 0.120$).

Once the Alienation\textsubscript{c} scale was in its final accepted form, it was necessary to organize the data for comparative analytical use. By assigning numerical values from one to five to the final Likert-type responses, a total value was obtained by the relative degree of Alienation\textsubscript{c} on the completed scale. A chart was then prepared plotting the distribution of values in relation to the total N (Number) for each value (Table 5-3).
Table 5-2
Correlation Coefficients of the 17-Item Alienation Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Virginia Commonwealth University</th>
<th>College of William and Mary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5-3
Distribution and Categories of Alienation Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 to 27</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 to 31</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 to 35</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 39</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 85</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By developing a highly structured questionnaire for use in collecting data and subsequently converting that data into ordinal scales, contingency tables were then constructed for the purpose of studying the relationship between variables. Through the observation of frequency distributions in these two-way tables, it was possible to learn the direction of such a relationship. Yet, it is necessary to use a statistical device while analyzing the data to ascertain the exact degree of the relationship between variables. By means of the chi-square test, hypotheses about the relationship between variables in this research were tested. The Cramer's $V$ was also utilized as an indicator of strength of relationship.

**Hypothesis 1a: Alienation\textsubscript{C} is inversely related to involvement in community organizations.**

In measuring the faculty members' involvement in community organizations, three dimensions were regarded: the number of organizations of which they were members; the number of offices held by them in those organizations; and their frequency of attendance per month. Tables 5-4, 5-5, and 5-6 compare the results of the Alienation\textsubscript{C} scale to the respective dimensions.

It becomes immediately clear that a pattern exists whereby those faculty members scoring lower on the Alienation\textsubscript{C} scale are quite involved in community organizations. Conversely, those scoring highest on Alienation\textsubscript{C} were virtually inactive in community organizational
Table 5-4

Alienation<sub>c</sub> by Organizational Membership<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Organizations</th>
<th>Alienation&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or two</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three plus</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Cramer's V = .131; χ² = 15.819; p = 0.045; Number = 460.
\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\hline
\textbf{Office Held} & \multicolumn{5}{c}{\textbf{Alienation}_c} & \textbf{Total Number} \\
& \textbf{Very Low} & \textbf{Low} & \textbf{Medium} & \textbf{High} & \textbf{Very High} & \\
& \% & \% & \% & \% & \% & \\
\hline
None & 19.6 & 17.1 & 21.8 & 19.9 & 21.6 & 100.0 & 357 \\
One & 13.6 & 21.2 & 25.8 & 19.7 & 19.7 & 100.0 & 66 \\
Two plus & 40.6 & 21.6 & 18.9 & 16.2 & 2.7 & 100.0 & 37 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Alienation\textsubscript{c} by Office Held\textsuperscript{a}}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{a}Cramer's $V = .133$; $X^2 = 16.303$; $p = 0.038$; Number = 460.
Table 5-6

Alienation<sub>c</sub> by Frequency of Community Organization Meetings Attended per Month<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Attendance</th>
<th>Alienation&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One, two, or three times a month</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four times a month plus</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Cramer's V = .159; \(X^2 = 23.348; p = 0.003;\) Number = 460.
involvement. For example, of the 91 faculty members who scored "very high" on Alienation_c, only one of them held two or more offices in community organizations. A similar pattern seemed to exist throughout the full range of community organizational involvement. Hypothesis 1a, therefore, is accepted.

Hypothesis 1b: Alienation_c is inversely related to political participation.

It was found that the degree of Alienation_c has absolutely no effect on political participation (Cramer's V = .003; p = .988). This was not anticipated since the literature consistently demonstrated a tendency for alienated individuals to be more apathetic, and less likely to be involved in political affairs. Hypothesis 1b is rejected.

Hypothesis 1c: Alienation_c is inversely related to stronger family ties.

Again, no particular pattern was demonstrated between family ties and degree of Alienation_c (V = .109; p = 0.345). While this researcher found no direct evidence in the literature to support this hypothesis, the general suggestion is that effective family ties are the most significant means of transmitting and reinforcing values, goals, and role in society. However, the nature of this population may be partly accountable for the null findings. Perhaps the question asked does not actually tap the strength of family ties, in that it refers to visits to relatives living away from home only. Even so,
on the basis of evidence here, Hypothesis lc is rejected.

**Hypothesis ld**: Alienate\_c is not related to the professional status factors.

As indicated in previous discussions, the degree of one's alienation from the larger society is not necessarily relevant to his status in an occupational subculture. Four contingency tables on the relationship each of teaching experience altogether, and at the present institution, degree held, and academic rank to Alienate\_c revealed no significant relationships.

- **Alienate\_c** by Teaching Experience: \( V = 0.031; p = 0.582 \)
- **Alienate\_c** by Present Institution: \( V = 0.011; p = 0.380 \)
- **Alienate\_c** by Degree Held: \( V = 0.022; p = 0.865 \)
- **Alienate\_c** by Academic Rank: \( V = 0.028; p = 0.515 \)

The level of Alienate\_c is unrelated to each of the "Professional Status Factors." Here, the data provide evidence of the independence between the academic subculture and the larger community. The degree of occupational prestige, normally inversely associated with alienation, here seems to be absent. Hypothesis ld is, therefore, accepted.

**Hypothesis le**: Alienate is inversely related to the institutional prestige factor.

Here, we see a strong inverse relationship between the two variables, with faculty members at Wm & Mary scoring significantly
higher on Alienation (Table 5-7). A look at some additional data may be helpful in gaining a broader understanding of this relationship. Generally, in their personal lives, faculty members at VCU spent significantly more time with individuals from within the larger community, rather than those from their academic environment (Table 5-8).

Also, when comparing institutions, faculty members at VCU were more likely to visit relatives than those at Wm & Mary (Table 5-9).

In addition, having seen an inverse relationship between Alienation and community involvement among the total sample (Tables 5-4, 5-5, and 5-6), faculty members at VCU show a tendency to be significantly more active in this area.

Although the number of community organization memberships and the frequency of attendance was comparable among faculty members at both institutions, those at VCU demonstrated a tendency to be significantly more active, as they held proportionately more offices in those organizations (Table 5-10).

Generally, then, it seems that those faculty members at Wm & Mary tended to spend more time with their colleagues, than with persons within the larger community, and are less active in community organizations. This may indicate that faculty members at the more prestigious institution are somewhat more intellectually oriented, thereby exhibiting a tendency to be less involved in traditional forms
Table 5-7

Alienation by Institution<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Alienation&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonsweat University</td>
<td>22.3 21.2 22.6 17.7 16.2 100.0 283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>17.5 13.0 21.5 22.6 25.4 100.0 177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Cramer's V = .158; $\chi^2 = 11.268; p = 0.024; Number = 460.
Table 5-8

Institution by Time Spent between the Academic Subculture and the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Time Spent</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subculture</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\text{Cramer's } V = .232; \chi^2 = 24.768; \ p = 0.001; \text{ Number } = 460.\)
### Table 5-9

**Institution by Number of Visits to Relatives\(^a\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number of Visits</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Times</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Virginia Commonwealth**

- University: 2.8 61.1 10.6 12.0 8.2 5.3 100.0 283
- College of William and Mary: 5.6 75.8 6.8 7.3 3.4 1.1 100.0 177

\(^a\)Cramer's V = .202; \(X^2 = 18.750\); \(p = 0.002\); Number = 460.
Table 5-10
Institution by Office Held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>None (%)</th>
<th>One (%)</th>
<th>Two (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Cramer's V = .103; \(X^2 = 4.920\); \(p = 0.085\); Number = 460.
of community involvement. Hypothesis 1e is accepted.

**Hypothesis 1f:** Alienation\(_c\) is directly related to those disciplines which study man and his behavior.

In Table 5-11, data about the relationship between Alienation\(_c\) and academic discipline are presented. Here, faculty members in the physical and biological sciences, business, and education were significantly less likely to score high on the Alienation\(_c\) scale, while those in the social sciences, humanities, and fine arts were more likely to do so.

In recent years, the number and intensity of controversial social issues have increased. Since the very subject matter of those disciplines in the behavioral sciences deals with the phenomena, faculty members in these departments would tend to be more critical of traditional forms of social structures, and less likely to internalize community values and goals. Conversely, faculty members not in the sciences dealing with man and his behavior would be more likely to accept the status quo, as the data indicate, suggesting acceptance of Hypothesis 1f.

**Hypothesis 1g:** Alienation\(_c\) is inversely related to age.

Table 5-12 compares results of the Alienation\(_c\) scale to the age of the respondents. A pattern is evident, whereby the younger faculty are significantly more likely to score higher on the Alienation\(_c\) scale, while older persons are less likely to do so.
Table 5-11

Alienation$_c$ by Academic Discipline$^a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Discipline</th>
<th>Alienation$_c$</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Cramer's $V = .156; \chi^2 = 43.451; p = 0.057; \text{Number} = 446.$
Table 5-12

Alienation\textsubscript{c} by Age \textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Alienation\textsubscript{c}</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 60</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 plus</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Cramer's V = .123; \(X^2 = 27.820; \ p = 0.033; \) Number = 460.
This result is consistent with previous findings, which indicate that as individuals grow older, they generally become increasingly committed to the values and goals of community. It may logically be assumed that older persons are more likely to have larger extended families, giving rise to more visits and personal involvement in the larger society. Also, as one gets older, through experience and familiarity, he is more likely to be chosen for office in community organizations. In addition, with increased age, the sheer amount of exposure to one's culture would normally generate a more effective integration of the individual into society.

From the results of Table 5-12, Hypothesis lg is accepted.

Hypothesis lh: Alienation will be lower among women.

It seemed plausible that women, generally thought to be more integrated into society, would less likely be alienated. However, the data indicate that among college faculty members, this is not the case (V = .110; p = 0.238).

Here, women were proportionately distributed similarly to men when contrasted with Alienation scores. A possible explanation for this unexpected result is that women with occupational careers are less likely to be involved in traditional forms of community interaction. This may be even more pronounced among professional women, such as college faculty members, who more nearly function in their occupational role as their male counterparts, than do women in less professional occupations. Further, this role similarly may not be
limited to involvement within the professional subculture, but may extend into the community as well. Hypothesis lh, therefore, was rejected.

**Alienation**: A Summary of the Findings

Generally, the findings indicate a rather clear inverse relationship between community integration and Alienation. Particularly within the institutionalized structural framework of community organizations, those faculty members with greater degrees of involvement scored lower on the Alienation scale. However, in the area of political participation and family ties, as measured herein, the degree of Alienation seemed to be unrelated.

It seemed that members of the more prestigious institution, Wm & Mary, by scoring significantly higher on the Alienation scale, were less likely to be involved in traditional forms of community activity. Yet, as a group, the status of faculty members from both institutions appeared unrelated to their Alienation score, with the exception of academic discipline. There, Alienation was significantly higher among those in disciplines which had as their subject matter man and his behavior.

Age was inversely related to Alienation, due to the increased exposure involvement, and commitment by individuals as they grow older in society. Finally, women were no more likely to score high on
Alienation than their male counterparts, presumably due to the similarity of their professional occupational roles.
CHAPTER VI

PROFESSIONAL ALIENATION AND THE COLLEGE FACULTY MEMBER

The same criteria were used in determining the validity of the Faia alienation scale as the Frankl scale. A test was made between the mean score of each item and the mean of the total scale, giving the correlation coefficient of that relationship.

Table 6-1 shows the item/total score correlation of each of the five items of the Alienation scale at each institution.

The correlations were consistently high with the lowest being .45, indicating a fairly strong relationship between each item. None of the items was culled, and data from the full five-item scale were compiled in order to measure Alienation.

In a check of external validity, the responding faculty member was asked in Part IV of the questionnaire (see Appendix for this and further questionnaire quotations) his degree of agreement to a hypothetical situation, devised to indicate one's alienation from the academic subculture:

2. A colleague and friend of yours who had been in the teaching profession for a number of years (since the beginning of his professional career) recently expressed reservations about his choice of occupations. Specifically, he mentioned that the educational system in America was now organized in such a way as to preclude
Table 6-1  
Correlation Coefficient of the Alienation Scale  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Virginia Commonwealth University</th>
<th>College of William and Mary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the attainment of its values and goals. Then, just yesterday, he told you that he was quitting the academic profession, and accepting a position in the business world. Regarding this outcome, what is your opinion?

- ____ Strongly Approve
- ____ Approve
- ____ Undecided
- ____ Disapprove
- ____ Strongly Disapprove

However, a weak relationship was shown to exist when comparing results of the Alienation scale to those from the hypothetical situation ($X^2 = 21.803$), although it was in the predicted direction ($V = .108; p = 0.150$).

In converting the data to quantitative form, the same method was used here as was for each of the four scales. Numerical values from one to five were given to the five possible responses (from Very Low to Very High), so that a total value, or score, could be determined for each participant in the scale. A chart was then prepared, plotting the distribution of scores in relation to the total $N$ for each score (Table 6-2).

Subsequently, five categories were rank ordered according to degree of Alienation, for the purpose of testing the related hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 2a**: Alienation is inversely related to involvement in professional organizations.

The degree of faculty members' involvement in professional organizations has little or no effect on their Alienation scores.
Table 6-2

Distribution and Categories of Alienation Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 12</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 14</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 16</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 to 25</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Alienation by membership in professional associations: \( V = .134, p = 0.589 \); Alienation by frequency of attendance of professional meetings: \( V = .095, p = 0.405 \); and Alienation by offices held in professional associations: \( V = .089, p = 0.496 \).) These findings were quite unexpected, as it seemed that faculty members who were more involved in professional organizations would more likely be committed to the general goals and values of higher education. A possible explanation for this apparent contradiction might be weakness of the Alienation scale, already indicated by the lack of a strong relationship to the check for external validity. However, another possibility might be the weakness of professional organizations of a means of integrating the college faculty member into the academic subculture. For example, a large majority of the respondents (80 percent) were members of two or more professional associations. This would indicate this particular factor is a somewhat less sensitive measuring device among college faculty members than earlier expected. In addition, even among those who held offices in the associations, or attended more conventions, there was no noticeable difference in their degree of Alienation. Also, professional associations meet rather infrequently, normally only once per year. Participants commonly regard their occurrence as an occasion for a vacation or holiday, rather than an intellectual forum for conducting business of the academic profession.
For example, only 25 faculty members (5 percent) presented as many as two papers at conventions of professional associations during the past three academic semesters.

The evidence presented here is clearly not strong enough for Hypothesis 2a to be accepted.

**Hypothesis 2b:** Alienation\(_p\) is inversely related to productivity.

The productivity index was slightly in the direction of confirming the hypothesis, although far from giving any clear indication that it was strongly related to Alienation\(_p\). However, scaling was a problem, as some 43 percent of faculty members responding to the questionnaire had not produced any work of significance within the past five years.

Yet, a closer look taken at responses of the Wm & Mary population may provide a more accurate test of this hypothesis. Here, faculty members from the more prestigious institution scored significantly higher on the productivity scale (Table 6-3). Consequently, a more even distribution among respondents existed than did the sample in its entirety. Further, faculty members at Wm & Mary who were more productive scored lower on the Alienation\(_p\) scale (Table 6-4), giving some degree of acceptance to Hypothesis 2b.

**Hypothesis 2c:** Alienation\(_p\) is inversely related to the professional status factor.

As indicated in the previous discussion, alienation among
Table 6-3
Institution by Productivity\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Cramer's V = .165; $X^2 = 12.592$; $p = 0.014$; Number = 460.
Table 6-4

Alienation by Degree of Productivity
among College of William and Mary Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Productivity</th>
<th>Alienation</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Cramer’s V = .184; \(X^2 = 23.827; p = 0.093;\) Number = 177.
college faculty members from their academic subculture is also seen to be related to their relative degree of status in their profession. Individuals with higher status would have more teaching experience, have higher rank, and hold higher degrees.

Tables 6-5, 6-6, and 6-7 present data contrasting the professional status factors with Alienation. Here, the data suggests that the length of time teaching at the present institution is unrelated to Alienation (\( V = .110; p = 0.320 \)), although the total number of years in the teaching profession seems to be significant. College faculty members with more teaching experience are more likely to score lower on the Alienation scale.

Also, there is a strong association between those who hold higher degrees on low Alienation scores, regardless of rank (\( V = .151; p = 0.002 \)). Generally, those individuals with higher degrees and more teaching experience would seem to be more secure in their role as college faculty member. Also, those with more teaching experience and higher degrees are likely to have become better known to their professional colleagues throughout the academic world, experiencing more personal involvement within their professional subculture. In addition, faculty members with more teaching experience and higher degrees would probably be enjoying greater incomes, and more financial stability than their peers.
Table 6-5
Alienation by Teaching Experience<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Very Low (%)</th>
<th>Low (%)</th>
<th>Medium (%)</th>
<th>High (%)</th>
<th>Very High (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 5 years</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 years</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20 years</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 plus years</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Cramer's V = .126; X<sup>2</sup> = 29.457; p = 0.079; Number = 460.
Table 6-6

Alienation by Degree Held<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Held</th>
<th>Alienation&lt;sub&gt;p&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Science</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All but dissertation</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Cramer's V = .151; $X^2 = 31.647; p = 0.002; Number = 460.
Table 6-7

Alienation by Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Very Low (%)</th>
<th>Low (%)</th>
<th>Medium (%)</th>
<th>High (%)</th>
<th>Very High (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a \text{Cramer's } V = .110; \quad X^2 = 16.807; \quad p = 0.157; \quad \text{Number} = 460.\]
Generally, then, Alienation\textsubscript{p} is higher among those who may be considered newcomers to the professional academic subculture and lacking sufficient exposure to its traditional values and goals. This, presumably, with less income and a lower degree of personal involvement in the academic world, would cause them to feel more occupational insecurity, giving rise to higher Alienation\textsubscript{p} scores. On this basis, Hypothesis 2c is accepted.

**Hypothesis 2d:** Alienation\textsubscript{p} is inversely related to institutional prestige.

Faculty members at Wm & Mary, the more prestigious institution, tended to score lower on Alienation\textsubscript{p}, as indicated in Table 6-8.

This would be consistent with earlier findings associating low scores on productivity, degree held, et cetera, with Alienation\textsubscript{p}. It seems there would automatically be a strong positive relationship between the professional status factors and institutional prestige. Since faculty members at the more prestigious institution are more likely to focus their lives around their academic environment, they would tend to be more significantly integrated into the professional subculture than peers at institutions with lower prestige. Hypothesis 2d is accepted.

**Hypothesis 2e:** Alienation\textsubscript{p} is inversely related to those disciplines which study man and his behavior.
Table 6-8
Alienation by Institution\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Alienation\textsubscript{p}</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Cramer's V = .135; $X^2 = 8.416$; $p = 0.078$; Number = 460.
When comparing the various academic disciplines to Alienation scores (Table 6-9), the data suggest that those not in the behavioral sciences (social sciences, humanities, and fine arts) are significantly more likely to be alienated ($V = .160; p = 0.041$).

The relationship was particularly strong among faculty members at Wm & Mary, as faculty members in the behavioral sciences tended to be more productive and generally more involved in their professional subculture ($V = .179; p = 0.093$). Hypothesis 2e is accepted.

**Hypothesis 2f**: Alienation is inversely related to age.

While it was presumed that older persons would more likely be integrated into the professional subculture merely due to their age, it seems to have no direct effect on their degree of Alienation ($V = .097; p = 0.356$). Hypothesis 2f was not accepted.

**Hypothesis 2g**: Alienation is higher among women.

The data are indicative of a slight tendency for women to score higher on Alienation (Table 6-10), although by no means conclusive.

Yet, looking at data from each institution, there seems to be sufficient evidence to support the hypothesis.

Specifically, while women at VCU were proportionately distributed among their male colleagues on the Alienation scale ($V = .108; p = 0.503$), women at Wm & Mary were significantly more likely to score higher (Table 6-11).
Table 6-9

Alienation by Academic Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Discipline</th>
<th>Alienation&lt;sub&gt;p&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Sciences

| Sciences | 23.7 | 28.8 | 20.3 | 13.6 | 13.6 | 100.0 | 59  |

Biological Sciences

| Sciences | 34.8 | 17.4 | 34.8 | 8.7  | 4.3  | 100.0 | 23  |

Business

| Business | 20.3 | 28.9 | 27.1 | 18.6 | 5.1  | 100.0 | 59  |

<sup>a</sup>Cramer's V = .155; X<sup>2</sup> = 43.051; p = 0.009; Number = 446.
Table 6-10

Alienation by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Alienation&lt;sub&gt;p&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Cramer's $V = .125; \chi^2 = 7.223; p = 0.125; \text{Number} = 460.$
### Table 6-11

Alienation by Sex among College of William and Mary Respondents\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Alienation (p)</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Cramer's \(V = .242; \chi^2 = 10.343; p = 0.035; \text{Number} = 177.\)
This apparently incongruous finding may be the result of a higher degree of professionalism among faculty members at Wm & Mary, generating more pressure for creativity, productivity, and professional involvement. In this sense, because of the somewhat conflicting roles in contemporary American society of wife and mother on the one hand and career professional on the other, women may be less likely integrated into the academic subculture. The fact that women's scores on the Alienation scale were appreciably no different than men at VCU would then be seen as a result of a relative lack of professional involvement and commitment there among college faculty members to a degree that the detracting nature of the female role is less significant. Hypothesis 2g is accepted, in part.

In summary, the findings generally indicate an inverse relationship between professional integration and Alienation. Participation in professional associations was not related to the Alienation scores, they were seen as a rather weak means of integrating the college faculty member into the professional academic subculture. On the other hand, the degree of productivity seemed to be inversely related to Alienation, particularly at Wm & Mary, where respondents were more likely to score higher.

Further, those who had been teaching for shorter periods of time, and held lower degrees, were more likely to score higher on Alienation, presumably due to their increased professional insecurity.
and exposure. Surprisingly, Alienation was unrelated to age, although Wm & Mary women, and those outside the social sciences, humanities, and fine arts departments tended to score slightly higher.

In conclusion, while the evidence is not consistently strong, it does seem to support the general proposition that individual faculty members who experience increased involvement, commitment, and participation in the professional environment, while being more creative in their particular discipline will be less likely to have feelings of alienation from the academic subculture.
CHAPTER VII

CULTURAL SENTIMENTS: SOCIAL TOLERANCE
AND POLITICAL LIBERALISM

Attitudes from two other areas were measured in order to gain a broader perspective of the college faculty member and his relationship to the social milieu. Here, questions designed to tap their tolerance of social deviance, and degree of political liberalism were asked. The three questions of the "Social Tolerance" scale, and five of the "Political Liberalism" scale were randomly ordered in Part II of the questionnaire ("Academic and Community Life") and arranged with the same five-item responses. Scoring for both scales was also similarly done, with numerical values from one (Strongly Disagree) to five (Strongly Agree).

The first part of this chapter will deal with validity tests and scaling of the two variables, and the second part with testing hypotheses.

The same test for internal consistency was made on the three-item social tolerance scale with the following results.

The item/total score correlation indicated a high degree of consistency between items in the scale, with none falling below .71 (Table 7-1). As all items were kept, the responses were then converted into quantitative data for use in an ordinal scale. The
Table 7-1

Correlation Coefficients of the Social Tolerance Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Coefficient Virginia Commonwealth University</th>
<th>Coefficient College of William and Mary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
possible range of response values was from a minimum of 3 to a
maximum of 15. A fairly even distribution occurred when values were
delineated as follows (Table 7-2).

A final test, that for external validity, was made by
contrasting the responses of the social tolerance scale to those of
the hypothetical situation logically designed to measure social
tolerance. The results indicate that the scale was measuring the same
attitude as expressed in the hypothetical situation, with an $X^2$
significance level of 0.001.

Table 7-3 reveals results of the internal consistency tests
on the political liberalism scale.

All items were retained in the scale, as the lowest
correlation coefficient for either institution on any item never fell
below the unacceptable level of .35. The same method was used in
quantifying the data as previously used on the other attitude scales.
Here, from a range of numerical scores with a low of 5 to a high
of 25, the distribution is presented in Table 7-4.

The final scale was then tested for external validity,
comparing it to responses of Hypothetical Situation number 3, in Part
IV of the questionnaire. The results indicate conclusively that the
scale is logically related to and measuring political liberalism,
with an $X^2$ significance level of 0.001.

Even though social tolerance and political liberalism are
different attitudinal dimensions, the available literature and
Table 7-2

Distribution of Scores of the Social Tolerance Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Value</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3, 4, or 5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or 7</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 or 9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or 11</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 13, 14, or 15</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7-3
Correlation Coefficients of the Political Liberalism Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7-4

Distribution of Scores on the Political Liberalism Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Value</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 through 11</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 or 13</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 or 15</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or 17</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 through 25</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
evidence suggests they are positively related. Table 7-5 indicates the intensity of the relationship between the two variables in this research.

Due to similarities of the two variables, then, in this research the dimensions of social tolerance and political liberalism will be considered as a single "tolerance-liberalism" concept. Here, both measures will be tested for their strength of relationships with the other principal variables.

This research has previously demonstrated the inverse relationship between Alienation_c and involvement in community activities. It would follow, then, that individuals who are less integrated into their culture would be less inclined to accept the social and political standards of society than the more socially integrated individuals. Hypothesis 3a focuses on the relationship between alienation from the community at large, and the tolerance-liberalism dimensions.

Hypothesis 3a: "Tolerance-Liberalism" will be positively related to Alienation_c.

Social tolerance and political liberalism have long been considered characteristics of college faculty members when compared with the general population. Professors are often seen to be critical observers of society, rather than committed participants in it. It would be expected, then, that faculty members less integrated into society and experiencing higher degrees of Alienation_c would
Table 7-5
Political Liberalism by Social Tolerance\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Liberalism</th>
<th>Very Low (%)</th>
<th>Low (%)</th>
<th>Medium (%)</th>
<th>High (%)</th>
<th>Very High (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Cramer's V = .260; \chi^2 = 125.109; p = 0.001; Number = 460.
also score higher on both the social tolerance and the political liberalism scales. As Tables 7-6 and 7-7 indicate, this is precisely the case. Clearly, a pattern exists whereby those who scored higher on Alienation were significantly more likely to score higher on both the social tolerance and the political liberalism scales. A major consequence of a relatively lower degree of social integration may be a mutual lack of support by the alienated individual of the traditions, customs, and values held by the majority in the surrounding environs. The alienated college faculty member may feel he does not belong to the larger social environment, and will have greater criticism and less acceptance of its culturally prescribed social and political standards. The evidence is formidably in support of Hypothesis 3a.

Hypothesis 3b: "Tolerance-Liberalism" is inversely related to Alienation.

While the community-alienated individual is less integrated into the general culture, the nature of professional alienation among faculty members centers on their lack of involvement in the academic subculture. It has been seen that faculty members who score higher on Alienation are more productive and generally more integrated in the professional subculture than are their more professionally alienated peers. Also, there would seem to be less pressure to conform to current societal standards among professionally integrated faculty members, since they would have some degree of security and social
Table 7-6

Alienation by Social Tolerance\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alienation (c)</th>
<th>Social Tolerance</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Cramer's V = .165; \(X^2 = 50.385\); \(p < 0.001\); Number = 460.
Table 7-7

Alienation \( c \) by Political Liberalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alienation ( c )</th>
<th>Political Liberalism</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)Cramer's \( V = .127; \chi^2 = 29.726; p = 0.020; \) Number = 460.
belonging within their academic subculture. Yet, the relationship between social tolerance and Alienation is not significant ($V = .093; p = 0.462$). Although political liberalism and Alienation were not significantly correlated ($V = .111; p = 0.117$), the relationship is in the predicted direction. Hypothesis 3b is not supported by the data.

**Hypothesis 3c:** "Tolerance-Liberalism" is positively associated with institutional prestige.

In Tables 7-8 and 7-9, faculty members at the more prestigious institution--Wm & Mary--scored significantly higher on both social tolerance and political liberalism, as predicted in Hypothesis 3c ($V = .159, p = 0.021$; and $V = .204, p = 0.001$, respectively). Here, occupational security and success--higher among the more professional faculty members at Wm & Mary--may be largely responsible for their relatively high tolerance and liberalism scores. Individuals who have attained professional and economic security in their professional subculture, combined with their relative lack of community involvement, can afford to be more critical of convention. In addition, since faculty members at Wm & Mary are more successful professionally, they are more likely to encounter objective debate over the validity of traditional social and political customs and policies.

**Hypothesis 3d:** "Tolerance-Liberalism" is positively related to those who study man and his behavior.

In Tables 7-10 and 7-11, the relationship shown between the
Table 7-8

Social Tolerance by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Social Tolerance</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aCramer's V = .159; \( X^2 = 11.600; \ p = 0.021; \) Number = 460.
### Table 7-9

Political Liberalism by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Political Liberalism</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Cramer's V = .204; \(X^2 = 19.119; p = 0.001; Number = 460.\)
Table 7-10
Social Tolerance by Academic Discipline<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Discipline</th>
<th>Social Tolerance</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Cramer's V = .191; $X^2 = 65.229; p = 0.001; Number = 446
Table 7-11

Political Liberalism by Academic Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Discipline</th>
<th>Political Liberalism</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aCramer's $V = .195; \chi^2 = 68.157; p = 0.001; \text{Number} = 446.*
behavioral science orientation and the tolerance and liberalism scores strongly support the hypothesis. Responding faculty members in the social sciences, humanities, and fine arts departments consistently scored higher on both attitudinal dimensions than did their peers.

Characteristics of faculty members in these disciplines are consistent with those factors related to a higher tolerance of social deviance. Since faculty members here routinely deal with controversial subjects, oftentimes critical of the status quo, they would be less inclined to automatically accept traditional social customs and norms.

Hypothesis 3e: "Tolerance-Liberalism" is inversely related to age.

Long associated with political, economic, and social conservatism, increasing age is also shown here to be inversely related to the tolerance liberalism dimension (Tables 7-12 and 7-13). Older persons, previously shown to be more involved in community activities, are more likely to uphold community standards. Also, older faculty members were previously shown to have had more productive careers than their younger colleagues, thereby providing them with a higher degree of both professional and economic security. Consequently, as age increases, individuals seem to become less tolerant of those who deviate from community social standards, while at the same time, are more inclined to support the existing political and economic values than their younger colleagues. Hypothesis 3e is, therefore, accepted.
Table 7-12
Social Tolerance by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Social Tolerance</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 60</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 plus</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cramer's $V = .223; \chi^2 = 91.533; p = 0.001; Number = 460.*
Table 7-13
Political Liberalism by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Very Low (%)</th>
<th>Low (%)</th>
<th>Medium (%)</th>
<th>High (%)</th>
<th>Very High (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 60</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 plus</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cramér's V = .137; \( X^2 = 34.843; p = 0.004; \) Number = 460.
Hypothesis 3f: Women will score lower on the "Tolerance-Liberalism" dimension.

Table 7-14 presents the relationship between sex and political liberalism. Women and men were virtually equally distributed when compared to their degree of social tolerance ($V = .084; \rho = 0.511$), although men tended to be slightly more liberal. Yet, the variance was so small that Hypothesis 3f is rejected.

In summary, the evidence supports the general proposition that the nature and degree of faculty members' involvement in social structures has a significant effect on their social and political attitudes. Particularly, those who were found to be alienated from the general culture were less inclined to accept conventional social and political standards. Although the degree of alienation from the professional subculture seemed to have no effect on the two attitudes, a number of professional status factors were related. Specifically, faculty members from the more prestigious institution, tended to be more socially tolerant and politically liberal. Also, among departments, higher tolerance-liberalism attitudes are more likely among the faculty members in the behavioral sciences disciplines. Younger faculty members were more tolerant and liberal, as the older, more professionally successful and economically secure respondents were more likely to accept traditional social and political standards. Finally, there was no significant variance between men and women, when compared to their respective tolerance and liberalism scores.
### Table 7-14

Political Liberalism by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Political Liberalism</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\text{Cramer's } V = 0.123; \chi^2 = 6.95; p = 0.139; \text{ Number } = 460\).
CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Research

The general aim of this research was directed toward exploration of the relationships between social integration, alienation, social tolerance, and political liberalism among college faculty members. An attempt will be made here to sum up what has been learned about these relationships, and to discuss the general conclusions of this research.

Through the use of a rather extensive questionnaire, some 75 items of information were requested from 792 full-time college faculty members at two major educational institutions in Virginia: all of the arts and sciences departments, and those of business administration and education at the College of William and Mary, and Virginia Commonwealth University. The overall response rate was high (62.75 percent), with a total completed usable response of 58.07 percent. Available information indicated that characteristics of the responding faculty members were representative of their respective schools, in terms of degrees held, sex ratio, rank, and discipline.

Data in four general areas were collected:

Background Information--

Age, sex, department, degree held, rank, total teaching
experience, and length of time teaching at the present institution were measured.

Attitudes--

Four Likert-type scales were used to measure degrees of alienation from the community at large, alienation from the professional subculture, political liberalism, and social tolerance of deviant behavior.

Community Integration--

Involvement in community organizations, political activity, and strength of family ties were measured.

Professional Integration--

Involvement in professional associations and productivity were also measured.

The analysis in this project was organized into three main areas:

1. The college faculty member's alienation from the community at large, and his degree of community integration;

2. The college faculty member's alienation from the academic subculture, and his degree of professional integration;

3. The college faculty member's degree of social tolerance and political liberalism, and his occupational role.

The Findings

From the first results of data analysis, it was evident that a pattern existed, whereby those faculty members less structurally integrated into the community were significantly more likely to feel
alienated from it. Surprisingly, a large proportion of the respondents (31 percent) were not in any way involved in the various community organizations. Only 35 percent were involved in as many as three organizations, suggesting the possible importance of their occupational subculture as the main source of social interaction apart from their immediate family. Further, while 15 of the 94 respondents ranking Very Low on Alienation$_c$ held two or more offices in community organizations, only one of the 91 faculty members ranking Very High on Alienation$_c$ did so. Faculty members at Wm & Mary scored significantly higher on Alienation$_c$, perhaps as a result of their lower degree of community involvement, and greater degree of professionalism and related academic activities. Among academic disciplines, faculty members in the humanities and social sciences scored significantly higher than those in the physical and biological sciences, business administration, and education. This was seen primarily as a result of the nature of their subject matter. The former often deal with the more controversial social issues and are inherently critical of existing social conditions. Other academic disciplines, however, have considerably less exposure to man and his relationships in society, and individuals in these departments are more likely to be less at odds with the larger community. Older faculty members in every group were found to be less alienated. They become more involved with the surrounding culture, its traditions, customs, and values, and participate in community organizations more than their younger colleagues.
A number of factors were found not to be related to Alienation, however, particularly those related to occupation. Predictably, among these were degree held, rank, teaching experience, and length of time teaching at the present institution. These factors were evidently irrelevant to community attitudes and activities, and relevant only to the faculty member's professional role.

Three factors predicted to be related to Alienation were found to be unrelated, however. Political activity, shown in the previous literature to be inversely related to alienation, was thought to be found unrelated in this research due to the increasing number of political alternatives and variety of public forums in the political arena available to college faculty members. The strength of family ties, consistently shown in the literature to be the most effective means of integrating the individual into society, was found in this research to be insignificantly related to Alienation. However, in retrospect, the question asked of respondents in this research purportedly to measure strength of family ties seems ill prepared to do so. Specifically, it requests the number of visits per year to relatives "not living with you." Consequently, only a small percentage (29.5) of the respondents fell into the four main categories, visiting their relatives more than a few times per year. Also, this question does not consider the effect of the strongest source of family ties, the nuclear family. Finally, women were expected to be significantly more alienated, due to their apparently conflicting
roles of "career professional" and wife-mother-housewife, et cetera. However, this researcher consistently underestimated the permeating effect of the occupational role of college faculty members on the activity and attitudes of women as well as of men.

Alienation among college faculty members from the community at large, then, is seen to be primarily a result of their lack of integration into the larger society. Here, regardless of the nature of their occupational involvement, faculty members who score higher on Alienation are those who participate less in community activities. Generally, the proposition advanced by earlier sociologists that decreased structural integration among individuals in society gives rise to feelings of alienation from society is supported by findings.

With respect to the faculty member's professional integration, their involvement in wide range of professional activity was measured, as well as their feelings of alienation from the academic subculture. The data revealed little or no relationship between membership and frequency of attendance of professional associations and alienation from the professional subculture. However, a closer look found that while nearly all of the respondents were members of associations, and attended annual conventions, there were only a small minority who were professionally productive (a more likely indicator of professional integration). For example, only 5 percent of the responding faculty members (25 of 460) had presented as many as two papers during the
past three academic semesters, although nearly all had attended a
collection during that time. While some 43 percent of the respondents
had not produced any work of significance within the past five years,
among those who were professionally productive there were fewer
incidences of higher Alienation scores. Data also show a strong
inverse relationship between Alienation and both the lengths of
time teaching, and degree held, further indicating a lack of profes-
sional integration among professionally alienated faculty members.
Higher incidences of Alienation were also found in the less produc-
tive academic disciplines—namely, business and the biological and
physical sciences, and at the less prestigious institution. However,
age, sex, and rank were factors found to be of little significance.

The degree of alienation individual faculty members
experience from their academic subculture seems to be chiefly a
result of their relative degree of professional creativity and
productivity, apparently the most significant indicator of commitment
and involvement to the professional subculture.

In an effort to broaden the perspective of the college faculty
member in relation to his occupational role, two additional attitudinal
dimensions were measured—political liberalism and social tolerance
of deviant behavior. While political liberalism and social tolerance
were developed as two distinct attitudinal dimensions, there was a
relatively strong positive correlation between them—suggesting that
in some way both scales possibly may have been picking up the same
psychological attitude. Consequently, even though scale items were logically chosen and/or devised to measure traditionally accepted sociological concepts of political liberalism and social tolerance, it seemed sensible to regard them as two dimensions of a single "Tolerance-Liberalism" concept. Subsequently, both scales were used in testing related hypotheses.

Some of the strongest relationships in the study were found in this area. Specifically, tolerance-liberalism was highly correlated with community alienation. This was seen as a consequence of the relative lack of social integration among more alienated faculty members, giving rise to a corresponding absence of support of the values and norms of society. Here, higher liberalism and tolerance scores are also seen to reflect decreased commitment to conventional societal values and norms in those specific areas. The alienated faculty member, lacking a sense of belonging to the community, is more critical and less accepting of culturally prescribed social and political standards.

This was not the case, however, when tolerance-liberalism was correlated with the faculty member's relative alienation from his professional subculture. Degrees of tolerance-liberalism were generally independent of academically-related factors such as productivity, organizational involvement, and associated professional integration indexes. Tolerance-liberalism was positively related to professional alienation.

These findings were not seen to be a result of the lack of
faculty members' integration into their subcultural role only. It is more likely that faculty members at Wm & Mary who scored higher on social tolerance and political liberalism than those at Virginia Commonwealth University did so as a consequence of their being less integrated into the community at large. It would also follow that those in the humanities and social sciences scored especially high in tolerance-liberalism for reasons congruent with findings on their relatively high community alienation scores; namely, that the nature of subject matter in these academic disciplines would generate a greater criticism of social values and standards. Also consistent with earlier findings, older faculty members--presumably having more professional and economic security along with increased exposure and involvement in the community--were less likely to reject social and political standards, thereby scoring considerably lower on social tolerance and political liberalism. Again, sex seemed to have little effect on social tolerance and political liberalism scores, indicating the strength of the professional academic subcultural environment in compensating for the effects of traditional forms of differential socialization among the sexes.

Generally, then, among college faculty members, social tolerance and political liberalism were significantly more likely to occur among those who were less integrated into the community at large. The findings here also indicate that within the professional academic subculture, those college faculty members less integrated into their occupational role will experience higher alienation from
their professions. In conclusion, while this research does not provide a clear definition of the relationships between alienation, occupation, and social integration, it is hoped it has offered some insight into the nature of alienation among college faculty members.
Dear Colleague:

I am writing to request your assistance in completing a research project being conducted among college faculty members in Virginia. This research has been designed by Mitchell Kambis, under my direction, for his M.A. thesis in Sociology at William and Mary, and will provide data for comparison with faculty members at Virginia Commonwealth University.

It is expected that findings from this project will contribute to increased understanding of the complex interplay between academic and community life. Your participation is indispensable for the successful completion of this research, and I am hopeful you can attend to this matter at an early date.

Cordially yours,

Anthony L. Guenther
Assistant Professor
of Sociology
March 24, 1971

Dear Colleague:

The purpose of this letter is to request your assistance in completing a research project being conducted among college faculty members in Virginia. Specifically, two prominent state universities were selected to participate, one of which is Virginia Commonwealth University. The project is undertaken by Mitchell Kambis, at the College of William and Mary, in completing requirements for the M.A. Degree in Sociology.

It is hoped that this research will provide new insight, and contribute to a better understanding of the interrelationship between academic and community life. Your participation is indispensable for the successful completion of this project. I urge your cooperation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Lewis Diana
Chairman
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Dear Professor:

I am asking you to participate in a study of professors' activity in their profession and in the community and their attitudes toward them. Yours is one of two colleges selected for the research. This study is aimed at filling gaps in the academic literature concerning professional and organizational involvement of college teachers. I believe you will find the questionnaire easy to complete. It should take less than 30 minutes. This research is being conducted for an M.A. thesis in the Department of Sociology at the College of William and Mary.

The information you provide will be held in strictest confidence. Since no code numbers are employed, your identity will not be determined, and the data will be reported only in aggregate form. In order to insure objective analysis and interpretation, it is important that you answer all the questions as completely and as accurately as possible and that you return the questionnaire in the self-addressed stamped envelope. If you wish to elaborate on some of the multiple-choice questions, simply indicate the section and question number and note them in the margins or on the last page.

Every assistance on your part to mail back the completed questionnaire at your earliest convenience will be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your participation in this research.

Sincerely yours,

Mitchell P. Kambis
QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Sex:
   __ Male
   __ Female

2. Age at my last birthday was:
   __ 21-30
   __ 31-40
   __ 41-50
   __ 51-60
   __ 61-70
   __ 70+

3. Department:
   __ Social Sciences
   __ Humanities
   __ Fine Arts
   __ Education
   __ Physical Sciences
   __ Biological Sciences
   __ Business
   __ Engineering
   __ Other: __________________

4. Degree Held:
   __ Bachelors
   __ Masters
   __ All But Dissertation
   __ Doctorate
   __ Other: __________________

5. Rank:
   __ Instructor
   __ Assistant Professor
   __ Associate Professor
   __ Full Professor
   __ Other: __________________

6. How many years have you completed teaching full-time at the college or university level?
   __ This is my first year
   __ This is my 2nd - 5th year
   __ This is my 6th - 10th year
   __ This is my 11th - 15th year
   __ This is my 16th - 20th year
   __ More than 20 years

7. How many years have you completed teaching full-time at this institution?
   __ This is my first year
   __ This is my 2nd - 5th year
   __ This is my 6th - 10th year
   __ This is my 11th - 15th year
   __ This is my 16th - 20th year
   __ More than 20 years

8. Do you have tenure?
   __ Yes  __ No

PART II: ACADEMIC AND COMMUNITY LIFE

Please indicate your degree of agreement with the following statements from the following responses:

Strongly Agree (SA); Agree (A); Undecided (U); Disagree (D); Strongly Disagree (SD).

1. American colleges and universities are probably among the best in the world in terms of encouraging initiative, creativity, and independence of mind.
   __ SA  __ A  __ U  __ D  __ SD
2. I am usually exuberant and enthusiastic.  
   _____ SA  _____ A  _____ U  _____ D  _____ SD

3. Life to me seems completely routine.  
   _____ SA  _____ A  _____ U  _____ D  _____ SD

4. It is the responsibility of government to insure a good standard of living for all.  
   _____ SA  _____ A  _____ U  _____ D  _____ SD

5. In life, I have very clear goals and aims.  
   _____ SA  _____ A  _____ U  _____ D  _____ SD

6. My personal existence is very purposeful and meaningful.  
   _____ SA  _____ A  _____ U  _____ D  _____ SD

7. In American society, the "scholarly life" is among the most satisfying there is.  
   _____ SA  _____ A  _____ U  _____ D  _____ SD

8. Every day is constantly new and different.  
   _____ SA  _____ A  _____ U  _____ D  _____ SD

9. If I could choose, I would prefer never to have been born.  
   _____ SA  _____ A  _____ U  _____ D  _____ SD

10. Conventional rules and customs concerning sexual behavior in marriage are much too restrictive.  
    _____ SA  _____ A  _____ U  _____ D  _____ SD

11. After retiring, I would do some of the exciting things I have always wanted to.  
    _____ SA  _____ A  _____ U  _____ D  _____ SD

12. By the time students reach college, it is almost impossible, for a number of reasons, really to "educate" them in the broadest sense of the term.  
    _____ SA  _____ A  _____ U  _____ D  _____ SD

13. In achieving life goals I have made no progress whatever.  
    _____ SA  _____ A  _____ U  _____ D  _____ SD

14. The traditional capitalistic system provides for the best possible distribution of wealth.  
    _____ SA  _____ A  _____ U  _____ D  _____ SD

15. My life is running over with exciting good things.  
    _____ SA  _____ A  _____ U  _____ D  _____ SD
16. If I should die today, I would feel that my life has been very worthwhile.

___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD

17. Americans place far too much faith in higher education as a means of improving society.

___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD

18. In thinking of my life, I often wonder why I exist.

___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD

19. In general, full economic security is harmful; most men wouldn't work if they didn't need the money for eating and living.

___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD

20. As I view the world in relation to my life, the world completely confuses me.

___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD

21. I would approve of the private use of marijuana and other mild hallucinogenic drugs.

___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD

22. I am a very irresponsible person.

___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD

23. Concerning man's freedom to make his own choices, I believe man is completely bound by the limitations of heredity and environment.

___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD

24. Student activist groups should become stronger and have more influence.

___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD

25. With regard to death, I am prepared and unafraid.

___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD

26. With regard to suicide, I have thought of it seriously as a way out.

___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD

27. Nowadays, it is almost impossible for academic people to avoid becoming "alienated" from the academic world.

___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD

28. I regard my ability to find a meaning, purpose, or mission in life as very great.

___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD
29. My life is in my hands and I am in control of it.  
   ___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD

30. I would disapprove of people attending formal public events dressed in an unkempt manner.  
   ___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD

31. Facing my daily tasks is a painful and boring experience.  
   ___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD

32. I have discovered clear-cut goals and a satisfying life purpose.  
   ___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD

33. The principles of "freedom" and "equality" are closer now than in the past to being realized in American society.  
   ___ SA ___ A ___ U ___ D ___ SD

PART III: OCCUPATIONAL AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

1. How many professional organizations are you a member of (such as the American Historical Association)? _________

2. Do you hold any offices or belong to any committees in any of these associations?  
   ___ Yes  
   ___ No

3. How many times during the past academic year did you attend conventions of professional associations? _________

4. How many papers did you present at the conventions during the past three semesters (1969-70; and Fall, 1970-71)?  
   ___ None  
   ___ 1 or 2  
   ___ 3 or more

5. How many of the following have you published in the last five years? (In each of the spaces below write in the appropriate number. If "none" write "0." Include co-authorship or co-editorship.)  
   ___ Books  
   ___ Articles in professional journals (Do not include newspaper articles, instructional material published only for your classes, book reviews, and short notes of less than one page.)  
   ___ Editorship of professional journal  
   ___ Art pieces, patents, and other creative works of a major nature, especially if exhibited or sold for large sums.
6. How important is each of the following in your current position with the college or university? (Check once in each row.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS RELATED TO UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>VERY IMPORTANT</th>
<th>IMPORTANT</th>
<th>IMPORTANT</th>
<th>SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congeniality of colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency of colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of school among those in field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research facilities and opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How many of each of the following types of organizations are you a member?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME OF ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>OFFICE HELD (IF ANY)</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE (PER MONTH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic organizations (service and charity, such as the P.T.A., Rotary Club, Lions Club, Jaycees, Kiwanis, Community Chest.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotic organizations (such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternal and social organizations (such as the Elks, Masons, the Country Club.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational organizations (sports, special interests, hobbies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reform organizations
(civil rights, conservation, peace.)

Cultural organizations

Religious organizations

8. Have you given money or done other things to help in campaigns for local political office in your community within the past year?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

9. With whom do you spend most of your leisure time: (a) with people mainly from your department, (b) from another department, (c) from the faculty generally, (d) or from the community?
   ___ Mainly from my own department
   ___ Mainly from another department (please specify): ____________
   ___ From the faculty generally
   ___ From the community

10. On the average, how often do you get together with relatives—that is your kin, other than those living with you? (Check the nearest time interval.)
    ___ More than once a week
    ___ Once a week
    ___ Few times a month
    ___ Once a month
    ___ Few times a year
    ___ Never

PART IV: SOME HYPOTHETICAL SITUATIONS

The following instances involve specific activities which one might encounter in American society. However, many people would differ as to their reactions to these situations. Please check the response nearest to your own opinion.

1. John Leonard, a graduate student, was arrested for possession of marijuana. Although, at his trial, the judge agreed John was not a "pusher", he sentenced him to six months in jail. Regarding this outcome, what is your opinion?
   ___ Strongly Approve
   ___ Approve
2. A colleague and friend of yours who has been in the teaching profession for a number of years (since the beginning of his professional career) recently expressed reservations about his choice of occupations. Specifically, he mentioned that the educational system in America was now organized in such a way as to preclude the attainment of its values and goals. Then, just yesterday, he told you that he was quitting the academic profession, and accepting a position in the business world. Regarding this outcome, what is your opinion?

___ Strongly Approve
___ Approve
___ Undecided
___ Disapprove
___ Strongly Disapprove

3. The President of the United States came to speak at the convocation of your college or university. In cancelling classes for that day, the administration made it clear that student attendance was mandatory. However, a number of students organized and attended a separate rally at that time. They also featured a radical speaker who advocated reforming the government even if it meant revolution. On the following day, they were suspended from school. Regarding this outcome, what is your opinion?

___ Strongly Approve
___ Approve
___ Indifferent
___ Disapprove
___ Strongly Disapprove

4. Richard Smith, a long-time friend and neighbor, had become more and more detached from social and community life within the past year. In a discussion with him, you found he felt that living in American society had become extremely frustrating, and that he only found meaning in his work. Then, just yesterday, he told you that he had had enough; he was moving himself and his family to another country in an attempt to regain purpose and meaning in life. Regarding this outcome, what is your opinion?

___ Strongly Approve
___ Approve
___ Indifferent
___ Disapprove
___ Strongly Disapprove

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
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