Two Faces of Alienation: A Study of the Iranian Students' Activism and Passivity in American Universities

Alireza Mohseni-Tabrizi
Western Michigan University

Recommended Citation

TWO FACES OF ALIENATION: A STUDY OF THE IRANIAN STUDENTS'
ACTIVISM AND PASSIVITY IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

by

Alireza Mohseni-Tabrizi

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Sociology

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
April 1984

TWO FACES OF ALIENATION: A STUDY OF THE IRANIAN STUDENTS'
ACTIVISM AND PASSIVITY IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

Alireza Mohseni-Tabrizi, Ph.D.

Western Michigan University, 1984

The relationship between Iranian students' alienation from the Iranian politics and society and their social and political activism is examined at the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, and Western Michigan University. The major goals of the study are to determine if there is a significant difference in the alienation levels of students who are politically and socially active and those who are not prone to participate in social and political activities, and to compare and contrast activists and non-activists by testing several propositions about characteristics of alienated students. The analysis of the data shows strong support for all six hypotheses on which this study is based. The findings reveal a significant relationship between alienation and activism. Although activism and alienation appear to be significantly related, the student activists tend to differ markedly from non-activists in certain respects. Activists hold higher Socio Economic Status (SES), have higher degree of media connectedness, have higher organization membership, possess a coherent political ideology of radical reform, and seek more vocational and non-academic fields of study as their basic value committments than do the non-activists.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

Mohseni-Tabrizi, Alireza

TWO FACES OF ALIENATION: A STUDY OF THE IRANIAN STUDENTS'
ACTIVISM AND PASSIVITY IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

Western Michigan University   PH.D. 1984

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark __✓__ .

1.   Glossy photographs or pages _____

2.   Colored illustrations, paper or print _____

3.   Photographs with dark background _____

4.   Illustrations are poor copy _____

5.   Pages with black marks, not original copy _____

6.   Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____

7.   Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages __✓__

8.   Print exceeds margin requirements _____

9.   Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____

10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____

11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.

12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.

13. Two pages numbered _____ . Text follows.

14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____

15. Other_____

University
Microfilms
International

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is my pleasant duty to express my gratitude and appreciation to all those who assisted me in the preparation of this dissertation. I am very grateful to my advisor and doctoral committee chairman, Professor James C. Petersen, who generously gave time and effort to read every chapter as I completed it. He took the great trouble of reading the manuscript with meticulous care, correcting many mistakes and making many improvements for which I am most grateful.

Once more I am greatly indebted to my committee members, Professor David M. Lewis and Professor Edsel L. Erickson for reading the manuscript with their usual thoroughness and for their scholarly advice and invaluable suggestions. Their sympathetic criticism and many useful suggestions were of significant help to me in writing the final draft of this manuscript.

I am indebted also to every individual Iranian student who cooperated in filling out the questionnaire and returning it to me for compilation.

My thanks are also due to my father whose continual support throughout the completion of this manuscript served as a constant inspiration and to my mother for her prayerful support on my behalf.

Finally, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my

ii

wife, Ladan and to my son, Nima, for their understanding and tolerance of my idiosyncrasies during a period when I was working under great pressure to write this manuscript.

<div align="center">Alireza Mohseni-Tabrizi</div>

<div align="center">iii</div>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

iv

v

LIST OF TABLES

vi

ix

CHAPTER 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Using alienation as a theoretical perspective for sociological research is by no means a new idea. For at least 150 years writers have recognized the relationship between estrangement and revolution (Marx, 1959), and that between anomie and suicide (Durkheim, 1951). The concept of alienation not only has become a dominant theme in both the contemporary literature and the history of sociological thought, but has been used extensively to characterize certain types of reaction to social stresses and strains. It has been used to condemn the dissenter who refuses to support the values and structures of society in which he/she lives, and conformist, who over-conforms and follows exactly the socially prescribed behavioral norms but whose actions bring no personal meaning of fulfillment.

It has become a platform slogan with politicians, an empirical question with academians, and an area of great concern for the public. In everyday discourse it is said that children are alienated from parents, youth from society and the people from government. Ecologists tell us that man is alienated from nature and our theologians and

1

philosophers warn us that we are alienated from our spiritual-essence. Josephson and Josephson (1962) call it a central problem of our time; Ignace Feurlicht (1978) proclaims: "We are said to live in an age of alienation"; Erick Kahler (1957, p. 12) writes: "the history of man could very well be written as a history of the alienation of man"; and Kenneth Keniston (1965, p. 451) reminds us:

> The history of nations is in part a history of wandering, exile, outcastness, and the search for a homeland. Revolutionaries from Christ to Castro have been separated from their homes by emigration, exile, and ostracism, and have returned from their alienation in the desert or the mountains only when they could bring new doctrines by persuasion and force.

A great deal of contemporary research in alienation has centered around such important questions as: what do we mean by alienation? In what forms does alienation appear in our lives? Has alienation been a continuing human problem, or is it something new in our society today? What does alienation "feel like"? Who is alienated in our society today? How does alienation affect the way in which people live? What are the causes of alienation in our society? Is alienation a learned phenomenon? Is alienation imposed or self-chose? How can we learn to cope with the alienating pressures in our own lives? Can the idea of alienation help us to understand more profoundly the nature of our social world? Does it contribute to greater awareness of the crucial problems with which man is faced?

Although the answers to these questions are many, varied, and in some cases, conflicting, the history of alienation in large part has become the history of man's attempt to find proper answers to these basic questions.

The usage and application of the term in the vast literature on the subject varies substantially, ranging from study of conflicts and misery in personal life to the analysis of the world-wide student unrest and youth rebellion, dictatorship of proletariat and the rise of facism and nazism. The term has been applied to those who deliberately reject society and its institutions (Keniston, 1965) and those who are rejected by society (Marx, 1964). Some have used it to refer primarily to undesirable social and moral conditions (Durkheim, 1951; Merton, 1957). Others have characterized it in terms of personal disintegration or identity diffusion (Erickson, 1959; Feuer, 1969; Fromm 1955, 1965). Finally, a few stress that individual alienation may be caused as a result of an individual's inability to cope with contemporary social and cultural demands and his earnest desire to invest his released energies to bring about the necessary social and cultural reconstruction (Becker, 1967; Flacks, 1967; Keniston, 1968).

Among alienation theorists, however, there is a general agreement that whatever else alienation might be, it expresses itself as a style of life, a special attitude brought to ordinary activities, a special relationship to

the crucial events of one's life. Whatever the alienated do, they do in an alienated way; and by examining their style we may come to understand what alienation involves.

With this in mind, the general goal of the present study can be seen as two-fold: first, to determine if there is a significant difference in the alienation levels of the Iranian students in the U.S. who are politically and socially active and those who are not prone to participate in political and social activities. A second goal is to compare and contrast activists and nonactivists by testing several propositions about characteristics of alienated students in order to depict whether there are meaningful differences or similarities between family socioeconomic status, political ideology of radical reform, and basic value commitments, organizational membership, and media exposure of active and passive students.

Social Significance of the Problem

Although the concept of alienation has become a dominant theme in both the contemporary literature and the history of sociological thought, there has been much debate over the merits and dangers of alienation itself. Many scholars have put it simply, is alienation good or bad? To some the answer would be bad. Writers like Durkheim, and anomie theorists, Roszak (1969), Kaufmann (1973), Levi (1967), Domenach (1965), and Piere Naville (1962) see man as potentially evil and it is only societal constraints which can make him good. Thus alienated individuals including psychotics, revolutionaries, apathetics, and ideologically alienated are misfits, rejects, and malcontents and their presence is to be deplored: they are wrong and society is right; they need punishment or perhaps treatment. By contrast, for Marx and Marxist theories of alienation, Daniel Bell (1960), Schorer (1965), Mills (1951), Fromm (1960), Marcuse (1964), Kahler (1961), Keniston (1960), Djilas (1970), Etzioni (1968), Lefebure (1966), and Feuerlicht (1978) alienation is good, necessary, and normal. These theorists make the assumption that man is naturally good, but corrupted by society. In this regard, Keniston (1960, p. 413) writes:

It can not simply be said that society is right and the alienated wrong; alienation may point more to a society that needs "treatment" than to an individual in need of therapy.

These scholars far from calling it a sickness or a misfortune or a fad or a phony, find it normal, necessary, innovative and creative, productive, and healthy. Hofstadter (1965, p. 112) thinks that "there is something valuable in alienation"; Nisbet (1970) and Schorer (1965) declare that a good deal of creative energy is generated by alienation; Daniel Bell (1960), Schwartz (1967), and Rosenfeld (1967) stressed that alienation plays a positive role; Keniston (1965, p. 416), notes that from the alienation of the gifted "can spring poetry, painting, art, and the highest achievements of culture". According to C. Wright Mills (1958, p.159) the alienation of the intellectuals gives them "the capacity to formulate radical views and higher standards". Nisbet (1962, p. viii) calls it "a key concept in . . . the social sciences." Etzioni (1968, p. 618) notes that alienation is "a concept of the critical intellectual and the social scientist". Arnold Hauser (1965, p. 94) finds that "nothing better expresses the nature and origin of the culture crisis of our time than the concept of alienation". Alain Touraine (1971, p. 7) even states that "alienation, that much criticized notion, is now more useful than ever".

Feuerlicht (1978), too, points at the constructive contribution and positive role of the alienation:

> Man must alienate himself from many persons and things. He must give up, forget, suppress feelings in order to grow, to have more important relationships, more valuable experiences. One often must become estranged from one's family in order to found a new one; one becomes a stranger to some friends in order to make new ones, one leaves a political party, even a country, or gives up an ideal in order to find new and perhaps more satisfying ties. I alienate myself means I am a human being (pp. 8-9).

The present study is a scientific inquiry into a group of Iranian students, the state of their alienation (if any), the forms of manifestation of alienation, and of the differences (if any) in the alienation levels of those who are politically and socially active and those who are not prone to participate in political and social activities.

The significance of this study relies on the following facts: First alienation is chiefly important because it points to its own causes, directs us to what is intolerable, frustrating, and maligned in student life and social process, and suggests what needs to be done. Second, although student alienation and activism have received considerable attention from scholars in the West and Anglo-American societies, only a few studies have investigated the problem in developing and underdeveloped areas. Despite the vast literature on the subject in the West and America, the patterns of student alienation and activism in the third world societies are relatively unknown. This study, therefore, enables us to examine the problem in developing areas by depicting whether there are

significant and meaningful differences or similarities between patterns of student alienation and activism in developed and developing societies. Third, several features shared by present scales of student alienation and activism raise questions about their measurement value in comparative empirical research:

1) All have been developed and tested primarily in the Western and American societies, and we lack information on whether they provide meaningful measurement in developing and underdeveloped societies.

2) The resulting item differences raise the question of whether the scales are truly equivalent. To what extent do scales of alienation and activism measure a common construct rather than different ones for each scale?

3) There is little evidence that the scales of alienation and activism are reasonably valid and reliable. To evaluate the meaningfulness and utility of alienation scales, the present study helps us to test them in a different context and thereby develop reasonable equivalent, valid and reliable scales of student alienation and activism.

4) The study of the alienated may also sharpen our eyes to some of the major pressures on Iranian youth; having seen these pressures dramatically illustrated and reacted to by the alienated, we may be better able to discern the less extreme ways in which similar pressures shape the lives of

the less alienated youths. What we really argue is that the major themes in the lives of these alienated youths are but extreme reaction to pressures that affect all young Iranians, and that the alienated are responding not only to the idiosyncrasies of their individual pasts, but to dilemmas of upbringing, to social stresses, and to historical losses that affect their entire generation.

5) If one accepts that a fundamental objective of the social sciences is to test plausible theories against the natural world, this study can be regarded as an attempt to do so.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND CONCEPTUAL CONCERNS

Historical Review

Alienation theorists are divided on the history of alienation. Some (e.g., Murchland, 1971; Sykes, 1964; Adorno, 1969; Touraine, 1971; Glazer, 1947; Etzioni, 1968; Lukacs, 1971; Domenach, 1965; Mills, 1957) have identified alienation as either a postindustrial or modern phenomenon. While others (e.g., Feuer, 1962; Lichtheim, 1968; Fromm, 1968; Meszaros, 1970; Neumann, 1966; Kaufmann, 1973; Thoreau, 1962; Weissopf, 1971; Hauser, 1965; Hoffer, 1971; Kahler, 1961; Josephson, 1962; Pappenheim, 1959; Marcuse, 1960; Nisbet, 1970; Feuerlicht, 1978; Johnson, 1973; Urick, 1970) have viewed alienation not as a new term or modern innovation, but rather as an antique phenomenon as old as man or almost as old.

The former group of writers use the word to express estrangement from society, isolation, and powerlessness, often take it to denote a modern phenomenon. For example, A. Touraine (1971, p. 61) states that "we are entering a post-industrial society of alienation"; A. Etzioni (1968, p. 618)

10

declares that "the industrial society is the archetype of an alienating society"; G. Lukacs (1971, p. 84) calls it "a crucial problem of the age in which we live"; J. Domenach (1965, p. 1058) thinks that alienation is a "recent sickness which was unknown before the nineteenth century"; and C. Wright Mills (1957, p. 171) speaks of alienation as a "major theme of the human condition in the contemporary epoch."

The later group of writers, however, view it not as a distinctly modern phenomenon. It has a lineage which can be traced to the beginning of recorded history. It runs through a large body of historical, philosophical, religious, mythological, and literary expressions stretching back almost to the beginning of the written word.

Each of these assertions, however seems to be true. Alienation not only is a visible, dramatical, and crucial problem of the modern age, it is also as old as one can think, indeed, as old as man can think. Whenever man feels (felt) how small and powerless he is in the world, how insensitive nature is to his fate, there is (was) alienation. Whenever man realizes (realized) or feels (felt) that truth is unattainable to the human mind, there is (was) alienation.

The concept of alienation is a dominant theme in both the contemporary literature and the history of philosophical, religious, sociological and psychological thoughts.

Sociologists have been concerned with the relationship between invididual and society and have devoted their time and effort to analyze people with detached and hostile orientations toward society. For theologians, alienation from God is the most important and basic; for the philosophers, world alienation; for the sociologists and social critics, social or political or work alienation, and for the psychologists, self alienation.

Alienation from the Standpoint of Historical, Philosophical, Religious, and Mythological Expressions

The concept alienation has a lineage which can be traced to the beginning of recorded history. It is a dominant theme in both the Greek literature and the Old Testament. In tracing some of these origins to their pre-Christian sources, Bell (1966) wrote:

> The Greek idea of ekstasis (in Latin superstitio), the leaving of one's body in the mystery rites, or ecstacy, was regarded by the Romans as mental alienation (abaliention mentis) and is socially reprehensible (p. 699).

According to Schaar (1961) the notion of alienation is as old as literary history:

> Homer had written of the tribeless, lawless, heartless one, the one outside the fellowship, doomed to work his way through the desolate regions beyond the friendly fire of clan and kin. The motif of the eternal wanderer begins in the dawn of the Jewish tradition and weaves in and out of the whole subsequent history of Western religion. Abram is the prototype and universal symbol of alienated man. Separated from his family, his nation, and his national religion, he

wanders, without a home, in soil, society or faith. He is the nomad, unable to love and belong. Unable to love, he subjects himself to a trascendent power and substitutes law for communion, subordination for love. Estranged from himself, Abram projects all that is good in him onto a strange absolute being, which is no longer his absolute being. In return for this, he gains a new identity, which is symbolized by the change of his name to Abraham (p. 174).

To the early Christians, alienation meant the separation of man from God. As Bible views, man was thrown out of heaven for which and in which he was created. Thus, because of his fall and separation from God, man remains a stranger on Earth. This type of world alienation can also be found in Hinduism, Buddhism, Judiasm, Sufism, and Islam.

The Old Testament is replete with stories of alienation, from the separation of Adam and Eve from God as it is described in Genesis, through the wanderings of the Israelites, to the stories of the prophets in the latter books of the Old Testament. According to Fromm (1968), alienation can be traced back to the prophets of the Old Testament and their discussion of "idolatry". The "idolatruous man bows down to the work of his own hands. The idol represents his own life-forces in an alienated form" (p. 122).

The religious connotation of the term was very pronounced during the Middle Ages and was also popular with the writers of the reformation. "In the Middle Ages it implied a definite degree of mystical ecstacy in man's

communion with God. Later the Protestants understood the term to represent a spiritual death, or estrangement of man's spirit from God by virtue of his original sin" (Kon, 1969, p. 146).

Lichtheim (1968: 264) has argued that the concept alienation can also be traced back to Plotinus (204-70 A.D.), the founder of Neoplatonism and the last of the great ancient philosophers. Plotinus visualized alienation as being the absence of knowledge (Encyclopedia Britannica, 1958, pp. 58-60). Plotinus saw life (self-realization) as the product of the intellect. He further visualized two realms in nature: the unknowable and the knowable. The unknowable was converted to the knowable through the subjective application of the intellect. Failure to develop the intellect meant that one lived in a materially dominated world, devoid of meaning (alienated). One could live in an essentially nonmaterial environment if governed by the intellect. Exactly where one lived depended upon one's measure of rigorous moral and intellectual self-realization. By a generous measure of both one could awake from the alienated, or materially dominated life and discover oneself. Platinus' scheme was the basis of a theology wherein the intellect enabled man to attain the highest level of life, or "the Good".

Perhaps the most notable usage of the term alienation among classic philosophers prior to Hegel was that associated with Social Contract Theory. Those individuals

most frequently identified with this theory are Thomas
Hobbes, John Locke, and Jean Jacques Rousseau. A number of
authors (Fromm, 1968, p. 133; Lichtheim, 1961, pp. 43-4;
Meszaros, 1970, p. 106) argue Rousseau, Hobbes, and Locke
employed the concept prior to Hegel in relation to man's
being separated from nature.

Of all men, Rousseau exerted the greatest influence in
developing the concept of modern alienation. Contrary to the
Enlightenment's rationalism and optimistic belief in
progess, he pointed to the innate goodness and happiness of
natural man and to the corrupting influence of private
property, society, and civilization. He also opposed the
civilized man's conformism, his other-directedness in
contrast with the autonomy of natural man.

The Social Contract Theory of Hobbes, Locke and
Rousseau centered around the need for a strong political
authority based on self interest and rational consent. They
demonstrated the value of political authority by comparing
it to the hypothetical state of nature where political
authority was absent and disorder prevailed. By describing
things in this manner they hoped to illustrate the
advantages of political authority and to prove the rationale
for voluntarily entering into contract.

While the conclusions drawn by each of these men
differed considerably, their method was the same. Man must
renounce his right to act at will; he must surrender or
otherwise give up his rights to the sovereign and enter into

agreement with the commonwealth. In the case of all three men, however, this contract creates a condition akin to, if not actually, alienation. Even though the contract is to be entered into voluntarily and considered beneficial to society, the end result is the same, restriction of one's freedom of action – even a sacrifice of self. The social contract alienates one from his natural rights in favor of the community. [1]

Although Rousseau, Hobbes, and Locke employed the concept prior to Hegel in relation to man's being separated from nature, Hegel is recognized as the first person to make an extended philosophical elaboration on the term. He treated alienation in a systematic manner although his thoughts were highly abstract.

For Hegel the history of man was at the same time the history of man's alienation (Entfremdung). Assuming an idealistic position, Hegel posits an absolute mind or spirit which man does not know and from which he is therefore alienated. Through its creations the mind transfers parts of

---

1. Original presentation of the ideas discussed above can be found in the following works:
Leviathan or the Matter, Forme and Power of a Commonwealth Ecclasaticall and Civil by T. Hobbes. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1946.
The Second Treatise of Government by J. Locke, edited with an introducion by T. Peardon. The Liberal Arts Press, New York, 1952.
The Social Contract and Discourses by J. J. Rousseau, Translated with an introduction by G. D. H. Cole. E. P. Lutton and Company, Inc., New York, 1950.

itself to the outside world but considers these eternali-
zations to be alien to itself. "What the mind really strives
for", he wrote in The Philosophy of History, "is the reali-
zation of its own notion; but in doing so it hides that goal
from its own vision" (Fromm, 1969, p..47). In the words of
Igor Kon, "Hegel employs the term to denote the alienation
of consciousness from the individual, the subject viewing
himself as the object, so that the entire objective world is
nothing but the alienated spirit" (Kon, 1969, pp. 146-7).
According to Hegel, the final goal of consciousness is to
arrive at this recognition: in Hegel's language, "conscious-
ness thus returns to itself. The famous negation of nega-
tion" ~ The negation of the existance of the objects that
negate consciousness - recognizes that the objects are
merely alienated, reified consciousness" (Marx, 1969, p.
97).

Man's continual search for the absolute constitutes an
unending process of de-alienation. According to Richard
Lawrence Schacht (1967, pp. 82-88), Hegel's use of
alienation is dependent upon two factors: the nature of man,
and the nature of social substance. The social substance
consists of realm in which man lives and thinks (state,
culture, society, community). Hegel sees these as
"spiritual" and thus considers man's world essentially a
"spiritual world". Hegel also views man as a spiritual
entity, having both particular and universal qualities. The

universal quality is most important for it can exist only when man has achieved a unity of the social substance. Herein lies man's essential nature.

Hegel's notion of alienation then can only be understood in relation to his idealist philosophy. In denying the autonomous existence of external objects, alienation is concluded to be a fact of the mind: a separation of the mind from its essence into an "alienated spirit". The spirit then experiences his own creations and manifestations as alien, and finally conquers his self-alienation through knowledge (education, culture), thus achieving his true reality and unity.

In addition to Rousseau, Hobbes, Locke and Hegel, other prominant philosophers of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries ranging from materialists to positivists, rationalists to emotionalists, idealists to naturalists, romanticists to neoromanticists, and humanists to expressionists made an extended philosophical elaboration on the term.

Kant's rationalism that man must think in certain categories and cannot recognize the true nature of things, the things themselves, implied that man is stranger in the universe.

The materialist Ludwig Feuerbach, a "left Hegelian", although accepting Hegel's notion of man's being alienated from himself, renounced Hegel's idealist contention that

nature is a self-alienated form of the Absolute Mind.

Feuerbach applied Hegel's idea to religion by including God among the alienation of man. God, who had worshipped as the creator of the outside world, had to be seen as a product of man's creativity, just as were the State and civilization. Man creates God by projecting his own intellectual and emotional qualities into an external object. He objectifies or divides himself but does not recognize the object, the other being, as his own being. He should recognize that he is actually worshipping himself. In other words, God is merely self-alienated man (Kon, 1969, p. 147; Lichtheim, 1961, p. 15).

Two other members of the Hegelian left, Moses Hess and Karl Marx, applied the concept of alienation to economic and social life. In his essays on the "Philosophy of Action" (1843) and the "Essence of Money" (1844), Moses Hess, a distinguished member of the Hegelian left, pointed at man's alienation from his true being and from society and particularly, at money as representing alienated human potential, as being the product of mutually alienated man.

Marx's theory of alienation was a synthesis of views held by the romantics, Fichte, Hegel, Feuerbach, and Hess and was based on the idea of man's universality, cherished since the Renaissance and revitalized by Goethe's and Schiller's Rumanism.

As opposed to Hegel and Feuerbach, Marx gave alienation a broader meaning. He was primarily interested in the etiology of alienation and believed that alienation is caused by the social and cultural structures. In his Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts, Marx argues that because of private property and the division of labor, man does not see and enjoy his own product as the result of his potential. This alienation from his work dehumanizes him and alienates him from himself, from nature, and from his fellow man. These alienations can be conquered not by love, as young Hegel declared, or by knowledge, as the author of the Phenomenology and Feurebach demonstrated, but only another economic and political system which suppresses private property and specialization: Communism (Marx, 1953, p. 127).

Thus, the revolution of the proletariat can not occur according to Marx, without the worker being alienated from hiself, his work, and his society.

Like Marx, Alexis de Tocqueville in his book on Democracy in America, which appeared in 1835, a few years before Marx's early manuscripts, states that the worker loses as a human being as he improves as a worker. According to Tocqueville (1962, p.168) the division of labor is responsible for the self-alienation and degradation of the worker.

Unlike a number of his colleagues, Tocqueville accepted

the advent of secularism and democracy, but visualized that the very system which holds greatest promise for the individual has the exact opposite affect. Cast amid a mass of equals the individual loses his sense of potency and worth. A kind of emptiness and resignation prevails. Independence of thought and opinion are dwarfed by the weight of the collective. A general deterioration in the quality of interpersonal life presses man into a state of moral and intellectual starvation.

Policital power constitutes the most serious threat to individualism. "For Tocqueville policital power is simultaneously a cause of alienation, through its invasion of the communities of membership which form society, and refuge from alienation: that is, political power in a democracy becomes increasingly a fortress of escape from the ills and frustrations of civil society" (Nisbet, 1966, p. 133).

Like Marx and Tocqueville, Adam Smith (1960, pp. 302-303) voiced the warning that the division of labor could degrade the workingman.

> The man whose life is spent in performing a few
> simple operations has no occasion to exert his
> understanding and generally becomes as stupid and
> ignorant as it is possible for a human creaturb to
> become.

Like Marx, Smith identified three types of alienation: self-alienation, isolation, and powerlessness.

In the late nineteenth century, Friedrich Nietzsche a distinguished philosopher and a moking critic of ration-

alism, progress, democracy, and bourgeois existance aroused and strengthened estrangement from society and its prevailing values and goals.

Schopenhauer, a philosopher of the early nineteenth century and Nietzsche's predecessor also strengthened estrangement from society and prevailing values. He was a pessimistic critic of any existance and, incidentally, had been alienated from pracitally everybody in his personal life.

Existentialist philosophers are also concerned with the concept of alienation. Fritz Pappenheim (1959, p. 121) argued that "the core of existentialist philosophy expresses man's alienation". Sartre (1974) stressed the revolutionary significance of alienation and asserted that "the conciousness of the intolerable character of the capitalist system must be sought, above all else, in the consciousness of alienation" (p. 125). To Sartre alienation meant becoming thing-like through self-denial of freedom by assuming a permanent self. Other existantialist philosophers stressed different aspects of alienation. For example, Heidegger (1949) emphasized world alienation, inauthenticity and impersonality, and Jaspers (1956) stressed anguish and isolation. And Tillich (1962, p. 66) argued that "man's existance has the character of estrangement. Man is estranged from the ground of his being (his essential being), from other beings, and from himself. The result is objectivization,

loneliness, anxiety, submergence in the collective, dehuman-
ization, and the experience of meaninglessness."

     Use of the Concept in Art, Fiction, and Literature

     The search for identity has been a major theme of many
fiction writers of the twentieth century. According to
Norman Mailer (1959, p. 188) "the American literature of the
preceeding eighty years was a literature of alienation."
Keniston (1965, p. 412) thought that "our best writers are
alienated men writing about alienated heroes." Both Gerd
Geiser   (1967)   and   Domenach   (1965)   have   made   similar
assertion on German and French literature.
     Alienation has been a major theme in the writings of
Eliot, Ibsen, Sartre, Camus, Hesse, Kaffka, Arthure, Miller,
Hemingway,   and   of   course   Destoevsky   whose   works   were
inspiring in the discussion of alienation in the twentieth
century and in the words of Albert William Levi (1959, p.
203)   "all   of   his   problematic   heroes   are   creatures   of
alienation."
     Kafka   (1967)   reminded   us   of   the   isolation   and
powerlessness of man, the monstrosity of bureaucracy and the
meaninglessness of life.

"Stranger" of Camus (1942), which is the most vivid symbol of social alienation inspired a generation which felt alienated from almost anything past, present, and future. Camus saw only rebellion can expand human consciousness; with rebellion, awareness is born. Awareness of being human. "Camus' portrait of the rebel presents a normative ideal in persuasive terms: to become fully human, a constant tendency to be revolted by and to rebel against oppression and injustice is required" (Bay, 1967, p. 89). Albert Camus (1951) explanation of alienation is very similar to that of Durkheim's "collective plague" (p. 36).

Romantic poets "considered themselves alienated, isolated from society and therefore alienated and isolated their heroes" (Thorslev, Jr. 1962, p. 18). Examples of heroes and heroines alienated from their society can be found in the works of Chateaubriand, Lamartine, and the novels of Hugo (Jones, 1962, p. 9).

Goethe, a prominent representative of German humanism calls himself wanderer, and the Werther who is a representative of Goethe himself expresses feeling of restlessness and alienation from society. He thinks that all men are wanderers, pilgrims on earth and were haunted by fears of suffering a loss of self. "When we are missing ourselves, we are missing everything" (1951, p. 53).

Of course, there are many more fiction writers, poets, and artists who can be mentioned as depicting or lamenating

alienation. Indeed, the totality of classic as well as modern art, literature, fiction, etc. is engulfed by alienation. This points to the fact that in every act of creation, in every sort of spiritual and intellectual creation, an element of estrangement is involved.

Systematic Classification, Categorization and Formulation of the Theories of Alienation

As far as the theory formulation and orientation are concerned, theories and research in the field of alienation fall roughly into three categories: (1) value-oriented formulations which attempt to change the social structure of cultural structure; (2) non-value-oriented formulations which attempt to determine the parameters of alienation without regard to the effect of their work upon the social or cultural structure; and (3) compilatory and encyclopedic formulations which attempt to reorganize the theories of other men.

The first category includes the modern social critics (Goodman, 1960; Erikson, 1962; Tillich, 1958; May, 1953; Shils, 1972; Riesman, 1950; and Henry, 1963), the old revolutionaries (Marx and Engles), and the revolutionaries' modern counter-parts (Fromm, Freidenberg). All feel that the society is to blame for the ills of its members. The second category includes those theorists, such as Durkheim (1951) and Merton (1959) who attempt to eliminate most of the

value-orientations from their formulations. They attempt to gather only the social facts, and report results, regardless of the social or cultural effects of their report. Merton (1959), though included here, is also a compiler; his specific modes of adaption were traced back to Durkheim (1951) and Marx (1959).

The third group, the compilers, rather than adding anything new, attempt to systematize the works of other authors. Some of them do a great service by indicating areas of specific interest and pointing out hypotheses for further research. Others do little but restate the position of the original authors in new, and not always better terms (Keniston, 1965; Isreal, 1971; Johnson, 1973; Beasag, 1966; Feuer, 1962; Kon, 1967; Seeman, 1959; Nisbet, 1966; Applebaum, 1970).

As far as the discipline of study and area of concentration are concerned, theories of alienation are considered from two major schools of thought – sociological/ social system perspective (August Comte, 1975; Karl Marx, 1959; Max Weber, 1946; F. Tonnies, 1957; Emile Durkheim, 1951; George Simmel, 1965; Karl Mannheim, 1936; Robert Merton, 1959; and C. Wright Mills, 1959) and psychological/ social psychological perpective (Sigmund Freud, 1961; Erich Fromm, 1955; Erik Erikson, 1962; Lewis Feuer, 1963; Paul Goodman, 1960; E. Friedenberg, 1959; David Riesman, 1950; K. Keniston, 1965; R. Flacks, 1967; Philip Slater, 1970; Ronald Corwin, 1976; and Melvin Seeman, 1959).

Sociological and Social System Perspective

The sociological point of view sees alienation as a social problem; a reaction to the stresses, inconsistencies and injustices of the social system. The alienated man is said to be the victim of his society; his alienation is imposed upon him by an unjust social order. Under this tradition, the role of individual personality and personal pathology is largely ignored.

Lengthy discussion could easily be generated from the writings of the pioneering sociologists as well as leading contemporary social theorists relating to the notion of alienation. Our objective here, however, is to present those contributions which more clearly bear on the problem under investigation. This requires that we advance our discussion to that point of interest wherein alienation becomes differentiated from its abstract metaphysical origins. Here some individuals have made seminal contributions. These individuals are:

August Comte

Like many of the philosophers of his period, August Comte was profoundly moved by social destruction generating from the French Revolution. The very fabric of French society, including the family and the state, had been

shaken. The Revolution, together with the effects of indus-
trialization occasioned renewed thinking among prominent
scholars as to the fate and fortune of man. As a result, one
of the primary interests of Comte's life and work was the
improvement and reconstruction of society. Building upon the
ideas of others, Comte generated a theory of society which
truly set him apart from others.

Comte's thought was influenced throughout by three
principles: (1) all reality including the social dimension
was subject to natural forces or laws; (2) change took the
form of evolution and was subject to these laws; and (3)
evolution was progress, betterment. These ideas had been
expressed earlier in the works of Bonald, deMaistre, and
Condorcet. Comte applied these principles to the human mind
and formulated the law of three stages in the evolution of
knowledge. A similar idea regarding the evolution of knowl-
edge is found in the works of Comte's teachers, Saint Simon
(1964) and Turgot (1947). The three stages are the theolog-
ical, the metaphysical, and the positive. Theological
thought was predicated upon the governance of super human
forces. All phenomena were summarily the doing of this super
force. This mode of explanation (justification) gradually
lost its hold on men's minds as they began to question.
Questioning was itself an exercise in reasoning which
shifted the focus of attention from super natural forces to

natural forces. Answers were sought in the phenomena them-
selves, not in the super human forces believed to control
them.

Metaphysical thought was characterized by an effort to
explain events in terms of inherent qualities and by
analogy. While this was clearly an advance of theological
explanation, it did not achieve an independent status. In
positive thought the mind seeks limited causal explanations
in the form of relationships between phenomena. It does not
seek absolute answers or final cause. Comte was of the
opinion that European society had evolved to the final phase
of the metaphysical stage and that he was to reorganize
society along positive lines.

Positive, or rational scientific thought, was
considered by Comte to be the panacea for the disease of
disorganization afflicting society. Ultimately progress, or
synonymously, realization of a stable social order, could
best be achieved through the application of science to the
problems of society. This reorganization of society did not
require a total destruction of existing structures. What it
did require was the formulation and propogation of a moral
and spiritual value system based upon positive methods that
could exert proper control and discipline over the modern
industrial system.

The goal of Comte's positive philosophy was the recon-
struction and reinstitution of a sense of community among
men. The "religion of humanity", as it became known, would

be guided by the sociologists, whose knowledge of the prin-
ciples upon which enlightened social policy depends, best
equipped them for the task. They would, in fact, act as the
priesthood of the Positive Religion. Guided by humanitarian
values and tempered by brotherhood and altruism, the posi-
tive reorganization of society would be the main avenue of
progress and a stable social order.

Karl Marx

The political theory of "alienation" is generally
traced to the writings of Karl Marx, particularly to his
economic and philosophic manuscripts (also known as the
Paris manuscripts). His conception of alienation represents
one facet of his large theory of history. His work achieves
a synthesis of two major bodies of thought, the Hegelian
dialectic and the classical economic theory of value. Hegel
views thought (ideas) as the substance of everything.
Thought and reason are synonymous. All knowledge and
understanding exist in the form of thought. The basic
premise, therefore, upon which his entire theory was based
is that all things could be understood in terms of the logic
of ideas. Dialectical reasoning, according to Hegel,
consists of the principle of contradiction. Everything has
an opposite. Being, for example, is contradicted by not
being. Dialectical thought proceeds according to the form of

thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. When applied to reality it consists of a process of emergence. Reality is a continuous ongoing process of becoming. In accepting the labor theory of value according to Locke, Smith, and Ricardo and placing it within the context of dialectical thought, Marx formulated what is commonly called dialectical materialism.

In viewing Hegel from another angle, that is focusing on the "real" world rather than on the world of ideas, Marx took stock of the nascent industrial society. Medieval forms of home production were being swiftly replaced by the factory. Workers no longer lived and worked under the same roof. Large numbers of laborers now moved to central locations and worked at increasingly specialized tasks. This system of production, which was both defined and critized by Marx, is the private enterprise system of capitalism. Marx was particularly keen in his assessment of the emerging mode of production. Labor was being sold for wages to entrepreneurs. This means of production was owned by these entrepreneurs who managed them for profit. Any profit was everything over the cost of production, including the cost of labor. It was Marx's view that the capitalists would exploit labor by paying only a subsistence wage, or less. The effect of all this would be the emergence of two distinct classes, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The two groups would eventually become solidified against one another and produce a revolution. The result would be the

creation of a new arrangement in the means of production free of expoitation.

Of particular significance to the problem of alienation is Marx's description of the mode of production under capitalism. The worker no longer works on the whole product but contributes only a small part to the final product. This separation of worker from the fruits of his labor has far reaching affects. First, it makes of labor a commodity not unlike any other. Moreover, it makes of the laborer the same, a commodity. This means that the thing produced as well as the producing itself confronts the person as an alien thing--a thing to be reckoned with, an external power. The worker creates a commodity which sells in the market. Work becomes merely a means to other ends, namely, wages and making a living, and loses any personal meaning or relevance for the worker. Furthermore, since the product the worker produces sells for more than he himself can afford to pay for it, he begins to deify the products of his own creation.

But alienation penetrates beyond the economic realm. "He alienates products of his social activity in the form of state, law, social institutions. So there are many forms in which man alienates the products of his own activity from himself and makes of them a separate, independent and powerful world of objects toward which he is related as a slave, powerless and dependent" (Petrovic, 1967b, pp. 137-138).

Max Weber

With Max Weber we find again the quest for meaning in the developments of Western society. Having studied the works of such men as Comte, Spencer, Tonnies, Wundt, and Marx, he shared their general intellectual orientations. He differed, however, most significantly with Marx. Most unacceptable was Marx's singularistic (economic) explanation of all phenomena, including the social. It did not matter to Weber whether the socio-economic system under which men must live was socialistic or capitalistc. They were in actuality only slightly different in nature. What was important was that they operated according to yet more fundamental social forces. As Weber asks, ". . . what does it matter . . . if ownership passes from the few to the many--as Marx proposed--if the fundamental forces fo society--bureaucracy, rationalization of values, alienation from community and culture--continue?" (Nisbet, 1966a, p. 293). The phenomenon of rationality, which accompanies industrialization, is undoubtedly the pivotal point upon which Weber centers his analysis of institutions and societies. His work is an extension beyond the industrial sphere of the Marxian notion of powerlessness. Of this extension, Gerth and Mills write:

> Marx's emphasis upon the wage worker as being
> "separated from the means of production "becomes,
> in Weber's perspective, merely one special case of
> a universal trend. The modern soldier is equally
> separated from the means of violence; the
> scientist from the means of inquiery; and the

civil servant from the means of administration. (1946, p. 50).

The Germany of Max Weber was a veritable socio-political frontier. His generation saw the country undergo total economic and political transformation. It became a national state rather than merely a number of semi-autonomous, lesser principalities. Industrialization occurred swiftly in this new nation despite strong feuda-listic remains. New political factions struggled for power and ascendancy amid conflicting ideological perspectives. Two additional factors contributed to the situation in Germany. First, because industrialization occurred compara-tively late in Germany it benefited from the mistakes and achievements of others and consequently progressed very rapidly. Second, as industrialization occurred earlier in England, France, and the United States, they all underwent a reintegration, or settling effect in the form of a revo-lution. This did not happen in Germany and the result was a prolonged and paralyzing struggle for power and privilege among rival groups. Scholars became profoundly concerned about such things as the displacemnt of people, the break-down in primary relations, the ascendancy of impersonal values, and general rootlessness. These threatened the tried and tested ways of the past and stood to destroy the old community.

Weber studied these problems on a wide spectrum including capitatlism, religion, bureaucratic organization,

and law. He stressed the role of rationality in the total
context of social behavior, pointing out the value of
practicality and efficiency. In the end, however, he was not
fully convinced that rationalizatin of life was a net gain.
He wondered whether the sacrifice of the traditional way was
too big a price to pay for progress, if in fact it was
progress at all. "From being a force of 'progress' - the
indispensable means of liberating man from the tyrannies of
the past--rationalization becomes eventually the seedbed of
a tyranny greater, more penetrating, more lasting, than
anything previously known in history. Rationalization is no
mere process of politics; it is not limited in its effects
to political bureaucracy. It has affected all culture, even
the human mind, as it has affected the structure of modern
economy and state. So long as the process of rationalization
had something to feed on--that is, the structure of
traditional society and culture that was formed during the
Middle Ages--it was a generally creative and liberating
process. Both with the gradual diminution and desiccation of
this structure, with man's increasing disenchantment with
the values of this structure, rationaliztion threatens now
to become, not creative and liberating, but mechanizing,
regimenting, and ultimately, reason-destroying" (Nisbet,
1966, p. 294).

It is evident in much of Weber that the trouble he sees
is not one of disorganization but rather one of overorgan-

ization. For in the overorganization of human action one
finds the disapperance of all those vital qualities--love,
feeling, compassion, empathy--which are life.

Ferdinand Tonnies

The work of Ferdinand Tonnies closely parallels that of
Karl Marx in its treatment of social dynamics. Tonnies views
society as a social process characterized by essentially two
different forms of human association. He termed these
Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, the title of his book. The
distinction between the two is this. The Gemeinschaft (or
community) is association based upon empathy, spontaneity,
and impulsiveness. Members relate to one another as whole
persons as do members of a family. The Geselschaft is
association based on deliberate, purposive, and calculated
action.

It was Tonnies's contention that the process of history
found societies moving from Gemeinschaft to the
Gesellschaft. This transition, which had begun quite early
in history, was bolsterd by the changes fostered by the
Industrial Revolution. And this chanage was permanent for
there would be no return to the Gemeinschaft society
(Nisbet, 1966, pp. 75-76).

Tonnies's conception of the process of history was
formulated upon three interrelated themes found in the

literature of his day. First, there was the change in Western society from the corporate and communal to the individualistic and rational. Second, Western social organization was changing from one of ascribed status to contract. And, thirdly, there was a decline of sacred values and the ascendency of secular values. "Tonnies gave these themes theoretical articulation, and although his materials are drawn also from the Western European transition from Medievalism to modernism, his typological use of these materials permit universalized application" (Nisbet, 1966, p. 73).

Wesenwille, meaning "natural" or "integral will" is the impulsive and spontaneous expression of man's wants and desires. Kurwille represents man's rational qualities. Unlike the Wesenwille, Kurwille is conscious assessment and decision. Alternative courses of action are considered in thought and then pursued.

Tonnies found the Wesenwille to predominate in the Bemeinschaft type of association and Kurwille in the Gesellschaft. Each reflected peculiar qualities of personality and character. The Gemeinschft association dominated by Wesenwille showed a unity or a wholeness of the person where action stemmed from an inherent inner need. The Kurwille dominated person acted on rational and calculating ground. Meand and end were carefully weighed in terms of expected results. "The awareness of means and ends as two

separate in independent categories is the very core of Kurwille, whereas both are blended and remain undifferentiated in Wesenwille" (Pappenheim, 1959, p. 71).

Tonnies's work is an important contribution to the understanding of alienation. His account of the transition from family centered life to associational life raised into bold view the profound changes human relations. Tonnies regarded these changes as disruptive ans was even somewhat nostalgic about the Gemeinschaft; however, he did not advocate a return to the old way. Rather he sought a more meaningful adaptation to the emerging impersonal, autonomous Gesellschaft.

Emile Durkheim

Emile Durheim shared with Marx a concern for an explanation of the course of history. As noted in the preceding discussion, Marx saw change as emanating from the nature of social relation associated with the private enterprise system of production. Moreover, this change would produce a revolution and consequently a new social order. Durkheim observed the same general social conditions and preferred to describe them as evolutionary change in social solidarity. Two types of social solidarity are distinguished, mechanical and organic.

Mechanical solidarity is characterized by value homgeneity, traditional domination, and likeness. Organic

solidarity is based on differentiation and functional inter-
dependence. Most societies of history have been of the
mechanical variety wherein the collective conscience reigned
supreme. The rise of technology associated with the growth
of industrialization introduces a division of labor in
society beyond that which is governed by nature. New acti-
vities demand revised justification and therefore cause a
breach with the traditional values (collective conscience).
The result is a new social and moral order marked by seg-
mented interests and values, and united by the functional
interdependence of reciprocal roles.

The objective in Durheim's work was to demonstrate the
effects of the division of labor on the nature of social
life. It should be noted, however, that while he saw
societies changing from the mechanical to the organic type,
he did not think favorably of this change. Organic soli-
darity contained the inherent weakness of instability. Loss
of the mutual cohesiveness and trust based upon a community
of beliefs and sentiments could result in something of a
monstrosity. Durkheim seems to have looked upon the emerging
society with some trepidation.

The reason for this seems quite clear. The transition
from mechanical to organic solidarity left society in a
condition of considerable disintegration. With the
expanding division of labor, the values and norms of the
mechanical society gave way. In their place came
segemented interests and personal dislocation. To be

sure, a variety of pathologies, both personal and social, became evident. This, together with methodological consider- ations stimulated Durkheim in the direction of research. He undertook to study the connection between social integration and social behavior. Using suicide as an index of social integration, he observed three types of suicide associated with varying degrees of social integration. The three types were altruistic, egoistic, and anomic. Altruistic suicide occurs in those groups with high levels of integration. Egoistic suicide is characteristic of those groups which stress individuality and have very low levels of inte- gration. Anomic suicide is prevalent where a disintegration or breakdown in values and norms has occurred.

The central theme underlying Durkheim's analysis of the division of labor and suicide was man's isolation from traditional values. As societies grow larger in population, the more complex they become. There ensues a decay of the collective ideological integration. This state of decay and confusion Durkheim identified as normlessness, or anomie, the counterpart of perfect social integration.

George Simmel

"The deepest problems of modern life derive from the claim of the individual to perserve the autonomy and indivi- duality of his existence in the face of overwhelming social

forces, of historical hertiage, of external culture, and of the technique of life: The fight with nature which primitive man has to wage for his bodily existence attains in his modern for its latest transformation" (Simmel, 1950, p. 409). Life for growing numbers of people means city life. Oringinally believed to be the genuine liberation of man, it quickly had the opposite effect. People did not find self-realization in their highly specialized and mechanized lives. On the contrary, they found it impossible to preserve a sense of wholeness and self identity. What had first signaled the release of individual significance now served only to fragment men into highly regularized and routinized roles.

For Simmel, alienation was a kind of collision between society and the individual in the general form of individual life. He examined the various forms which characterized all social interaction. In fact, it was the description of these forms of interaction that set the task of sociology. All human groups, whatever their size or purpose, show peculiar forms of behavior on the part of member to member. Among these are superiority and subordination, competition, division of labor, formation of loyalties, and in-group solidarity. Simmel described quite clearly how the different properties of groups (size--the triad and the dyad) affected the nature of the relationshp between members.

An important area of interest in the work of Simmel was the special case of competition, that being conflict. He was drawn to this particular topic because of the many tensions and anxieties nurtured in the industrial society. In explaining the origins of conflict, Simmel found it to have both functional and dysfunctional import. The same is true of alienation. An amount of alienation was not only inevitable but necessary, for in this condition men find protection from the stress producing stimulation.

Unlike Durkheim and Weber, Simmel viewed alienation in a purely matter of fact fashion, free of any kind of emotional evaluation. In fact, it happened to be almost totally methodological. Most significantly, then, alienation manifests itself, at least to some degree, in every relationship.

Karl Mannheim

A number of writers already discussed, including Marx and Tonnies, saw society suffering from distrust and disorganization as a result of the fundamental changes occurring in society in connection with industrialization, rationality, and secularization. Karl Mannheim agreed that these changes were taking place and undertook to give an account of this following closely the method used by Marx.

The key to the problem as observed earlier by Marx, was the "consequences of the concentration of the means of production and the separation of the worker from those means" (Zeitlin, 1968, p. 310). However, Mannheim went further than Marx for he did not limit the implications of these two factors to the economic sphere. These changes had equally important consequences in other institutions, notably the political and military. While Marx saw the division of society along production lines with the resulting conflict between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, Mannheim saw both the means of political administration and the means of violence and destruction falling into the possession of a small elite minority. Accompanied by the bureaucratization and rationalization of social life, the basic tenants of democracy were virtually defeated.

Under these circumstances the average individual is reduced to a state of "terrified helplessness" and impotence, and unable to conduct himself as an autonomous agent. Mannheim therefore prescribed as a solution to this condition a system of democratic planning. This proposal met with a great deal of difficulty for how does one reconcile centralization of decision making necessary for planning with the requirements of decentralization in a democracy. Mannheim was never quite able to resolve this dilemma. He charged a small elite with the task of planning in hopes that they would strive for the common good. But past exper-

ience has shown that concentration of power has more often
than not entrailed oligarchy and even totalitarian rule.

In the end it must be said that Mannheim was somewhat
ambivalent about democracy. Whereas he frequently attempted
to "democratize" non democratic techniques, he is neither
without contradiction nor convincing. In spite of all this,
however, Mannheim should be recognized for having tried to
re-establish some semblance of guiding principles of the old
liberal era which had since lost its economic and social
base.

Robert K. Merton

A concern with the concept alienation in the work of
Robert K. Merton came by way of his analysis of the social
and cultural sources of deviant behavior. Specifically, his
objective was to identify and describe those ways in which
social structure is related to the performance for
anti-social behavior.

Acknowledging the value of functional analysis as an
explanatory device, he asserted that the social and cultural
structures supply both the desired goals and the proper and
acceptable means for achieving those goals. But, he says, in
the highly institutionalized societies of the West particu-
larly, there is an obvious imbalance in the emphasis placed
upon these two, with the greater stress given to the

cultural goals. Highly prized and desired goals without the perceived availability of means for attainment produces a condition of anxious disillusionment or "anomie".

Merton assumes first that all members of the society agree as to the desirability of the goals. In addition, non attainment of a given goal should not indicate failure but rather a delay in the realization of the goal. Failure, in his terms, can only result from loss of ambition. (Merton, 1968, p. 193).

Having conceptualized things in this fashion, Merton then constructed a typology of alternative modes of individual adaptation of means to ends. He considered five types of adaptation as shown in the following paradigm (Merton, 1968, p. 194):

	Modes of Adaptation	Cultural Goals	Institutionalized Means
I.	Conformity	+	+
II.	Innovation	+	−
III.	Ritualism	−	+
IV.	Retreatism	−	−
V.	Rebellion	±	±

(+) signifies "acceptance"
(−) signifies "rejection"

Type I, conformity, reflects perfect integration of goal and means and therefore does not imply any deviant behavior.

Type II, innovation, occurs when one has internalized the cultural goals without having equally internalized the institutionalized means for achieving the goals.

Type III, ritualism, finds one parctically ignoring the dsired cultural goals although there is no radical departure from the accepted and expected norms of conduct.

Type IV, retreatism, includes the dropouts, addicts, psychotics, etc, who have abandoned both the cultural goals and the institutionalized means. These are the truly alienated people. Resigned, asocial, disinherited, frustrated, these people are, as Merton (1968, pp. 191-196) says, "in the society but not of it."

Type V, rebellion, is particularly relevant here since it represtns an attempt to substitute a highly modified or new set of goals and means for a rejected one and so implies alienation from the existing social structure.

By means of this paradigmatic scheme, Merton is able to isolate those structural arrangements (particular adaptations) which can pressure person to engage in deviant behavior. It can be noted that with the exception of type I, conformity, anomie can exist in either the goals or the means.

C. Wright Mills

The great legacy of the Enlightment, says C. Wright Mills (1959), is the value of reason and freedom. An increased application of rationality would, it was believed, make men free. This was the supreme fact of the Modern Period which had witnessed unlimited faith in the notion of progress. But the Modern Period is at an end and is being succeeded by a post modern period wherein "the ideas of freedom and of reason have become moot, that increased rationality may not be assumed to make for increased freedom" (Mills, 1959, p. 167). The grounds for this assertion are to be found in the human consequences of the rationalization" of life. From the broader societal level on down to the immediate millieu, men must funciton within highly rational organizations. With the accompanying increase in the division of labor, life becomes segmented, making reasoning difficult if not impossible. The result is a society characterized by rationality but without reason.

From the point of view of the individual, life becomes an experience of fate. Feeling caught in a set of circumstances and forces beyond control, one does the best he can. The best, however, is an adaptation of the immediated situation which leaves one with a profound sense of hopelessness in the long run and a suspicion that neither freedom nor reason are important or possible. Alienation in all areas of

life, Mills asks whether a new "human nature" he calls "The Cheerful Robot" will soon flourish. He fears that it will and wonders further whether we have retained a sufficient amount of intellectual life and freedom to understand it and to respond to it. Although more pessimistic he challenges the social scientist to confront the problem vigorously.

Psychological and Social Psychological Perspective

The psychological theory of alienation, on the other hand, views alienation as developmental in nature, and traces its root cause to "personal" pathology. This tradition regards the individual victim of early childhood experiences and patterns of family relationships. The alienation of the individual is self-chosen and serves as a refuge from painful interpersonal relationships.

The term anomie has been employed both in social and psychological contexts. However, it is important to note that social anomie and psychological anomie are theoretically different in scope and origins involving estrangement from essentially different objects (Netter, 1957). In assessing social anomie, the individual's feelings are measured with reference to the social system where psychological anomie is measured in terms of the individual's feelings about himself. Here several writers have

made seminal contributions to the psychological concept of
alienation. These individuals include:

Erich Fromm

Erich Fromm has perhaps contributed more to the
popularity of the concept alienation than anyone. The term
found expression in _Escape from Freedom_ (1941) but took on
greater significance later in his book _The Sane Society_
(1955). In this latter work, considered basically a contin-
uation of _Escape from Freedom_, Fromm proposes an analysis of
social character solely in terms of alienation.

Fromm was deeply indebted to Karl Marx for his view of
alienation. So similar were they that it is often difficult
to distinguish what is Marx and what is Fromm. Nonetheless
they do differ in at least two ways. In the first instance
Marx's use of alienation was selective, having reference to
man's alienation from the products of his labor, making of
his own acts an alien power standing over against him. On
the hand, almost nothing escaped Fromm's application of the
term (Fromm, 1955, p.114). In fact, it was Fromm's express
purpose to extend Marx's usage to the wider society and
especially to examine the alienating effects of more recent
developments. Secondly, in elaborating and extending Marx's
conception of alienation, Fromm also "psychologized" the

term by elevating to higher levels of importance the mental and emotional connotations of the term.

As stated earlier, Fromm attempted to study contemporary social character from the perspective of alienation. Without question he did just that and in so doing contended that, "alienation as we find it in the modern world is almost total, it pervades the relationship of man to his work, to the things he consumes, to the state, to his fellow man, and to himself" (1955, pp. 114-115).

As Fromm saw it, the roots of man's alienation are found in his evolutionary development. Unlike the lower animals whose functioning is fixed by instinct, man has a physiological endowment which enables him to transcend nature. He no longer lives according to the coercive forces of nature but rather according to the influence of self awareness, reason, and imagination. As a result man has become separated from the oneness of nature and cast into a foreign environment. "The problem of man's existence, then, is unique in the whole of nature; he has fallen out of nature, as it were, and is still in it; he is partly divine, partly animal, partly infinite, partly finite" (1955, p. 31). The result is essentially a new environmental situation to which man must adjust and adapt. This new situation is problematic in that it spawns a complex of needs requiring satisfaction. Among these needs are the need for relatedness or reunion, the need for creative activity, the need

for belonging, the need for self definition and identity, and the need for a perspective or point of view (1955, pp. 35-66).

The position taken by Fromm is that under capitalism man is unable to fulfill any of these needs satisfactorily. Instead of enjoying a reunion with nature he suffers from isolation and character disintegration. Endowed with the equipment to rise above nature he is, nonetheless, unable to satisy his felt need for creativity. Nor is he able to find closeness or primaryness in the growing autonomy and impersonality of mass humanity, and perhaps because of these problems he is uncertain of what he is or should be, and consequently faces an identity problem. What remains is a collection of bodies devoid of purpose and direction, point of view and perspective. All the features of capitalist society--work, bureaucracy, competition, leisure, religion, sex, reason, freedom, mass, etc.,--are alienating. The picture portrayed by Fromm is admittedly one-sided but very little can be found to justify optimism.

Melvin Seeman

It was Melvin Seeman (1958) who made more organized sense of the concept of psychological alienation.

The first thing which Seeman attempts is to dispel the idea that alienation is a one factor problem. He points out

that the term "alienation" has become so general that it is used to explain everything.

In referring to the development of alienation in our contemporary society, Melvin Seeman (1959) argues our bureaucratic structure creates and maintains situations where people are not able to learn how to control the outcome of their own behavior. The society controls the reward system to such an extent that the individual sees no relationship between his own behavior and the rewards he receives: it is this situation that gives rise to feelings of alienation.

Melvin Seeman attempts to classify what he believes are the most frequent uses of the term "alienation" into five distinguishable types, from the perspective of the actor and in the language of expectations and rewards (Seeman, 1959, pp. 783-791).

In listing five different meanings of alienation, Seeman tries to refine them strictly (Seeman, 1959, pp. 784-790).

Powerlessness.-". . . the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot deter-mine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcement he seeks." Seeman suggest that this view of alienation, which stresses the individual's of realizing his own will, is pro-bably the most frequently used in contemporary sociological literature. Thus, powerlessness as a type of alienation is a

subjective notion, similar to Marx's and Fromm's conceptions.

The second type of alienation is called *meaninglessness*, which exists, ". . . when the individual is unclear as to what he ought to believe when the individual's siminal standards for clarity in decision-making are not met." More specifically, meaninglessness refers to the difficulty in making accurate predictions about the behavior of others or about the outcome of one's own actions.

Normlessness is Seeman's third type of alienation. Focusing again on the subjective, he defines normlessness as a condition ". . . in which there is a high expectancy that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve given goals."

The fourth usage is subjective *isolation*, which involves the low assignment of ". . . reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the give society." As Seeman points out, this usage does not refer to isolation as a lack of social adjustment but to a detachment from cultural standards.

Finally, "alienation" may mean *self-estrangement*. ". . . the degree of the given behavior upon anticipated future rewards." Reflecting Marx, the reward is not in the act itself but is external to work, in some processes apart from and outside of the act to work.

Seeman's work, however, can be criticized on several grounds: first, his tendency to oversimplify the previous theories in order to fit them into his categories; second, despite his attempt in factor analysing alienation, he fails to address the etiology of any of his categories; and finally his over emphasis on arriving at an operational definition of alienation makes Seeman's work in many ways somewhat superficial.

Kenneth Keniston

Keniston's theory of alienation is based on his research conducted on the alienated Harvard students (1965). While Keniston started with a social and cultural definition of alienation, his ultimate analysis turned out to be more psychological in nature. He defined these alienated intellectuals in terms of their "explicit rejection of what was seen as the dominant values of American culture" (Keniston, 1968, p. 326). The empirical cluster of attitudes termed the "alienated syndrome", descriptive of these students, consisted inter alia of distress, pessimism, avowed hostility, interpersonal, social, and cultural alienation and vacillation.

Keniston's description of his alienated students suggests that psychological alienation is an outgrowth of the son's tragic success in the oedipal conflict and of con-

fused parental identification. Yet the disasterous victory of the sons in the oedipal conflict instilled in them a deep dislike of all rivalry and competition.

E. Z. Friedenberg

For Friedenberg (1963), alienation (resentment) is a source of activism. A ressentiment person feels withdrawal or separation from an object or position of former attachment. The individual characterized by resentment fells conflict within himself and feels an oppressive sense of impotence which he has come to accept as an unchanging part of his place in the world. Resentment can be caused by school and school experiences, student's home life, and people they interact with, especially peers.

Friedenberg has hypothesized that students who are ressentiment either would adopt themselves to institutional roles and procedures or would retreat into defensive postures, i.e., open hostility, incompetence or indifference.

Friedenberg and his associates after conducting several empirical studies found that resentment is caused by:

1. Repression of individuality
2. Doing business with abstract entities
3. Personal values and feelings superceded by group values and feelings.

Richard Flacks

For Flacks (1967) student political alienation is not derived from oedipal conflicts with authoritarian parents but rather it is a direct expression of a perceived discrepancy between the values imposed by parents and the prevailing practices of the society. Some of these activists are the children of liberal radical parents who emphasize and value humanitarianism, intellectualism and romanticism in their personal lives. Thus, the activists are, in fact, living out the values of the parents and in so doing are forced into conflict with society.

According to Flacks (1967, p.63) activist political alienation is not born out of rejection of parental values, but rather out of successful socialization.

> In this way, the values that an earlier generation espoused in an abstract way have become embodied as personality traits in the new generation. In this sense, the students who engage in protest or who participated in "alienated" styles of life are not "converts" to a deviant adaption, but people who have been socialized into a developing cultural tradition.

Other theorists who have made a significant contribution to the concept of individual alienation include Reisman, Erickson, Goodman, and Feuer.

Riesman points out in the The Lonely Crowd (1965), the youth of today are taught not to be inner-directed but

other-directed. They are told to look to others for the appropriate behaviors to assume in the many private and public roles required in a complex structure. In such a situation many youth lose contact with their fundamental selves. Riesman's discussion of the "other directed" fits in exactly with Fromm's description of the psychologically alienated individual:

> For what is at stake is that the child learns that nothing in his character; no possession he owns, no inheritance of name or talent, no work he has done is valued for itself, but only for its effect on others (Riesman, 1950, p. 49).

Erick Erickson (1950) has referred to this situation as the identity crisis. On the one hand, the individual is taught the value of autonomy, but as soon as he displays some independent behavior, he is criticized (Friedenberg, 1959). Goodman (1960) maintains that we force youth to give up their integrity and create in them a sense of resignation by directing them toward meaningless and useless situation. The student is confronted from all sides with demands on himself. He must achieve, he must accept goals others set for him, and he must accept the prescribed methods of reaching these goals. In this type of milieu, the student has little opportunity to develop his own identity. "Youth after youth, bewildered by his assumed role, a role forced on him by the inexorable standardization of American adolescence, runs away in one form or another" (Erickson, 1950, p. 307). Young people become alienated from a society

that they see as false and meaningless and in which there is little chance to develop self-definition.

Similar arguments are found in the writings of some contemporary scholars. Lewis Feuer (1969) has indicated that political activism of the alienated youth is generational and psychological in origin. He attributes student activism to unresolved oedipal conflicts and negative identification with parents. He calls it a "politics of the unconscious."

> Emotions issuing from the student's unconscious and deriving from the conflict of generations impose or attach themselves to the underlying irrational directions (p.8).

While Flacks focuses on "generational continuity", Feuer postulates "generational conflict" as the underlying reason for contemporary student political activism. Feuer's description of the alienated activist is similar to Keniston's characterization of the "uncommitted" except that Keniston's uncommitted were apolitical nihilists whereas Feuer's radicals are political activists. Flack's description of activists is reminiscent of Keniston's "young radicals", though one notices distinct differences in the family background and political orientations of the two.

The above discussion on the theories of alienation leads to an important issue: is psychological alienation, as Marx put it, a reflection of social reality or is the sociological alienation, as Freud would put it, a reflection of psychic contents? The answer perhaps is that both are true, depending on the focus of reality.

Each of these schools of thought, however, has limitations. The psychologist underemphasizes the social reality which shapes individual lives; the sociologist overlooks the importance of psychological aspects of human experiences. The fact is that both kinds of factors, and many others, are simultaneously at work.

Alienation: Concept, Meaning and Definition - A Conceptual Analysis

Problems of Definition A sophisticated and empirically valid theory of alienation requires a clear and careful analysis, interrelation, definition and conceptualization of the key concept of alienation. Because, not many studies have attempted to deal seriously with the problem of definition and conceptualization of alienation and activism. In most of the studies, the authors move to the focus of their study before they deal adequately with the problem of definition and conceptualization of alienation. This, in part, is due to the diversity of concerns by different scholars with different definitions and dimensions of the concept alienation.

Over the years specific definitions of alienation have produced only one thing: controversy. Rooted in different values, and coming from different intellectual traditions, social scientists have not succeeded in defining the word.

The concept has either been so narrowly defined and discussed that it was of little concern as a general

paradigm, or it was so broadly defined and discussed that it had lost most of its validity and pertinency.

Seeman and those who utilize his measurement outline five primary forms of alienation: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement; to Srole and those who use his scale, it refers to isolation, despair and powerlessness; and to Thompson (1959), Horton (1964), and Aberbach (1962), it it a cognition that politicians do not care about people and cannot be trusted.

The ambiguity of the concept of alienation is illustrated by the fact that it is commonly assumed to incorporate several conditions or states of being and a great number of behavioral and psychological correlates ranging from apathy to psychosis. It is perhaps because of such problems that conceptual and theoretical agreement among concerned scholars is not imminent. Perhaps this ambiguity is due partly to the many issues raised by research (Johnson, 1973; Schwartz, 1973; Feurelicht, 1978; Victor, 1973; Keniston, 1965; Kon, 1969; Koff, 1973). Some of the issues concern the methodological implication important in the empirical pursuit of knowledge about alienation.

Social scientists, with few exceptions, have found in the term alienation an explanation for many problems ranging from the alienated lower class to the alienated intellectual, from the alienated businessman to the alienated reformatory inmate. Once alienation is treated as the independent

variable (x), another time it is considered the dependent variable (y), other times it is viewed as both, and it is even treated as an intervening or contaminating variable. Much work has been done hoping to specify those feelings, attitudes, or conditions associated with alienation. The result has been that while interest in the phenomenon has grown, our understanding has not. There appears to be as little agreement on the meaning of the term today as when Melvin Seeman wrote his article in 1959.

Lengthy discussion could easily be generated from the writings of the pioneering sociologists as well as leading contemporary social theorists and psychologists relating to the meaning of alienation. Our objective here, however, is to present those discussions which more clearly bear on the problem under investigation. This requires that we advance our discussion to that point of interest wherein the "conceptual" and "operational" meaning of alienation becomes differentiated from its abstract metaphysical origins.

According to Kon (1967, p. 507), the concept of alienation to be useful in research or theoretical development needs to be made specific by answering three basic questions: (1) Who is alienated? (2) From what is he alienated? (3) How is the alienation manifested?

Keniston (1965, p. 454) has argued that the concept of alienation requires specification in at least four respects:

1. Focus: alienation from what?

2. Replacement: what replaces the old relationship?

3. Mode: how is the alienation manifest?

4. Agent: What is the agent of alienation?

It is perhaps instructive to cite the most relatively commonly and/or widely used definitions of the concept. This may help us to construct a more comprehensive way of operational and conceptual descriptions of the term in a form of analytic schemata.

Concept of alienation - some definitions

The meaning and definition of the term in the vast literature on the subject are many, varied, and in some cases conflicting. From the foundations of the concept alienation and the contextual history of the term up to and including Marx, the reference (denotation) of the word can be settled. This suggests the following identity statements:

1. Alienation is the separation of man from the citizen body. (Paul the Apostle)

2. Alienation is the loss or derangement of mental facilities. (From the French word aliene')

3. Alienation is universal saleability. (Hobbes, Adam Smith)

4. Alienation is the separation of the mind from its essence. (Hegel)

5. Alienation is reification, through religion, of man's essence. (Feuerbach)

6.1 Alienation is the separation/estrangement of man from man from nature.

6.2 Alienation is the separation/estrangement of man from himself.

6.3   Alienation is the separation/estrangement of man
       from production.

6.4   Alienation is the separation/estrangement of man
       from other men. (Marx)

Most of the social psychological definitions of the
term are derived from Durkheim's conception of anomia. For
Durkheim (1933, pp. 209-10) alienation (individual anomia)
is "states of mind which accompany social disintegration:
feelings of normlessness, powerlessness, meaninglessness –
feeling that frequently lead to suicide."

MacIver (1950, p. 3) had defined alienation

. . . state of mind of one who has been pulled up
by his moral roots, who has no longer any stan-
dards but only disconnected urges, who has no
longer any sense of continuity, of folk, of obli-
gation . . . spiritually sterile, responsive only
to himself, responsible to no one. He derides the
values of the other men. His only faith is the
philosophy of denial. He lives on the thin line of
sensation between no future and no past.

For Fromm (1955, p. 120) alienation means:

. . . a mode of existence in which the person
experiences himself as an alien. He has become,
one might say, estranged from himself.

Merton (1957) has defined alienation as "the state
where social and cultural structures are in conflict or
where the individual is in conflict with the proscription or
prescriptions of the structure".

Keniston (1965, p. 204) defines alienation as a
"response to major collective estrangements, social strains,
and historical losses in our society, which first predispose

certain individuals to reject their society, and later shape the particular ways they do so."

In a _Dictionary of Social Science_, Kurt Lang (1964) defines alienation as "an estrangement or separation between parts or whole of the personality and significant aspects of the world of experience".

Mitchell (1968) defines the term as "a socio-psychological condition of the individual which involves his estrangement from certain aspects of his social existence".

According to Gwynn Nettler (1965, pp. 762-3) an alienated person is "one who has been estranged from, unfriendly toward, his society and the culture it carried".

For Levin (1962, p. 227-239), "The essential characteristic of the alienated man is his belief that he is not able to fulfill what he believes is his rightful role in society. The alienated man is actually aware of the discrepancy between who he is and what he believes he should be".

For Eric and Mary Josephson (1962) alienation is an individual feeling or state of disassociation from self, from others and from the world at large. It is used to refer

> to an extraordinary variety of psycho-social dis-
> orders, including loss of self, anxiety states,
> anomie, despair, depersonalization, rootlessness,
> apathy, social disorganization, loneliness, atomi-
> zation, powerlessness, meaninglessness, isolation,
> pessimism, and the loss of beliefs or values.
> Among the social groups who have been described as
> alienated in varying degree . . . are women,
> industrial workers, white-collar workers, migrant
> workers, artists, suicides, the mentally dis-

turbed, addicts, the aged, the young generation as
a whole, juvenile delinquents in particular,
voters, non-voters, consumers, the audiences of
mass media, sex deviants, victims of prejudice and
discrimination, the prejudiced, bureaucrats,
political radicals, the physically handicapped,
immigrants, exiles, vagabonds and recluses (pp.
12-13).

Marvin Olsen (1969, p. 289) has defined alienation as

"attitudes of estrangement between oneself and some salient

social object which might be any social or cultural phenom-

enon of direct concern to the individual. Hence, alienation

can only be meaningfully declared in relation to something;

. . . alienation is purely subjective phenomenon, not an

objective condition of a larger social system."

Some sociologists and social theorists have viewed

alienation and a host of related terms as a reified concept:

transforming and abstraction into something independent of

man which governs his life. For example, Stanley Moor (1957,

p. 125) has used the term in this way:

Alienation and estrangement refer to the charac-
teristics of individual consciousness and social
structure typical in a society whose members are
controlled by, instead of controlling the conse-
quence of the collection activity.

Alienation - Aspects and Characteristics

Alienation theorists have emphasized different condi-

tions of occurrence, sources, and causes of alienation.

Meier and Bell (1959, p. 190), analyzing the causes of

alienation, content that it results when individual lacks

access to means for the achievement of life goals. Such lack

of opportunity follows largely, they feel, as a result of

the individual's position in the social structure as deter-
mined by such factors as type of occupation, amount of
education, income, degree of commitment to particular
beliefs, attitudes and values. For Kaplan (1974, p. 120) the
primary source of alienation lies in the discrepancy between
the identifications of people in actual societies and the
satisfaction of their needs or desires in social activities.
When the identification of the individual appear to be sub-
ject to social or natural forces over which he has no con-
trol, he perceives himself as alienated from important
aspects of his personality. Such alienations occur often if
the society fails to produce what humans perceive as satis-
faction of legitimate human goals. It occurs as social
change disturbs identifications in ways threatening to the
personality of some members of the society.

Both Koff (1973) and Keniston (1965) have assumed that
certain social, psychological, political, cultural and his-
torical conditions produce alienation, in almost all per-
sons, regardless of their individual personality traits.
"We may conceptualize the forces that help produce aliena-
tion as psychological, sociological, cultural, and histori-
cal, at any given moment all of these forces are fused in
the individual's experience; and only with the cumbersome
phrase "psycho-socio-cultural-historical" can we adequately
indicate this fusion", wrote Keniston (1965, p. 384).

As far as the agents or sources of alienation are concerned, alienation theorists are divided. Some have viewed it as a social problem; a reaction to the stresses, inconsistencies and injustices of the social systems. The alienated man is said to be the victim of his society; his alienation is _imposed_ upon him by an unjust social order. Most of the sociological discussion of alienation particularly those derived from Marx's work deal with _imposed_ alienation (of which the alienated individual remains largely unaware). Rousseau, 1950; Marx, 1959; Coser, 1971; Marcuse, 1964; and Amitai Etzioni, 1968; are among others who have given expression to this idea. For example, Rousseau (1959) accused society of having created a barrier between and all the people. He affirms that society, not his own neuroses produces his apprehensiveness. Likewise, Etzioni (1968) has stressed that the roots of alienation are not in intrapsychic processes but in the societal and political structure.

While some stress the fact that it is society that alienates the individual, others point at the individual alienating himself from society. Most of the psychological discussion of alienation that derive from Fromm's, Erikson's, Keniston's, and Kahler's work deal with _chosen_ alienation, of which the alienated individual is aware that he is alienated from his work, society or himself. "Alienation, once seen as imposed on men by an unjust social and

economic system, is increasingly chosen by men as their basic stance toward society", writes Keniston (1960, p. 3).

Since alienation is comprised of feelings and perceptions (which may vary in intensity) is better thought of as a combination of _degree_ and _direction_. Kaplan (1976), Johnson (1973), Keniston (1965), Victor (1973), Schwartz (1973), and Urick (1970) are among others who have given detailed expression to this idea.

Although alienation connotes general feelings of apathy and despair, nevertheless, the objects of alienation may differ: self, others, society, and its institutions. The forms may differ primarily in subtle variations, powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, self estrangement, pessimism, repudiation, dejection, etc. (See Keniston, 1965; Johnson, 1973; Victor, 1973; Feuerlicht, 1978; Kaplan, 1976; Seeman, 1959).

As far as the subjective and objective aspects of alienation are concerned, alienation theorists are divided: social theorists and students of the school of sociology have emphasized the _objective_ aspect of alienation. By objective they mean concrete behavior clearly observable by both the members of the group and the outside observer — what people do. Marx, Mizruchi, Coser, Etzioni, Moor and Johnson have emphasized this point of view.

Psychologists, on the other hand have favored the _subjective_ aspect of alienation. By subjective they mean

mental states and feelings. Fromm, Keniston, Feuer, Nettler, Olsen, Sebastian DeGrazia, and Kaufman have viewed alienation as a purely subjective phenomenon, not an objective condition of a larger social system.

Alienation theorists also differ in their enumeration of the basic forms of alienation. Frederick Weiss (1962, pp. 463-79) distinguished three basic forms (self-anesthesia, self-elimination, and self-idealization); Ernest Schacted (1962, pp. 73-83) has distinguished four (The alienation of man from nature, from their fellow men, from the world of their hands and minds, and from themselves); and Lewis Feuer (162, pp. 116-134) six (the alienation of class society, of competitive society, of industrial society, of mass society, of race and of generations).

Finally, the status of the term in sociological theory is determined by whether alienation is concluded to be a quality or a relation. Those theorists who argue that alie- nation is a quality (e.g., Horton, 1964; Blauner, 1967; Barakat, 1972; Allardt, 1972) contend that its denotation is a psychological fact. This is not surprising since an entailment of arguing alienation to be a quality is to be harnessed to the position that alienation can only be a psychological phenomenon. This is because no qualities in the milieu have been devoted as alienation. The structural variables dealt with by sociologists, such as norms, roles, etc., are all relations. Opposed, then, to the position that

alienation is a quality is the contention that it is a relation. And here alienation may be a fact of the mind (Fromm, 1956) or a fact of society (Marx, 1953).

From sociological point of view the difficulties of assuming alienation as a quality are:

1. Although some commonly accepted dimensions of alienation such as meaninglessness, self estrangement, and powerlessness could be seen as qualities of the mind, isolation and normlessness could not. Isolation has always been taken to be a relational fact of an individual and/or a group, while norms have always been taken to be regulatory constraints in a milieu, and normlessness the lack of this relation. Powerlessness and self-estrangement, furthermore, do have a relational meaning in terms of the milieu; the former denoting the control over events and the latter the relationship between the individual and the milieu. In trying to avoid this difficulty, Allardt (1972) takes Seeman's (1954) dimension of powerlessness to be a psychological experience, then reduced Seeman's (1959) other four dimensions into the experience of uprootedness. Yet, this procedure essentially begs the question. Powerlessness and uprootedness could certainly be conceived of as relational facts of the mind; Allardt (1972) merely asserts them to be qualitative. Furthermore, in taking alienation to be qualitative, he collapses alienation as a sociological phenomena (as a relation) into a psychological disposition (as a

quality) with no justification proposed at all. In short, Allardt (1972) takes on the difficulties of microscopic reductionism for the sake of schematic neatness in his theory. Barakat (1969), on the other hand, asserts the dimensions of powerlessness, normlessness, etc., not to be alienation at all, but rather social variables which cause alienation. Although, not taking on the problems of reductionism, his position is perhaps more radical than Allardt (1972).

2. The proponents of the qualitative aspect of alienation have usually made systematic distinction between the psychological and social levels of alienation. This seems to be invalid because in taking alienation to be qualitative, Barakat (1969), for example, cannot talk of a social level of alienation at all, and thus his distinction between general alienation (alienation from society) and specific alienation (e.g., alienation from a job) is spurious on his criterion.

3. The concluding criticism of regarding alienation as a quality raises the ontological issue of whether alienation can be conceived of in terms of degrees.

An upshot of alienation being a relation is that there can be degrees (or scales) of alienation. The proposition that A has become further separated from B becomes equivalent to A has become more alienated from B. Had 'alienation' been a quality the notion of increasing (or

decreasing) alienation would be ontologically impossible,
and just as absurd as the notion of an increasing (or
decreasing) scale in greenness. The true situation however
(for qualities) is that either x is green or it is not. This
is not to deny different types of greenness, but rather the
contention that one green is more green than another. This
fact holds true for all qualities, and ". . . the notion of
degrees of any quality is a confused one – that the question
of a thing's possession of a quality is confused with the
question of its possession of other qualities (or of certain
relations) as well" (Anderson, 1963, p. 266).

Most authors, then, have wanted to talk in terms of
increasing and decreasing levels of alienation, yet only a
relational conception can allow such notions of degrees.
Barakat (1969, p. 7) for example, in taking alienation to be
qualitative, introduces ontological inconsistencies when he
asserts, "The greater the gap between reality and utopia the
greater the alienation and the more encompassing and
overwhelming." In short, his notion of a gap between utopia
and reality ontologically presupposes a relational
definition, thus in siding with a qualitative definition his
theory is unsatisfactory as it makes the very assumptions it
tries to show are false.

It can be concluded then that Barakat's (1969)
conceptual claims exhibit confusion. If alienation is taken
either to be a qualitative or relational fact, it denotes a

structural variable which in itself is not a process, but rather may be a necessary condition leading to a process.

A new approach to term clarification

Perhaps a more comprehensive way of operational descriptions of the term is to list them in a form of analytic schemata.

The first of these is Seeman's (1959) separation of the concept into five components: (1) powerlessness; (2) meaninglessness; (3) normlessness; (4) isolation; (5) self-estrangement. His descriptions refer to subjective feelings or ideas and not necessarily to objective reality; for example, a person who feels powerless may actually be strong.

Josephson and Josephson (1962) have suggested another operational analysis of the term - namely differentiations between states of alienation versus conditions causing alienation.

Feuer (1962, pp. 137-140) has divided the concept somewhat differently listing the following modes: "(1) the alienation of class society; (2) the alienation of competitive society; (3) the alienation of industrial society; (4) the alienation of man's society; (5) the alienation of races; (6) the alienation of the generations.

Scott (1965) has described alienation in regard to its sources, seen as a series of deficiencies; (1) lack of commitment to values; (2) absence of conformity to norms;

(3) loss of personality in roles; (4) deficiency in control of facilities.

Weiss (1962, pp. 463-479) has distinguished three basic forms of alienation - namely self-anesthesia, self-elimination, and self-idealization.

Schachted (1962, pp. 73-83) has divided the phenomena into four basic forms: (1) alienation of man from nature; (2) the alienation of man from fellow man; (3) the alienation of man from the World of their hands and minds; and (4) the alienation of man from themselves.

Samuel Keen (1969) has divided the concept into principles of human society, locating varieties of alienation in those human activities (foci) involving speech, promises, work, reproduction, civility, hope for the future and respect for ecology.

Barakat (1969, pp. 3-4) has suggested another operational description of alienation, viewing it as stages instead of a set of variants. These stages are: (1) sources of alienation at the level of social and normative structures; (2) alienation as a psychological property of the individual; (3) behavioral consequences of alienation.

Victor (1973, pp. 12-13) has divided the phenomena somewhat differently listing the following modes:

(1) feelings of detachment from gods, nature, society's rules and values, community, other people, one's emotions and desires, one's acts, work, property, technology;

(2) feelings of a lack of power, life or existance, guide-
lines for thought or action, purpose or direction, identity
or individuality, place or position; (3) image of himself as
a zombie, a computer, a puppet or robot, a performer or
gladiator, a greyhound.

In addition, Victor (1973, pp. 13-14) has outlined the
ways in which people _react_ to their alienation; (1) some
confront it actively, trying to change themselves or their
environment. They pursue self-examination or psychotherapy;
they seek people who are like themselves and may join
movements, communes, or groups of anonymous alcoholics, drug
addicts, and gamblers; (2) some become revolutionaries,
trying to change their environment directly or indirectly
(as through pamphleteering or art); (3) some accept the
terms of society while trying to win, pursuing wealth or
prestige in a singleminded way, giving up self and social
interests in the process (this group includes devotees of
encounters of mystical disciplines, hippies, student
activists and artists, professional soldiers, gamblers, and
racing drivers); (4) some try to ignore their alienation by
detaching themselves still further; they become super-cool,
resigned, or apathetic; they may manage marginal social
adjustments or be derelicts, and they number among the
drinkers, drug users, dropouts, hermits, and those who are
present but only putting in time; (5) some disguise their
alienation from themselves or others by the appearance of

normalcy; they may hold steady jobs and participate in family, social, and community activities; but doing these things without the foundation of knowing themselves and their relationship to the world, they rely heavily on convention; they adhere to rules, whether of etiquette, custom, morality, or law; mechanical conformity, without understanding the context of their actions, is their adaptation; they copy what others do. Although, the need behind their conformity may be desperate, they lack genuine involvement with people".

And Schacht (cited in Johnson, 1973) has illustrated the concept of alienation by listing three basic conceptual meanings: "(1) alienation as separation: This describes those processes or states of alienation evolving from the (inevitable, ontological) separation of two or more entities. Along with separation, the notion of a tension existing within or between these entities is integral in this denotation (this meaning is in Hegel's notion of the universal sense of "becoming alienated"). (2) Alienation as transfer: when alienation is connected to deliberate (contractual) renunciation or relinquishment, a significantly different meaning is suggested. This is closer to the historic English meaning of alienation as transfer (or expropriation) of property or of rights belonging to an individual, which are either renounced or given over to others. Although, tension may accompany such alienation, feelings of

anger or resignation would more usually be connected with these surrenders. (3) Alienation as objectivity: this meaning depicts alienation as being aroused by the basic, subjective "awareness of others". Here man's capacity to perceive "the other" as discrete from himself is identified as alienation. The affective concommitants of this condition are mainly those of loneliness and isolation, rather tension or frustration".

Such an enumeration of the concept of alienation that have been made so far suggest basic criteria according to which such classification seem to have been made (or could be made).

(1) According to the subject that is alienated: we may distinguish between alienation of things and alienation of selves. Then we may distinguish between individual alienation and social alienation. We may classify as types of social alienation the alienation of societies as a whole (such as capitalistic societies), the alienation from social groups (capitalists, workers, intellectuals, bureaucrats, producers, consumers, etc.) and the alienation of social institutions (such as the state, the church and cultural institutions).

(2) According to the object from which alienation exists: we can distinguish between alienation from something else, or somebody else and alienation from oneself (for example, alienation from nature, alienation from fellow man

(3) According to the aspects of an object from which alienation is manifested: we may distinguish between alienation with regard to a particular system or systems. An individual or group of individuals may be alienated from the cultural system, its values; from the social system, its structural features; and/or from one's self, the personality system. Individuals and groups may be alienated from the first two, individuals are more likely to be alienated from their own individual selves than are collections of persons as an entity.

Conceptualization of Political Alienation

The notion of political alienation is perhaps the most frequent usage in current literature (e.g., Seeman, 1958; Goldner, 1962; C. Wright Mills, 1959; Coser, 1971; Campbell, 1964; McDill and Ridly, 1962; Thompson and Horton, 1960; Cohen and Hale, 1966; Dean, 1961; Ransford, 1968; Parkin, 1968; Flacks, 1970; Long, 1969; Russopoulos, 1970). The idea of political alienation as powerlessness originated in the Marxian theory: the worker is alienated to the extent that the prerogative and means of decision are expropriate by the ruling entrepreneurs. One might say the Marx's interest in the powerlessness of the worker flowed from his interest in the consequences of such alienation in the work place - for

example, the alienation of man from man, and the degradation of man into commodities (Seeman, 1958, p. 784).

It was Melvin Seeman (1958, p. 784) who made more organized sense of political alienation. He defined political powerlessness "as the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes or reinforcements he seeks". This form of alienation is called by some writers (e.g., Fromm, Marza) as the "feeling of fate".

According to Seeman, feeling of political powerlessness is not related to the actual power which the individual holds. Feelings of alienation have no necessary relationship to "objective reality". Alienation is "real" in so far as the individual feels that it is real, i.e., "subjective reality" not necessarily "objective reality".

Influenced by Seeman, Victor (1973, p. 12) defines political powerlessness as "the expectation that one's behavior cannot determine outcomes." His description, similar to that of Seeman, refers to subjective feelings or ideas and not necessarily reality; for example a person who feels powerless may actually be strong.

For Coser (1971, p. 51), too, political powerlessness "is a psychological state when an individual feels deprived of any influence or involvement in the social events that are determining his fate".

Levin (1960, pp. 61-62), in his study of politics in Boston, discussed the attitudes of voters which, according to him, made them alienated. He defines political alienation as "the feelings of an individual that he is not part of the political process. The politically alienated believe that their vote makes no difference. This belief arises from the feeling that political decisions are made by a group of insiders who are not responsive to the average citizens - the outsiders".

Political alienation according to Stephen Koff (cited in Johnson 1973, p. 284), "involves the alienated person's perception that he does not have the ability to influence decisions in the political area which have a significant impact on him. His perception of the rules of the game and the operation of the system are such that he believes that he has no role in the control of his political destiny".

Social Alienation

The notion of social alienation can be traced to Durkheim's conception of anomie, which included a "feeling of separation from the group or of isolation from group standards. Victor (1973, p. 12), has defined the term as "not valuing goals or value widely held in society."

The usage of the term has been most common in descriptions of the intellectual role, where writers (e.g., Seeman, Nettler) refer to the detachment of the intellectual from popular cultural standards.

According to Seeman's definition (1958, pp. 788-9), this type of alienation refers to "the assignment of low reward values to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society". Thus, the individual who assigns low values to goals that are generally valued highly would be rejecting society. That is, the individual who wishes to become an isolate simply withdraws. This, it is assumed, can be done either through a process of physical withdrawal (e.g., a hermit), or through the withdrawal of the power of society (e.g., a beatnik attempting to show that society has no hold over him), or in some case, through psychotic withdrawal.

Student Alienation

Probably the largest segment of the population which has been called alienated in recent decades is youth, that is, the age group from about sixteen to about twenty-five years. Lewis Feuer (1969), a historian of the student movement notes that "alienation was the chief slogan - word of the protesting students in America, Japan and Russia." (p. 503).

Urick (1970) and Victor (1973) have noted that youth and students are our most visibly, dramatically alienated group. They are probably the largest segment of the population which has been called alienated in recent decades. A

leading force demanding change during the mid-20th century has been the university students. Few societies, regardless of geographic position, political system, or state of economic development have escaped recent episodes of serious student upheaval. Czechoslovackia, Egypt, France, Holland, Hungary, Iran, Japan, Mexico, Pakistan, Poland, Turkey, Vietnam have witnessed student protest and activity. The students have become the loudest spokesman for social change and a leading catalyst for political transformation.

Several writers (e.g., Keniston, 1965; Katz, 1965; Flacks, 1968; Mehra, 1971; McDonald, 1970; Taylor, 1969) have characterized youth alienation as a pattern of behaviors or attitudes "freely" chosen by young people who explicitly reject what they perceive as the dominant values or norms of society. As Keniston (1965, p. 80) has noted:

> The alienated are different from their man-alienated friends; they differ not what they do but in how they do it. Alienation expresses itself most characteristically as a style of life, a special relationship to the critical events on one's life.

The sources of student alienation are generally traced to the loss of certain traditional values. A common assumption invariably made is that the breakdown of family life, high rates of divorces, and softness of modern living and above all parental over-indulgence and spoiling have contributed to the prevalence of youth alienation. It is said that these dissenters, brought up in undisciplined

homes by parents unsure of their own values and philo-
sophies, are playing out their frustrations and anger
against the older generation, against all authority and
against most established institutions (Keniston, 1968: 299).

Similar arguments are found in the writings of some
contemporary scholars. Lewis Feuer (1963) has indicated that
political activism of the alienated youth is generational
and psychological in origin. He attributes student activism
to unsolved oedipal conflicts and negative identification
with parents. He calls it a "politics of the unconscious":

"Emotions issuing from the student's unconscious and
deriving from the conflict of generations impose or attach
themselves to the underlying irrational directions" (p. 8).

For Feuer, psychological alienation as represented by
the "hippi sub-culture" and activist political alienation as
represented by "student political movements" are
inseparable.

Richard Flacks (1967), on the other hand, asserts that
student political alienation is not derived from oedipal
conflicts with authoritarian parents, but rather is a direct
expression of perceived practices of the society. Some of
these activists are the children of Liberal radical parents
who emphasize and value humanitarianism, intellectualism and
romanticism in their personal lives. Thus, the activists
are, in fact, living out the values of the parents and in
so doing are forced into conflicts with society.

According to Flacks, activist political alienation is not born out or rejection of parental values, but rather out of successful socialization. The students who engage in protest or who participate in "alienated" styles of life are not "converts" to a deviant adaptation, but people who have been socialized into developing cultural tradition" (Flacks, 1967, p. 63).

While Flacks focuses on "generational continuity", Feuer postulates "generational conflict" as the underlying reason for contemporary student political activism. Feuer's description of the alienated activist is similar to Keniston's characterization of the "uncommitted" except that Keniston's uncommitted were apolitical nihilists whereas Feuers's radicals are political activists. Flack's description of activists is reminiscent of Keniston's "young radicals," though one notices distinct difference in the family backgrounds and political orientations of the two. A brief description of Keniston's "uncommitted" and the "young radicals" would help to bring out the distinguishing feature of the two forms that student dissent has taken in recent years.

Keniston's theory of alienation is based on his research conducted on the alienation Harvard students

(1965). While Keniston started with a social and cultural definition of alienation, his ultimate analysis turned out to be more psychological in nature. He defines these alienated intellectuals in terms of their "explicit rejection of what was seen as the dominant values of American culture" (Keniston, 1968, p. 326).

Keniston distinguishes between a pattern of behavior which is activist and one which is alienated. The activist youth moves outwards into the arena of social and political life, seeking to introduce and produce change; the alienated youth, by contrast, moves inward seeking to find and develop his own inner world of aesthetically oriented personal experience. The empirical cluster of attitudes termed the "alienated syndrome," descriptive of these students, consisted inter alia distress, pessimism, avowed hostility, interpersonal, social and cultural alienation and vaciliation.

Keniston's description of his alienated students suggests that psychological alienation is an outgrowth of the son's tragic success in the oedipal conflict and of confused parental identification. Yet, the disastrous victory of the sons in the oedipal conflict instilled in them a deep dislike of all rivalry and competition.

Student Alienation and Its Behavioral Outcome –
Conceptualization of Passive and Active
Face of Alienation

The theorists of the youth movement (e.g., Flacks, 1967; Katz, 1965; Bay, 1967; Mehra, 1971; Tret and Corise, 1967; Lifton, 1960; Sampson, 1967; HansToch, 1965; and Block, Haan, and Smith, 1968) have taken a position that student alienation manifests itself in many different forms depending on the object, origin, and mode of its expression. For example, Block, Haan, and Smith (1968) have differentiated between five patterns of adjustment of youth to the contemporary social and political scene in order to show the degree of involvement with political and social issues and the degree to which the individual accepts or rejects the traditional values and the institutionalized authority of the society: (1) political apathetic youth – are characterized by their low level of the status quo; (2) alienated youth – refers to youth who have rejected traditional societal values by rebelling against the institutionalized structure of authority but are uninvolved in political and social issues; (3) individualist youth – are involved in political matters while generally accepting the status quo; (4) activist youth – are involved politically and socially but have rejected the traditional values and structures of authority; (5) constructivist youth – are described as somewhat similar to the activists in their degree of involvement in social and political matters but unlike activists,

however, they seek to work within the existing framework of society to produce change.

Keniston, 1965; Berger, 1970; Flacks, 1967; Koeppen, 1969; and others, on the other hand, have identified two forms of youth behavior: (1) a passive retreatist response, the defining features of which is withdrawal from and rejection of traditional social values, norms and institutions (for example, the hippi sub-cultures); and (2) a more active radical response, the defining characteristics of which is participation in a demonstration or group activity that concerns itself with some political, social or ethical principle (for example, student political movements).

These forms of contemporary youth alienation as suggested by Flacks, Keniston and others, though appearing in the literature on the student behavior as the most common forms of the youth alienation, exhibit confusion and ambiguity. Keniston (1967), for example, by contrasting students who withdraw from interest in politics and participation (whom with those who are activists, has only shown how these students react to their social and political grievances fails to discuss and measure in a comparative manner the level and degree of their alienation. Such misconstruction often gives an impression that the youth most involved in social and political activities do not seem to be the type one would expect to be alienated.

To avoid such misconception, Schwartz (1973) has correctly justified that not only the attitude of alienation is significantly associated with both withdrawal and activism as behavior orientations but that withdrawal and activism can be understood as part of the same psychopolitical process. That is, both active and psychologically alienated students express feelings of estrangement, apathy, meaninglessness, disaffection, powerlessness, etc., from certain aspects of their society. Nevertheless, the manner in which these students express their sense of alienation is different. Psychologically alienated, non activists, and/or uncommitted students express their sense of alienation in a passive retreatist response. The defining feature of which is withdrawal from and rejection of dominant social and political values, norms and institutions (for example, the hippie sub-culture). On the other hand, active political alienated or committed students express their feelings of alienation in a more active radical response, the defining feature of which is participation in a demonstration or group activity that concerns itself with some political, social or ethical principle (for example students political movement).

Thus these two groups share similar feelings of alienation from essentially similar objects but are different in the manner or mode of expression of their alienation.

Conceptualization of Activist and Non-Activist

It is abundantly clear that no single factor will suffice to explain the student activism and passivity as a "behavioral pattern". According to Keniston (1967, p. 116), "even if we define an activist narrowly as a student who (a) acts together with other in a group, (b) is concerned with some ethical, social ideological or political issue, and (c) holds liberal or radical views, the sources of student activism are complex and interrelated. Keniston (1967, p. 116), has identified four kinds of factors involved in any given protest: "First, the individuals involved must be suitably predisposed by their personal backgrounds, values and motivations. Second, the likelihood of protest is far greater in certain kinds of educational and social settings. Third, socially-directed protests require a special cultural climate; that is, certain distinctive values and views about the effectiveness and the meaning of demonstrations and about the wider society. And finally, some historical situations are especially conducive to protest".

Accordingly, it has been argued that any systematic analysis of student activism and passivity must come to grips with several different situations which set the stage for the activistic pattern. Sampson (1967, p. 8), suggests that "each of these situations may be seen as providing the force which acts on the person or group and which motivates

their behavior. It also sets the conditions which maintains, enhances, or undermines the activist pattern".

Lifton (1960, 1963, 1964) and Keniston (1967) have argued that the "transformationist" (Utopian, Marxist, universalistic or democratic) aspirations of activist youth in rapidly developing nations often seem closely related to their personal frustrations under oppressive regimes or at feudal practices in their societies as well as to their personal sense of loss of a feudal, maternal and organic past. Furthermore, youth movements "have traditionally been highly ideological, committed either to concepts of universal democracy and economic justice or to particularistic values of brotherhood, loyalty, feeling and nation" (Keniston, 1967, p. 129).

According to Keniston (1967), breakdown of family life, high rates of divorces, and softness of modern living and above all parental over-indulgence and spoiling have contributed to the prevalence of youth alienation.

Feuer (1963) and some contemporary scholars have attributed youth alienation to unsolved oedipal conflicts and negative identification with parents. For Feuer psychological alienation as represented by the uncommitted and/or non-activist and activist political alienation as represented by committed and/or student political activist are inseparable.

Finally, Flacks (1967) has viewed student political alienation as a direct expression of a perceived discrepancy between the values imposed by parents and the prevailing practices of the society. For Flacks, activist political alienation is not born out of rejection of parental values, but rather out of successful socialization.

In the literature on the student alienation a common distinction has been made between a pattern of behavior which is activist and one which is non-activist. A conceptual definition of two varieties of alienation must be emphasized if one is to adequately offer an in-depth analysis of the student activism and passivity as well as an examination of the differential origins of these two types.

In a general sense, the defining feature of the "alienated activist", as presented by Flacks (1967); Keniston (1967); Bay (1967); Sampson (1967); Trent and Craise (1967) and others is participation in a demonstration or group activity that concerns itself with some political, social or ethical principle. Being highly committed to some social or political cause, the activist believes that the traditional social and political institutions in his society have failed and must be replaced by new participatory and decentralized institutions. He is a politically optimistic protestor with a program, purpose or coherent ideology of radical reform and revolution. Being interested in socio-political reform and reconstruction, the activist

actively attempts to transform his society. His movement, according to Hans Toch (1965: 5) has several key elements: (a) relatively long lasting large groups, (b) arise spontaneously, (c) a clear program or purpose, (d) aimed at correcting, supplementing, overthrowing or in some manner influencing the social order, (e) a collective effort to solve a problem that many people feel they have in common. Finally, content of many of the activistic behavior of committed or politically active alienated students is more altruistic than egoistic or personal. Keniston (1967) sees these alienated students as demonstrating actively not because they see their own interests are threatened, but rather because they see others as the unwilling victims of social injustices. Nettler (1952) too admits that alienated activist "may be more sensitized to the wounds of anonymous others, and, hence, more altruistic" (pp. 676-677).

The defining characteristic of the "alienated non-activist" and/or "psychologically alienated pessimist" according to Bay (1967), Mehra (1971), Flacks (1967), and Keniston (1967), is withdrawal from and rejection of traditional social values, norms and institutions. Philosophically, he is too pessimistic and unconcerned to engage in any kind of organized protests. His demonstrations of dissent are private through nonconformity of life-style, behavior and ideology, through personal experimentation in hallucinogenic drugs and through efforts to enhance his own

subjective experience. Lacking a program, purpose or coherent ideology of action and radical reform, the alienated passivist has undergone a regressive self-transformation that leaves his society relatively unaffected. He shows his disapproval of and disinterest in politics and social reconstruction and is convinced that society is beyond restoration and considers dropping out the only alternative solution. He finds his life lonely and meaningless, with nothing to look forward to. The world seems an empty wasteland to him, a deep existing void. Reading Kafka or Camus, he identifies strongly with "The Stranger", and sees himself as living on the fringes of the feeling world, an observer rather than a participant. He remains observer but not participant – or rather his participation consists of observation. Finally, content of his activistic behavior is egoistic or personal. In appearance he is bearded, long-haired, dirty and unkept, and comes across as profoundly disenchanted with society. He is popularly portrayed as an experimenter in Zan and drugs and conventional in his daily behavior and life style. He is described as personally frustrated and unhappy, often deeply maladjusted as a person and a failure in life.

Thus, viewing youth alienation expression in two major forms as a passive retreatist response and an active radical response does imply that the attitude of alienation is significantly associated with both activism and withdrawal

as behavior orientations and that withdrawal and activism
can be understood as part of the same psycho-political
process. Both activists and non-activists usually do the
same things but they do them in a special way; they differ
not in "being alienated" but "how to express" their sense of
alienation. They find their way into behaviors where their
humanistic or dramatic interests could be expressed.

Viewing both activists and non-activists as alienated,
however, does not imply that they are not different in their
psychological, ideological and social-economic backgrounds.
Review of the literature on the youth alienation and
activism has revealed distinct differences in the behavioral
pattern and characteristics of the active and passive
student.

The point-by-point contrast of an alienated ideology to
an alienated non-activist ethos by Keniston (1965, pp.
79-81) clearly indicates manifestation of attitudes in both
groups:

ALIENATED ACTIVIST OUTLOOK	ALIENATED NON-ACTIVIST OUTLOOK
1. Commitment:	1. Distrust of commitment:
- human nature basically good	- low view of human nature
- closeness, togetherness	- repudiation of intimacy
- team-work, social-mindedness	- rejection of group activities
- usefulness, need for civic and political activity	- futility of civic and political activities
- praise of democratic culture	- rejection of democratic culture
- resolution, decisiveness	- vacillation, hesitation to act

2. Optimistic idealism

- optimism about future
- confidence about world
- universe orderly, structured, purposive
- truth objective and necessary

- meaning found in universe

- possibility of mutual under-standing
- appearances trustworthy, taking at face value
- long-range universally grounded values

3. Friendliness, respect and admiration

- disapproval and denial of resentment; acceptance
- tolerance, respect
- self-confidence
- sociocentricity in friendly world

4. Achievement Goals

- activity, manipulation, doing

- saving for tomorrow
- instrumental work

- reason, self-control, self-discipline
- socialized individualism
- social participant
- drive to succeed

2. Pessimistic existantialism

- pessimism about future
- anxiety about world
- universe chaotic, unstructured, meaningless
- truth subjective and arbitrary
- meaning created by individual
- impossibility of true communication
- appearances usually misleading
- short-range personally centered values

3. Anger, scorn, and contempt

- justification and admission of resentment; rejection
- intolerance; scorn
- self-contempt
- egocentricity in egocentric world

4. Aesthetic Quest

- awareness, experience, sentience, being
- living for today
- self-expression and creativity
- passion, emotion, feeling

- isolated individualism
- social outsider
- rejection of success

The perception of the system of the <u>alienated activists</u> is similar to those of the <u>alienated non-activists</u>. However, the activists are unwilling to accept their situation with-out trying to do something about it. They may temporarily be willing to participate within "the rules of the game" of the very systems from which they are alienated – voting and

peaceful demonstrations being appropriate examples of this.
In spite of this marginal or prosystem behavior, they
frequently belong to a movement, party, or group which is
ultimately dedicated to the overthrow of the system. All of
their activities, within the system and against, are aimed
ultimately at its radical change and overthrow. Outside and
against the system, they may fulfill clandestine roles
poised to undertake violence, illegal strikes,
assassination, revolution, coup d'etat, and civil war; in
fact, anything to achieve their ultimate goal.

Whereas alienated activist has a program purpose or
coherent ideology of radical reform and revolution, the
alienated nonactivist lacks a coherent ideology of action.

Moreover, the activists and the non-activists differ in
the way their rejection of the norms and values of their
society is expressed: the activist actively attempts to
transform his society; the non-activist, in contrast, has
undergone a regressive self-transformation that leaves his
society relatively unaffected. Despite occassional agreement
in principle between he alienated and the activist, cooper-
ation in practice between the two has been rare. Activist
accuses the alienated of irresponsibility. While the alien-
ated is convinced that the activist is moralistic, uptight,
and uncool. Whereas activism denotes commitment and
participation, passivity denotes lack of concern; whereas
activism indicates an optimistic confrontation with social

injustice, passivity indicates a pessimistic negativism and nihilistic political apathy.

Review of the literature on the youth alienation has also revealed distinct differences in socio-economic background of the active and the passive students.

Almost every objective study has shown that the student activists come from economically privileged, professional and educated families. They are endowed with superior intelligence, high talents and healthy bodies (Katz, 1965; Peterson, 1966; Mehra, 1971). Their grievances against the society appear to be based on no socio-economic deprivation (as described by Merton, 1959; and Marx, 1964).

Research by Lipset, 1966; Sampson, 1962; Flacks, 1967; Keniston, 1967; Schwartz, 1973; and others have indicated that the current group of student activists is predominantly in upper SES categories then is the nonactivists counterpart. According to Schwartz (1973) one reason for this is the fact that people in upper SES categories seem more likely to play out their alienation in active modes, such as reformism, rebelliousness, because they have the resources and the relative economic and social invulnerability to do so because they have learned norms of civic duty and participation that would make withdrawal a nonvalued option.

Just as the activists tend to be drawn from the upper and upper-middle-class families, they also appear to hold

views and values essentially similar to their parents than do the non-activists.

Both Keniston (1967) and Flacks (1967) have found that activism is related to a complex of values, shared by both activists and their parents. According to Flack (1967, p. 68) "where as nonactivists and their parents tend to express conventional orientations toward achievement, material success, sexual morality and religion, the activists and their parents tend to place greater stress on involvement in intellectual and esthetic pursuits, humanitarian concerns, opportunity for self-expression, and tend to emphasize or positively disvalue personal achievement, conventional morality and conventional religiosity." Similarly, as Keniston (1967, p. 117) points out "student activists come from families with liberal political values; a disproportionate number report that their parents hold views essentially similar to their own, and accept or support their activities."

It has been suggested that activists are not, on the whole repudiating or rebelling against explicit parental values and ideologies. There is some evidence that such students are living out their parents values in practice; and as Flack's (1967) study suggests activists maybe somewhat closer to their parental values than non-activists. Solomon and Fisherman (1973), studying civil rights activists in the United States, argue that many demonstra-

tors are "acting out" in their demonstrations the values
which their parents explicitly believed, but did not have
the courage or opportunity to practice or fight for.

Zonozi's study of activist and non-activist in Iran
reveals similar results as were given by Flacks and
Keniston. According to Zonozi (1976, pp. 48-52) the value
patterns expressed by activists are likely correlated with
those of their parents. He suggests that activists may be
somewhat closer to their parents value than nonactivists.
Zonozi's study is partially based on Flack's "four value
patterns" classification (e.g., Romanticism, intellectual-
ism, humanitarianism, and Moralism). Conceptual definition
of these concepts presented by Flacks (1967, pp. 69-70) are:

Romanticism

This variable is defined as "sensitivity to beauty and
art-appreciation of painting, literature and music, creativ-
ity in art-forms concern with esthetic experience and the
development of capacities foresthetic expression concern
with emotions deriving from perception of beauty-attachment
of great significance to esthetic experience. More broadly,
it can be conceived of as involving explicit concern with
experience as such, with feeling and passion, with immediate
and inner experience; a concern for the realm of feeling
rather than the rational, technological or instrumental side

of life; preference for the real in of experience as against that of activity, doing or achieving."

Intellectualism

This variable is defined as: "concern with ideas desire to realize intellectual creativities – appreciation of theory and knowledge. Participation in intellectual activity (e.g., reading, studying, teaching, writing) – broad intellectual concerns."

Humanitarianism

This variable is defined as: "concern with plight of others in society; desire to help others – value on compassion and sympathy-desire to alleviate suffering; value on egalitarianism in the sense of opposing privilege based on social and economic distinction's particular sensitivity to the deprived position of the disadvantaged."

Moralism and self control

This variable is defined as: "concern about the importance of strictly controlling personal impulses – opposition to impulsive or spontaneous behavior-value on keeping tight control over emotions – adherence to conventional authority; adherence to conventional morality – a high degree of moralism about sex, drugs, alcohol, etc. reliance on a set of external and inflexible rules to govern moral behavior; emphasis on importance of hard work; concern with determination, "stick-to-itiveness"; antagonism toward idleness –

value on diligence, entrepreneurship, task orientation, ambition."

Zonozi's study of activist and non-activist shows that these values are highly related to activism (see table 1). Moreover the value patterns expressed by activists are highly correlated with those of their parents.

Table 1

Scores on Selected Values by Activism (%)

	Activists	Non-Activists
a. Romanticism		
high	54	22
medium	26	42
low	20	36
b. Intellectualism		
high	63	9
medium	32	51
low	5	40
c. Humanitarianism		
high	47	3
medium	34	28
low	19	69
d. Moralism		
high	52	49
medium	36	22
low	12	29
N	22	28

Source: (Ahmand Zonozi, 1976: 51)

Moreover, Zonozi's study indicates that like American student activists, Iranian student activists come from

families with liberal political values. A disproportionate number have reported that their parents hold views similar to their own, and accept or support their activities.

Another major factor which distinguishes activist from nonactivist is family structure. While few empirical study has tested this hypothesis, is seems probable that in many activist – producing families, the mother will have a dominant psychological influence on her son's development (Keniston, 1967, p. 120). Flack's finding that the mothers of activists are likely to be employed, often in professional or service roles like teaching and social work, is consistent with this hypothesis. It is abundantly clear the in American middle-class families, it is the mother who actively embodies in her life and work the humanitarian, social and political ideals that the father may share in principle but does not or cannot implement in his career. Furthermore, it is expected that middle-class families in the U.S. place a big premium on self-expression and intellectual independence, encouraging their children to make up their own minds and to stand firm against group pressures. Once again, as Keniston (1967, p. 120) points out, the mother seems the most likely carrier and epitome of these values, given her relative freedom from professional and financial pressures.

While no empirical study has tested this hypothesis in Iran, it seems probable that because of the traditional

nature of family structure, in many Iranian activist-producing families, it is the father who has a dominant psychological influence on his son's development. Moreover, in contrast to American middle-class women, Iranian middle-class women do not have greater social and financial freedom to work. As a result, than it is the father who actively embodies in his life and work the humanitarian, social and political ideals that the mother may share in principle but does not or cannot implement in her career.

Research by Bay, 1967; Keniston, 1967; Lipset and Altbach, 1966; Zakikhani, 1978; Zonozi, 1976; Bill, 1969; Lewis, 1977; Astin, 1970; Schwartz, 1973; Feurlicht, 1978; Feuer, 1973; Hein, 1974; Heist, 1965; Flacks, 1967; and others have indicated distinct differences between the student activists and non-activists in terms of academic achievements, level of education, marital status, sex, age, degree of exposure to the mass-media, group size, political ideology, form of alienation, and organization membership.

In terms of academic achievements, some studies (Bay, 1967, p. 76; Keniston, 1967, p. 117) indicate that activists tend to do better than nonactivists. That is, the higher the students' grade point average, the more outstanding his academic achievements, the more likely it is that he will become involved in any given political demonstration, Zonozi (1976, p. 31) in his study of activist and non-activist in

Teheran University has found similar results. A disproportionate number of activists reported higher GPA and better academic achievement than did nonactivists.

Activism also is related to the level of education. Lipset and Altbach 1966 and Keniston, 1967 have found that the most effective protest leaders have not been undergraduate, but teaching assistants, graduate and young faculty members. Zakikhani (1978) finds the similar result — Among activists in Iran. A disproportionate number of activist was found among graduate students (57%) than was among undergraduates. One reason for the positive relationship between level of education and activism as Keniston (1967, p. 122) mentions, is that "teaching assistants, graduated students and young faculty members tend to be in daily and prolonged contact with students, are close enough to them in age to sense their mood, and are therefore in an excellent position to lead and organize student protests".

Zakikhani (1978) in Iran and G. Victor (1973) in the U.S. have found that married students are less alienated and more politically active than singles and singles are less alienated and more politically active than widow students.

Zakikhani (1978) in his study of Iranian student activists and non-activists has found a statistically significant relationship between student activists' and non-activists' social isolation and their marital status. That is, widowed nonactivists were more social isolated than widow activists;

single student non-activist were more social isolated than single activists; and married student non-activists were more social isolated than married student activists (pp. 46-48).

Just as activists tend to differ from non-activists in terms of marital status, so they do in terms of sex.

Several studies (e.g., Geshwender, 1974; Victor, 1973; Lewis, 1977; Zakikhani, 1978; Astin, 1970; Watts, 1969; Watts & Whittaker, 1966; Douban and Adelson, 1966) conducted in Iran and in the United States indicate that males are more active than females.

The expectation of higher activism rates for males is based upon known differences in the socialization of males and females. Douvan and Adelson (1966, pp. 149-155) in their study of American adolescent experience, have argued that girls are socialized in such a manner as to develop a greater degree on one type of autonomy than boys (e.g., greater responsibility at home, working and dating at an earlier age), but at the same time to develop less striving for independence from parents and a more passive, complaint orientation toward parental and toward all adult authority.

Similarly, Geshwender (1974, p. 306) has found that in American society females are expected to be less active than males because they develop a lesser degree of independence from parents.

Zakikhani (1978) in his study of the Iranian students alienation and activism has concluded that male students are more likely to involve in politics and actively participate in social affairs than female students. Student activists and non-activists also differ in terms of their degree of exposure to the mass-media. Schwartz (1973, p. 191) has suggested that today's American student activists are not likely to want to screen out political stimuli and, hence, that there is not a behavioral tendency for the activists to perceptually block political communications. Thus student activist will tend to seek significantly more, rather than less, political information.

In contrast to student activism, student alienation and non-activism, according to Schwartz (1973), is significantly associated with low political involvement, low interesting politics, blockages to perceiving or leaning political information, perceptual distortions of political phenomenon and viearious or excapist use of the mass-media.

Zonozi's study also indicates that activists in contrast to non-activists use the media effectively; and they generally succeed in their goal of making themselves and their causes highly visible. Thus student activism is actually associated with a predisposition to seek political information from nonsystem sources. Zonozi's study has indicated that student activists who negatively evaluate news-

papers tend to read more revolutionary, but not significantly more ordinary political material.

Another factor which affects students activism and passivity is age.

Probably the largest segment of the population which has been called activists in recent decades is youth, that is, the age group from about sixteen to about thirty years.

Keniston, 1967; Flacks, 1967; Feurlicht, 1978; Hein, 1974; Feuer, 1973; have argued that many young Americans from being uncommitted have a strong social and political conscience. Even in the silent generation, young people have shown self-sacrifices for social causes whenever the action was in line with their experiences. Hein (1974) has stressed the moral superiority of the young people. "Youth", according to Hein (1974, p. 39), "is unselfish in thinking and feeling. The older people, however, are egotistical and petty." Feuerlicht (1978) also stressed that the young activists are not self-alienated since they are preoccupied with their self or with the search for their self. Thus, young activists greatly helped at the flood disaster in Hamburg in 1962. Years later, hippies, alienated from society and sometimes called parasites, aided in the fight against forest fire near Berkely and also took a hand at the founding of a people's park in Berkely. Many graduates of law schools declined successful careers was Wall Street and corporation lawyers in order to assist the destitute. Fifty-one percent of the students of an American University

answered in a poll that they planned after graduation to help others, in social work, teaching, and so forth (New York Times, May 26, 1969, p. 39). Zonozi (1976, p. 84) has found that the young Iranian activists (16-25 years of age) belonged to an intellectual and social elite; They constituted 54% of the students. Their parents were mostly well off liberal. for many, being and working together with other young people in a teach-in, a sit-in, a demonstration, or a strike was a new and great experience which gave some of them a happy feeling of their selves and of a worth while goal in life they had never known before.

Size is another distinctive characteristic of activists and non-activists groups. The results of several studies in the United States (Peterson, 1966; Heist, 1965) and data from the Trent and Medsker (1967) study of high school graduates across the nation, all lead to the same conclusion: whereas student activism involves a very few select students in a very few select colleges and universities, student nonactivism and alienation is associated with many students in many colleges and universities. Peterson (1966) found that at most, only nine percent of any student body were reported as involved in protest movements.

Peterson's findings are compatible with Heist's research (1965) on student activism on the Berkeley campus. Heist observed that student political advocacy has taken place since 1960 on a few campuses in the United States.

In contrast to Peterson's and Heists findings, Borhanmanesh and Zakikhani have observed that student activism in Iran involves many students in many colleges and universities. According to Borhanmanesh (1965, p. 72) at most, 67% of any student body were reported as involved in protest movements.

Zakikhani (1975) also found that a greater proportion of student activists (58%) has been found in Iranian colleges and universities than non-activists.

Furthermore, research by Schwartz, 1973; Flack, 1967; Keniston, 1967; Zonozi, 1976; and others have demonstrated that whereas activists are politically optimistic, have coherent program, purpose or ideology of radical reform and revolution, denote commitment, indicate an optimistic confrontation with social injustice, the non-activists lack a coherent program or ideology of social reform, unconcerned to engage in any kind of organized protests, and indicate and pessimistic negativism and nihilistic political apathy.

Another major factor which distinguishes activists from non-activists is their form of alienation. Nettler 1952; Keniston, 1960 and 1967; Etzioni, 1968; Schwartz, 1973; Feurerbicht, 1978; Johnson, 1973; have argued that whereas

activists are _social_ alienated, non-activists are social and self-alienated.

According to Feuerlicht (1978, p. 109) more than 60% of student activists are almost totally alienated from society, but they are not self-alienated since they are preoccupied with their self or with the search for their self. Keniston (1968) has found that in contrast to passive alienated students, the content of many of the activistic behavior of committed or politically active students is more altruistic than egoistic or personal. Keniston sees these student activists as demonstrating actively not because they see their own interests are threatened, but rather because they see others as the unwilling victims of social injustices. Nettler, too, admits that activists "may be more sensitized to the wounds of anonymous others and, hence, more altruistic than non-activists" (pp. 676-677).

Schwartz (1973) also has suggested that the activists of today rather than merely perceiving themselves as ineffedicacious have a perception of the system as inefficacious.

Zakikhani (1978) found that more than 56% of Iranian students activists are alienated from Iranian society, but are not self-alienated. His findings indicate that 72% of the content of the activistic behavior of politically active students tends to be altruistic than egoistic or personal.

Moreover far from being uncommitted, they have a strong social and political conscience.

Finally, as some studies (e.g., Flack, 1967; Keniston, 1967; Zakikhani, 1978) have found there is a positive relationship between activism and organization membership. Because, as Keniston (1967) has pointed out "some student organizations have the key organizational ingredient that may in time produce an organized student activist movement. Activists argue that group action is more effective that purely individual acts".

In contrast to the activists, content of activistic pattern of the student passivists is more egoistic than altruistic. They are unconcerned to engage in any kind of organized protests and prefer more purely individual acts.

It seems fair to conclude, then, student activists are characteristically from families which are urban, highly educated, professional and affluent; and psychologically and ideologically their backgrounds are often very different from non-activists.

CHAPTER III

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

Introduction

Lengthy discussion could easily be generated from the studies and/or researches of numerous writers as well as leading contemporary social theorists relating to the notion of student alienation and activism. Our objective here, however, is to present those contributions which more clearly bear on the problem under investigation. This requires that we focus primarily on empirical studies of the student alienation and activism.

The inclusion of major studies on the student alienation and activism which contain pertinent empirical data requires specification of a criterion. Roughly, four "types of studies" can be defined under this category depending upon their varying degrees of theoretical and empirical content.

The first type, type "A" includes those studies which lack reference to any theoretical foundation on which they were dependent. Type "B" studies consist of studies which contain a discussion of

112

the theoretical premises on which they were based. Type "C"
includes studies which were done in such a way as to evaluate
or refine theoretical concepts of alienation. Type "D"
consists of primarily theoretical studies which also
contained empirical data used to support the theory.
Secondary empirical studies done by persons other than the
author of the theoretical work are included here.

Review of Selected Literature

One of the major studies in the area of the student
alienation and activism is Corwin's Education in Crisis: A
Sociological Analysis of Schools and Universities in Trans-
ition (1974). In this major work, Corwin considers "activism"
to be the response of individuals who experience one of three
types of inconsistencies: (1) status inconsistencies -- a
young person is defined as a child in some respects and an
adult in others, (2) discontinuities between different stages
in the life cycle, that is status expectations and values
inculcated in one stage of life are not rewarded later, (3)
disparities among institutional sectors, i.e.

values endorsed in the home might be contradicted in the
school or college.

Corwin's (1974) basic ideas regarding student activism
centers around what he calls paremeters of conditions which
must exist for activists movements to emerge. Thus we can
see that he is drawing heavily upon many sociological
elements of social change. Although he makes references to
activism throughout history and the globe, most of his
comments are directed towards the activism of the 1960's in
this country. This particular writing of Corwin's was
published in 1974 and thus provides us with much hindsight
regarding this period. He views the activism of the 60's as
more unprecedented that other times in the U.S. although one
could draw a slight parallel between the activism of the
30's and the 60's. Corwin views the activism of the 60's as
more political issues. He sees that grievances are rooted
outside the university and not at specific issues of the
school. The campus is seen as neutral ground and a microcosm
of the society at large. Again, bringing into play the
elements of organizational structure mentioned earlier.

Corwin identifies four types of conditions that must
simultaneously exist for activist movements to emerge. The
first is predisposing conditions that incline certain types
of individuals to become activists. In this condition he
explores the concept of who becomes involved in activism. He
draws heavily from Keniston and finds that the stereotype

image of an activist is not supported. He finds that most activists come from high status middle class families, have politically liberal fathers, major in social science or humanities, are intellectually oriented, and have highly humanitarian philosophies. He also feels that for involvement the situation must be "ripe" for change, that is, the value climate must be conducive to activism and there must be structural support for it. Closely allied to this is his idea of a new culture which he sees as emerging because of a high concentration of people with shared values in the school setting.

The second condition is that of _facilitating_ conditions that establish a value climate favorable to activism. Here he explores the "conflict of generations" which he sees as having a psychological interpretation as well as cultural dimensions. Drawing from a Freudian analysis he sees that student movements occur whenever the elder generation, through some historical failure, has become "deauthorized" in the eyes of the young. Many of the cultural dimensions can be seen in value conflicts between generations. This is particularly exemplified by Slater (1970). Also closely associated with this strain of thinking is Richard Flacks (1967) and his identifying of various values of the new value system of romanticism, intellectualism, humanitarianism, and rejection of moralism and self-control.

The third condition deals with <u>structural supports</u> that sustain activism. Corwin states that the roots of the generation gap extend deep into the social structure. He analyzed such aspects as demographic structure, social stratification, and social change. Regarding social change he acknowledges the often repeated theme that the most student activism occurs during the time of the most social change. Technology also plays an important role in change and its impact recently has been most influential, as Keniston (1965) notes the decade of between 1950-1960 had more differences than preceding decades. Corwin sees the generational conflict as being more than acting out against one's parents. He states that between the two generations there are many shared values and that much of the new culture is adopted or based upon the old. He states that although social change and value differences can fuel activism something else must account for why certain epochs of rapid change lead to student activism while others have not. For example, in the United Stated during the 60's activism was initiated over many causes and with much rapidity, yet during the "Watergate era" there was little if any student activism. Certain ingredients or as Corwin says condition of inconsistencies must simultaneously be present for action. Other aspects considered in the third condition are the ideas of child permissiveness or the "Spockian" child. However, if there is any credence here it is more pertinent to our issue

to realize that the inconsistencies between the home and the
university are more critical than whether one institution is
more authoritarian than another.

The fourth type of necessary condition is _triggering_
mechanisms, that provoke activism in particular instances
where these other conditions are present. The first three
conditions are centered around what predisposes people to
activism. This last condition is concerned with the
mechanism located within the structure of educational insti-
tutions that actually trigger activism. One of the first
areas examined here is that of size and alienation. The evi-
dence shows that larger institutions are more prone than
smaller ones to activism. This is also verified by Erickson
and Brookover (1975) who use the student body size of 1,000
as an indicator of size and activism. Corwin felt that the
best predictor of incidence for student demonstration was
the size of the student body. He felt that the size and
alienation syndrome did not hold up since few protests were
aimed at class size, inability to meet with administration,
faculty, etc. Also, quality of institutions needs to be
considered because many of the prestige schools are looked
to for natural and community affairs and thus become a
target area for broader interests. Other factors such as
teaching versus research, narrow specialization, control
structure, faculty hierarchy and extra curricular activities
were explored. Regarding these areas he felt that student

activism can help to compensate for these forms of status deprivation.

In summary Corwin feels that activism is caused by a combination of ingredients and that organizational characteristics of educational institutions are among the most essential of these ingredients. In line with this he feels that perhaps the most significant effect of activism will be to produce lasting structural change in the educational, social, and political systems of society.

Keniston (1965; 1967) perhaps is one of the major contributors to the area of student alienation and activism. His theory of student alienation and activism is based on his research conducted on the alienated Harvard students.

His study offers an in-depth analysis of two varieties of activism, their sources, and his assessment of their future directions and possibilities. His key distinction is between the activists and the alienated students. His discussion examines both the differential origins and present status of these two types.

Keniston (1965) characterized his activists as highly committed to some social or political cause. Philosophically, the activist believes that the traditional social and political institutions in his society have failed and must be replaced by new participatory and decentralized institutions. The psychologically alienated student, in

contrast to the politically optimistic protestor, is too pessimistic and unconcerned to engage in any kind of organized protests. His demonstrations of dissent are private through nonconformity of life-style, behavior and ideology, through personal experimentation in hallucinogenic drugs and through efforts to enhance his own subjective experience, he shows his disapproval of and disinterest in politics. Whereas the activist is interested in social reform and reconstruction, the alienated is convinced that society is beyond restoration and considers "dropping out" the alternative solution.

Keniston's studies of the uncommitted and the young radicals led him to suggest that political alienation is the diametric opposite of psychological alienation. Whereas activism denotes commitment; alienation denotes lack of concern; whereas activism indicates an optimistic confrontation with social injustice, alienation indicates a pessimistic negativism and nihilistic political apathy.

In addition, Keniston examines the likely direction of each types' development should there be changes in the degree to which thier patterns of response receive institutional or cultural sanction. He suggests that the direction of change for the activist student would be towards a concentration in the world of academics, whereas the alienated student would move more towards withdrawal into privatism and dysfunctional illness.

Studies of student activists have further demonstrated the importance of familial socialization experiences in the biographies of these young persons. Parents of protesters are typically upper-middle-class professionals of liberal political persuasions, decision-making in the family is democratic, and children are encouraged to develop a sense of responsibility to others as well as a capacity to be self-reliant. Growing up in this milieu is viewed as a natural prelude to campus activism. The idealistic, left-liberal political orientations and nonauthoritarian personality traits of individuals reared in such families clash head on with inaccessible bureaucratic elites as well as with the realities of a society that has failed to realize its democratic and egalitarian ideals. Given the characteristics of activists and the structural properties of societal institutions, protest behavior is understandable, if not inevitable.

In his article, "The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest", Richard Flacks (1967) focuses upon the context of the family and examines its role in laying the groundwork for the development of activist pattern.

For Flacks, the family emerges as a key factor in producing the activist-prone individual. The discontinuity between the learnings one acquires in democratically oriented, Spockian reared families and the kind of insti-

tutional world of education and occupation one encounters on the "outside", provides a basic source for unrest and activism. Liberal, equalitarian families produce activist-prone children.

Thus, the key to Flack's argument is that there is an essential disjunctiveness between the values within the families of activist students the generally ordered, organized, rationalized life and career opportunities which are open to the activist in the university and in the society. The data which Flacks presents indicate that the activist youth has not rejected the generally permissive, democratic and equalitarian familial values – thus his response cannot be so simply conceived as a striking out against authority – but rather has encompassed them so fully that he runs all too readily into conflict with the less democratically, more bureaucratically structured university and society.

One of the few studies on the Iranian student alienation and activism is that of Zonozi's "The Iranian Activist and Non-Activist". His research reveals similar data as were given by Flacks (1967) and Keniston (1965). According to Zonozi (1976, pp. 48-52) the value patterns expressed by activists are likely correlated with those of their parents. He suggest that activists may be somewhat closer to their parents value than non-activists.

Zonozi's study was partially based on Flacks' "four value patterns" classification (e.g., romanticism, intel-

lectualism, humanitarianism, and moralism). According to Zonozi, these values are highly related to activism in Iran.

Moreover, the value patterns expressed by activists are highly correlated with those of their parents. They come from families with liberal political views; their parents hold similar views to their own, and accept or support their activities; they tend to have higher parental incomes; more parental education, higher family education over at least two generations, higher grade point average, and less anxiety about social status as compared to the non-activists.

A number of other studies, furthermore, hold that intergenerational conflict may be a probable cause of youth activism and/or passivity. These studies view values and attitudes as determinants of individual and group behavior which play an important role in one generation's under-standing of another. As a result, a variety of empirical approaches have been used to investigate the attitudes, values, and behaviors of the youth.

In his book, The Pursuit of Loneliness, Slater looks at the make up of the common culture (old) and the counter culture (new). This is not to say that activism is due to a counter culture movement, but rather to offer some idea of what is being talked about. Slater sees that the old culture is based on the idea of scarcity which he sees as spurious and the new culture as based on human needs which can be met

by plentiful resources. Thus, Slater draws the two cultures
as such:

Old	New
property rights	individual rights
technology	human needs
competition	cooperation
violence	sexuality
concentration	distribution
producer	consumer
means	ends
striving	gratification

Jacobs (1957), in a study of values, concluded that
young adults are conformists: however, because of certain
observed differences, he described the young people of the
late 1950's as the "forerunners of a major cultural and
ethical revolution" (Jacobs 1957, p. 4). In another study
conducted with students as subjects, differences between
student and parent attitudes on a number of issues were
found and it was concluded that the results were a
"remarkable illustration of the 'generation gap'" (Crookston
et al., 1967, p. 139). Similarly, Yankelovich (1969) found
that generational differences are large in the United
States. He states: "on a wide variety of subjects - war, the
draft, civil disobedience . . . large minorities of youth
(and occasionally, majorities of college youth) are sharply
critical of our economic and political system" (Yankelovich,
1969, p. 4). Parade (1970) suggested that observers of the
American social scene now believe that a "class gap," based
on the differences in attitudes between those who are

educated and those who are not as well educated, is now developing in America.

In contrast to these studies which have found evidence to support the theory that a generation gap does exist, a number of studies have found that value and attitude congruence exists between the young and the old and that the social system in the United States is in a state of generational equilibrium. Studies conducted during the 1950s and the early 1960s revealed that the average college student of that time held privatistic values and sought a rich, full life centered around family, friendships, and vocations (Mogar, 1964; Feldman and Newcomb, 1969). Fredrickson (1967), in a study of adolescent values, concluded that the results did not support the findings of research that showed a breakdown of values among America's youth. He pointed out that the subjects in his study recognized the importance of family values and that they endorsed the ideal of ethical responsibilities. With regard to the family unit, one study found no significant differences in values between parent-child combinations (see Troll et al., 1969). Hadden (1969) found that even though the youth in his study "held contempt" for the previous generation, they still conformed docilely to the stated ideals of their parents. In one of the more strongly worded conclusions, one researcher stated that he was "perplexed as to the causes for the tremendous generalization appearing in the professional literature con-

cerning normal parent-adolescent conflicts" (Offer, 1969, p. 194). His research finding did not support the theory that an adolescent subculture exists under its own set of values. Harris, in a study commissioned by Life (1971), studied a national cross-section of the 26 million Americans who were between the ages 15 and 21. His results showed that the youth are a tolerant relaxed group whose attitudes and expectations, on many issues, differ slightly from their parents. Likewise, Lambert (1971), in a study designed to measure value change, found that today's youth have values similar to their parents and are basically satisfied with the American society. In an effort to quantify inter-generational differences, the Rokeach Value Survey (1968) was used to measure student and parent values. The results showed that while a difference exists with regard to the importance that each generation assigns to certain values, both generations possess similar value systems and are in basic agreement on many issues (Penn: 1972).

Another major study in the area of student alienation and activism was conducted by Trent and Craise (1967). Their study, "Commitment and Conformity in the American College," provided a summary, discussion, analysis, and interpretation of the personality and attitude data obtained by Heist and others at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley. After examining the collegiate activist and contrasting his personality and intellect with that

of the non-activist, they concluded that activists had far
more interests in intellectual inquiry, tolerance for ambi-
guity, objectivity, independence of thought, and involvement
with educational as well as political activists than non-
activists.

In like manner, Bay (1967) in his "Political and Apoli-
tical Students: Facts in Search of Theory", picked up on a
body of social psychological literature on student atti-
tudes and activism, and developed the thesis that the radi-
cal attitudes of the left-end of the political spectrum are
associated with a less ego-defensive, more intelligent and
reality-oriented approach to life. He developed his argument
within the functionalist's model of attitude formation and
change. The role of rebellion, in the existential sense as
suggested by Camus, is examined in Bay's account of the
development of these more radical political attitudes and
associated actions. He concluded that the protest - prone
type is healthier and more in touch with reality than the
conformity - socialized and non-activist individual.

Furthermore, the work of McLeish, 1968; Evelyn Dienst,
1971; and David Schwartz, 1973 lent partial support to some
of the hypotheses of student alienation and activism.

Evelyn Dienst (1971), in her research on a sample of
college students at the University of California at Berkeley
delineated (using the factor analytic techniques) two dis-
tinct and independent dimensions of student alienation:

psychological alienation, and activist political alienation. Psychological alienation was found to be associated with variables represented on the subdimensions powerlessness, isolation, meaninglessnes and normlessness, and activist political alienation was related to activists associated with left-wing radical activism in the United States. While the items used in the measurement of psychological alien-ation referred to the individual's feeling abut himself and his relationships with others, the items selected to measure activist political alienation were phrased to describe the individual's feelings about the social system and its poli-cies.

Dienst (1971) found a positive relationship between the activist political dimension of alienation and various measures of intellectuality, liberalism, interaction with others, and positive self-image, and a negative relationship between the psychological dimension of alienation and measure of psychological stability, self-esteem, and ability to interact with others. She also discovered the psychological dimension to be consistent with passive retreatist and the active political dimension compatible with active radical interpretations of alienation.

Dienst's description of the personal charac-teristics of the young activists suggest that they are unusually psychologically healthy and person-ally integrated people. As Bay (1967) has argued,

some degree of political and social activism is, perhaps, symptomatic of psychological healthy and a necessary condition for a dynamic and viable society.

The work of McLeish (1968) on College of Education and University students in Britain and on non-University post-secondary students in the Province of Alberta lends strong support to these findings. For example, university students are classified into one central and eight bipolar types (McLeish, 1968) -- quietist; enthusiasts - rebels; oracular-participatory; tutor centered - student centered; group oriented - individually oriented -- on the basis of their expressed attitudes to the teaching methods lecture, tutorial and seminar. This attitudinal typology is found to be congruent with various personality structures and social - political attitudes. In particular, "enthusiasts," who express a high regard for all three teaching procedures, are found to score high on measures of neuroticism and extraversion whereas "rebels" who wrote all three teaching methods at the low extreme are, relatively speaking, tender-minded radical introverts with high scholastic standards. In other words, the latter group, the (so-called) "rebels" or "alienated" students, are relatively stable and oriented towards relevant understanding whereas it is the "enthusiasts" or "conformists" who must be classified as insecure and maladjusted. The intermediate group or "quietists", are extremely stable, tough-minded conser-

vatives with low commitment to ideas and with a high power need.

David C. Schwartz (1973), in his study of political alienation of American university students provided additional support for some of the hypotheses on the student alienation and activism. Using a sample of American undergraduates at the University of Pennsylvania, Temple University, Drexel Institute of Technology and Atlantic County Community College, he tested a hypotheses that "individuals who perceive themselves to be in fundamental irreconcilable and threatening value conflicts with the political system tend to become alienated from the polity".

The findings which Schwartz presented, tend to support his basic hypothesis, that student protest behavior ought to be interpreted, at least in part, as macro-political in its actor - meaning for the students. The sit-ins are significantly more alienated from the political than are the non-protesters and do perceive a greater degree of linkage between the university and the political system significantly than do the non-sit-ins. The student activists are also substantially more participant in the national polity and tend significantly to be more liberal in their ideological orientation to national affairs than their non-activist counterparts. Schwartz further tested a hypothesis that perceived threat from value conflict (TVC), perceived, personal, political inefficacy (PI), and perceived

systemic inefficacy (SI) are significantly associated with both passive (psychological alienated) and active (politically alienated) students.

This hypothesis was confirmed by his data, showing that TVC, PI and SI tend to be significantly associated with the attitudes of political alienation in both samples. That is there is basic similarity in the psychological process of both passive and active alienation.

Moreover, studies of student activists have demonstrated the importance of alienation experiences and societal grievances in producing protest-prone youth. For example, Ransford's work (1968) is a study of black willingness to use violence in order to bring about social change. Ransford has found that isolation, feelings of powerlessness, and racial dissatisfaction (grievances) were each associated with a willingness to engage in disorderly politics (use violence) in order to achieve social change. Finally, Parkin (1968) disclosed that a prominent characteristic of English middle-class activists was a rejection of revered British institutions. Demonstrations provided a means of these individuals to express and symbolize their estrangement from and opposition to, central societal values.

The significance of societal grievances as a predictor of activism has further led to a search for the origin of these grievances. It does not appear that grievances are a

function of either familial or university socialization
experiences. They may be the result of differential asso-
ciation, but we have no data which provide information as to
this possibility. It is also possible that participation in
political activities lead to the development of grievances
against society rather than the causal sequence suggested
above. Any survey limited to one point in time will be
unable to empirically determine the temporal sequence
involved.

The second possible interpretation relies upon a cog-
nitive-developmental approach to socialization (Kohlberg,
1969, 1972). This approach sees the development of moral
orientations as occurring in a series of stages of cognitive
orientations. Each stage appears in an invariant sequence
and is a result of the individual imposing a structure upon
his moral cognitons. The development of these stages in not
independent of external stimuli, nor is it strictly deter-
mined by them. Kohlberg (1969, pp. 362-364) notes the
general lack of good empirical predictors of moral attitudes
or behavior. However, there is a general tendency for urban
and middle-class children to move through the developmental
stages more rapidly that rural and lower-class children
(Kohlberg, 1972, p. 41).

While these findings have been replicated (for a sum-
mary of statement see Flacks, 1970), the portrayals of
activists are incomplete and oversimplified. The results of

research by Braungart (1971), Kornberg and Brehm (1971), and
Finney (1971) suggest that the usual profiles of protesters
are deficient for three reasons – the use of bivariated
analysis, the relative neglect of factors which are
temporally close to protest activities and the reliance upon
studies of compositions rather than prevalence.

Through a multivariate analysis of early socialization
experiences and background characteristics of members of
campus political organizations, Braungart (1971) assessed
the relative contributions of the variable to organizatinal
participation. This approach enables him to challenge the
accepted belief that an upper–middle class origin is a pre-
requisite for the type of family structure which produces
protest–prone youth. Kornberg and Brehm's (1971) article
examined measures of early socialization and current poli-
tical and institutional identifications of student acti-
vists. Although prior socialization was associated with pro-
test behavior, the significance of early socialization dimi-
nished substantially when considered in conjunction with
presently held ideological and institutional commitments.
Finney has argued that causal inferences may be drawn only
from studies of incidence (i.e., the proportion of students
having trait X who are activists) and not from studies of
composition (i.e., the proportion of activists who have
trait X). Studies of composition have their greatest poten-
tial for obfuscation when they do not involve the use of

representative sample of students for comparative purposes.
Most research in this area consists of studies of compo-
sition and many do not utilize a representative sample of
the general student body.

Iranian Student Alienation

Alienation has been on a steady increase in Iran,
particularly among students and intellectuals in the last
two decades. Major themes in the writings of many modern
Iranian writers, novelists, journalists and poets have been
"alienation" and the Iranian literature of the preceding
eighty years was a literature of alienation. Indeed, writers
and novelists such as Gholam Housein Saaedi, Bahram Sadeghi,
S. Hedayat, S. Choobak, H. Gholshiri, B. Alavi, M.
Dolatabadi, Eiradj Pezeshkzad, Jalal Al Ahmad, Ali
Shariasti, and modern poets such as Neema Youshage, A.
Shammloo, S. Sepehri, N. Rahmani, and F. Farokhzad are
alienated individuals writing about alienated heroes.

It was during the last twenty years of the Pahlavi
regime that the power structure in Iran witnessed a funda-
mental transformation as the result of the development and
appearance of a professional middle-class. This new class
was composed of individuals who rested their power position
upon the skills and talents which they possessed thanks to a

modern education. The professional middle class was a non-bourgeois middle-class many of whose members, according to Cayler Young (1952) "related themselves to others through performance and service rather than through material wealth or family ties" (pp. 128-143). The members of this class were engaged in professional, technical, cultural, intellectual, and administrative occupations and included writers, artists, journalists, bureaucrats, and middle ranking army officers.

The 1956 and 1966 official censuses showed that during these ten years, the new class increased in size by over 60 percent (pp. 309, 310-35). According to the National Census of Population and Housing (1966) in 1956 approximately one out of every seventeen Iranians belonged to the professional middle class. Ten years later the proportion had come to be one in twelve (p. 35). This new class in varying degrees opposed traditional socio-political patterns. The members of this class such as technocrats, physicians, teachers, and new bureaucrats asked for justice, freedom, a quality educational system, a rational civil service, and genuine political participation and demanded less favoritism, nepotism and bribery. The depth of the challenge of the professional middle-class can be measured by studying opposition movements in Iran before and after the 1978 revolution. It was in the late 1940's and early 1950's that the new middle class formed, organized, and led both the Tuddeh Party and

National Front. The key segments of the new class, namely teachers, professors, and students, played crucial roles in major political movements of both the Tuddeh Party and the National Front in the early fifties. Although the Tuddeh Party and the National Front were destroyed by the Shah and the CIA in the mid-1950's the signs of opposition continued to spurt to the surface and were deeply tinged by middle-class coloring. For example in 1965 an attempt was made on the Shah's life; fourteen young men were subsequently arrested and brought to trial. The accused individuals were all members of the professional middle-class and half of them were either teachers or students.

It was this professional middle class who spread the seeds of the Iranian revolution of 1978 when the implicit clash between the rulers and the ruled became most visible. As Iran moved toward the Islamization of its revolution and the Ayatollah Khomenini's message of Islamic Republic became a unifying element in the revolution, major professional middle-class oriented political groups such as the National Front, Mujahedeen Khalq, and Tuddeh Party after coalition, joined the revolution. Mehdi Bazarghan the first prime minister of the Islamic Republic was the leading figure of the National Front.

Several studies in the United States (Flack, 1967; Keniston, 1967; Lipset, 1966; Sampson, 1967) and in Iran (Zakikhani, 1978; Bill, 1969; Nafisi, 1966; Borhanmanesh,

1965) have indicated that a majority of alienated students usually belong to the upper middle-class professional families. They are not downtrodden, the oppressed classes which a revolutionary Marxist theory would demand. As is suggest by Flack (1967) these are not a group of students who are marginal to the labor market, but rather the advantaged members of middle and upper-middle classes. Lipset (1966) finds that the student movements in developing nations, e.g. Russia, Japan, and Latin America, typically recruit people of elite background.

In brief, evidence both in Iran and in the United States point to the fact that alienated students, particularly activists are not drawn from disadvantaged status - anxious groups, on the contrary, they are selectively recruited from among those young Iranians and Americans who have had the most socially fortunate upbringings.

According to Bill (1963) the most alienated and explosive group within the professional middle-class is the student group. "The students are located at the key birth point of the new class for all members of this class were at some time students" (p. 9-10). The Iranian students do view themselves as members of a new middle class and as one study has revealed they are in many ways more distant from the existing upper class than from the lower (Bill, 1963, p. 31).

The Tehran-National University survey in 1966 produced some interesting results regarding the attitudes of the Iranian students toward other groups and classes.

> If a person who forms part of the group indicated below occupied a high position in government, what degree of confidence would you have that he would place the interests of the nation above those of his private interests?

Answer in Percent

	Much	Some	Little	None	No Answer
Business	4	24	30	20	22
Union Leaders	12	34	24	10	20
Religious Leaders	6	28	22	22	22
Workers	8	28	30	8	26
Industrialists	8	22	26	22	22
Large Landowner	6	14	24	34	22
The Military	4	28	22	22	24
Professionals	64	8	8	0	20

Source: (Tehran-National Universiy Survey, Tehran, 1966, pp. 68-76)

From the above answers, one can gain an insight into the attitudes of the Iranian student toward other groups and class. For example the students place a relatively strong trust in their own class. After the professionals, most confidence is placed in the workers, union leaders, and

industrialists while least is placed in large land owners, businessmen, and the military.

It is clear that the Iranian students are very much aware of class realities and that they have very little confidence in the Iranian upperclass. It is the youth of the lower and middle-classes who suffers the most and who are most alienated because they are losing the most. It was such an individual who assassinated Prime Minister Mansur in January 1965 and it was also such youth who attempted to assassinate the Shah that same year. As Gamson (1968) argues, "for the extremely alienated, not only is there little to lose through generating resistance but they can hardly be unaware that their major resources are constraints - the capacity to create trouble if their needs are not met" (p. 170).

The increased sophistication of students, as in all other groups in Iranian society, has produced greater concerns over issues of individual rights, both in the university and in the society. One of the enduring themes of the Iranian student movement is the pressure toward "universalism", that is, an increasing extension of principles like equality, equal opportunity, and fair protection of the law to all groups within the society in particular, and to all groups in the world, in general.

Thus the university grounds during the twenty five years have been centers for social and political

opposition. Iranian student movements in recent years not only have shown their rejection of dominant societal values and institutionalized structure of political authority, they have also exhibited a peculiar responsiveness to world events due to broad identification with others like themselves throughout the world. Primary identifications of such students is their sense of affinity for the El Salvadorian fighter, the exploited Polish worker, the Vietnamese peasant, the Afghan mujaheed, and the oppressed everywhere. These alienated students have realized that one of the consequences of security, affluence and education is a growing sense of personal involvement with those who are insecure, non-affluent and uneducated.

The student problem is closely intertwined with the situation of Iranian youth in general. As one report has indicated, over 55 percent of the population of Iran was less than 20 years of age; 48 percent was between the age of 15 and 30 in 1977 (Ministery of Labor, Investigation of the Problem of Manpower, Tehran 1964-77, pp. 567-570, 603-614). These figures become yet more significant when it is noted that the trends indicate an even higher percentage of young people in years to come.

Javani-Ye Purranj (Suffering Youth) of Naser Al Din Sahib Al-Zamani (1965) reveals that the Iranian student-youth has been concentrating his demands in six major problem areas: family, sexual, economic, educational, occupational, and political (pp. 22-23). All six areas are

interrelated in the sense that difficulties in any one of them may mean the same in any of the others. Sexual may mean parent-child (family) division which may lead to no money (economic) resulting in no education and therefore no job (occupation) hence political resentment and alienation.

A 1966 questionnaire distributed to Tehran and National University students provided the following information concerning the demands and priorities of Iranian university students. From the response, it is evident that these students felt that the two listed problems demanding greatest attention were inequality – injustice and the educational system. Almost one-half of them chose the former and one-third the latter:

> Below are some often important problems facing the people of this country. There are different opinions concerning which of these should be the government main task. In your opinion, to which of these problems should the government pay the most attention? Select one only.

Problem	Reply Percentage
-Bettering the spiritual and moral level of society	2
-Controlling and regulating business	0
-Eliminating inequality and injustice	46
-Improving conditions for your family	4
-Planning and expanding economic development	14
-Raising the general level of education and increase educational opportunities	30
-No reply	4
Total	100

Source: Tehran National University Survey, 1966, pp. 34-62.
(The original questionnaire was drawn up by Seymour Martin
Lipset and translated and administered by a trained Iranian
social scientist).

Several studies (e.g., Sehib al-Zumani, 1965;   Nafisi,
1966; Bill, 1963; Zakikhani, 1978) have discussed that the
young people of Iran have become more and more preoccupied
with opium, heroin, and alcohol and the suicide rate among
them is high.   Much of the difficulty is the overwhelming
force and challenge of change and this too has helped twist
and alienate him. Bill's analysis of the Iranian youth indi-
cates the relationship between those forces of change and
the depth of alienation he feels:

> The present young generation of Iran is the bat-
> tled victim of change. They are the living wedge
> of shock troops that are being mangled by a situa-
> tion that has exploded upon them . . . . He speaks
> of a great loneliness, emptiness, and insecurity
> and even coins colloqualisms to describe this
> experience.   When he says he is "hapalihapw", he
> means that the ground is constantly shifting
> beneath him and that there is nothing he can grasp
> to keep himself from falling.   He is lost,
> distrustful and cynical. He is a young man and an
> old man." (pp. 20-21).

Many alienated Iranian intellectuals and students have
held a pessimistic existential world view similar to that of
Inburn:

> He looks out on the surrounding country and some-
> how he doesn't like the view very much. He doesn't
> think it's much of an accomplishment after all. He
> thought he would really get something out of it,
> but the country just looks farther away from the
> way it was on the ground . . . . There's nothing
> he can see farther from his vantage point," says
> Inburn (Keniston, 1960, p. 39).

The detached and dropouts in Keniston's study remind us of many Iranian students today. Education, work, and life seem pointless to them, and they lack the resources to change their situation to a more meaningful one.

For many young Iranians distrust of explicit political ideology and absence of any vision of the future which might animate commitment are major obstacles. He sees himself to be powerless to enter importantly into decisions which affect his own behavior, he feels an empathetic twinge for the Freedom Fighters (Mujaheed) in Afghanistan, the Negro in the United States, the factory worker in Poland and the poor peasant in Southeast Asia (and elsewhere for that matter), who for him are kindred spirits all fighting in the same war. It is not their poverty with which he identifies, for the student activist is a part of one of society's more privileged groups; nor for that matter, is it simply a matter of feeling distressed, bearing witness and protesting the injustices he sees others subjected to. He feels that he and they share a common fate that cuts across the classic boundries of social class, race and culture: they are the victims, the people, the ones who should count but don't.

The manner in which student affairs were handled in Iran under the Shah government has greatly contributed to student resentment and alienation. The students not only demanded organizations and associations but also they wanted groups of their own without government interference and control. The government's long record of failure and inefficiency in this area, however, served to aggravate the problem. After 1954, students groups became closely supervised and controlled by the government and there were no open youth groups formed without Security Organization investigation and permission (Zakikhani, 1978; Bill, 1963).

Needless to say, the entire subject of youth and students problems in Iran has severe idio-political implications and much of the alienation and resentment continue to flow in this direction. Obviously, the policy of the political elite in responding to this situation will have an important effect not only upon the future direction this alienated group takes but also upon the future of Iran.

The Iranian political elite as well as Iran needs the commitment and support of its youth and as one Iranian leading psychologist has warned:

> The future of the youngsters of this country does not concern bridges and roads and asphalt which if cheated on only involve a material loss and can be rebuilt with new capital. If the life of the young generation of this country is lost it is not obtainable again (M. Sanawi, 1962, p. 77).

Iranian Students in the United States

The phenomena of education of Iranian students in the United States in particular and in other foreign educational institutions in general was a direct product of a social change in Iranian society. When the Iranian culture came in contact with modern Western culture in the middle of the nineteenth century, there was no infusion of cultural trends or free interaction and cultural exchange for the Iranian leaders felt inferior in power and administration. In order to overcome such short comings they sought to improve their educational systems. In other words, the contact between the Iranian leaders and the West was not organic and had no dynamic force except to motivate the state. The means of production and economic and social institutions were rooted in their long democracy, but the leaders thought that by training their administrators, they could, in turn, produce change. This was natural in a country like Iran where historically, the "well to do" has always been of greater importance than the role of institutions, the means of production and the vehicle of administration.

Thus, in contrast to European society where social development influenced the planning of education, countries like Iran, from the late nineteenth to the twentieth century, used education to awaken the people and influence society.

The first efforts to modernize Iranian education were introduced by Amir Kabir, the chief vasier (prime minister), who was primarily responsible for founding Dar al Funun, the first technical college opened in 1850. Later, under a constitutional government, educational institutions became affiliated with various ministries, and under Reza Shah these institutions provided the basis for the establishment of University of Tehran in 1933 (*International Review of Education*, 7(3), 1961, pp. 327-34; 8(3-4), 1963, pp.444-50; 9(3), 1963-64, pp.326-34).

The development of modern higher education in Iran since 1920 resulted in dramatic increases in the student population. As Table 2 indicates the number of students in higher educational institutions rose from less than 100 in 1922 to 800 in 1933-34 to nearly 25,000 in 1963-64 to 124,000 in 1973-74 to over 150,000 in 1975-76 to 180,000 in 1977-78.

Table 2

NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF

HIGHER EDUCATION IN IRAN 1922-1978

Year	Number of Students
1922	91
1933-34	795
1943-44	2,835
1953-54	9,996
1963-64	24,456
1973-74	123,114

1975-76   151,905
1977-78   182,103

    Source:

        1. Ministry   of   Labor,   <u>Investigation   of   the
           Problems of Manpower</u> (Tehran, 1964, III, pp.
           2033-2037).

        2. <u>Iran Almanac</u>, 1962 (Tehran: Echo of Iran 1962:
     ..   303).
           <u>Iran Almanac</u>, 1973-78 (Tehran: Echo of Iran,
           1973-78).

    In order to achieve a rapid modernization, the Iranian

leaders realized that they should import Western technology,

adopt Western attitudes valuing work and skill and strength-

ening the positive attitudes toward a good life. Because as

one study concluded, leaders of Iran "viewed the importance

of Western technology as inherently good because it can be

naturalized into the developmental scheme in a way that

ideological and political institutions can not" (Clark and

Mowlana, 1978, pp. 99-123).

    To acquire such technology, Iran had to rely on Western

education and knowledge. Thus education of Iranian students

in Western educational institutions was emphasized as one of

the main means of acquisition of Western technology. Subse-

quently, students became the agents of change.

    In 1851, the first group of the Iranian student began

their journey to Europe. The education of the Iranian

students abroad became most visible with the rise of the oil

economy. The tremendous income from the sale of oil products

made Iran a rich country. This, in turn, increased the

number of young Iranians receiving their education abroad.
For example, as one study indicated "in 1978 there were as
many Iranian students studying in foreign universities as in
Iran" (Mowlana, 1979, p. 108).

In the academic years, between 1970-71 and 1978-79, as
table 3 shows, increasing number of Iranian students have
arrived in the United States:

Table 3

NUMBER OF THE IRANIAN STUDENTS ARRIVED IN
THE U.S. IN THE ACADEMIC YEARS 1970/71 - 1978/79

Year	Number of Iranian Students Arriving in the United States
1970 - 1971	3042
1971 - 1972	3613
1972 - 1973	4021
1973 - 1974	6002
1974 - 1975	6723
1975 - 1976	8896
1976 - 1977	16009
1977 - 1978	25076
1978 - 1979	14328

Source: U.S. Travel Service Office of Research and Analysis,
Summary and Analysis of International Travel to the United
States. United States Department of Commerce Publication,
Sept 1970 - 1971 - September 1978 - 1979.

Under the Shah's modernization policy the efforts to
raise an educated cadre for government services continued.
This in turn, affected the expansion of the educational
system and increased students population. Raising the

general level of education and increasing educational oppor-
tunities gave rise to the demand for equality and justice.
The Iranian students became particularly demanding at two
points during the educational period and these were at the
entrance and exit points. These were, as one writer has put
it, "two dangerous and narrowing bottlenecks and crucial
junctions in the life of Iranian students" (Bill, 1963, p.
18).

Although, during the last two decades higher educa-
tional system in Iran expanded considerably but its expan-
sion was not as rapid as secondary school. Accordingly, of a
vast number of high school graduates only a small proportion
was able to enter universities and colleges. For example, as
one report indicated, in 1974 approximately one out of ten
university applicants, was accepted into the universities
(Third Educational Plan, Tehran, 1974, p. 60). And in 1974,
only one out of every fourteen applicants was admitted into
Pahlavi University (Third Educational Plan: 1974, p. 60).

An annually increasing number of secondary school grad-
uates signaled the growth of the reservoir of resentment
that existed in Iran. Thousands of the Iranian youth in the
end sought employment, but here also they encountered acute
competition and great pressures. Every year two thirds of
all secondary school graduates joined the masses of unem-
ployed and in 1975, this meant close to 25,000 graduates
(Plan Organization, Tehran, 1975, p. 112). One solution to

this problem was to take large numbers of these unemployed high school graduates off the streets and to scatter them throughout the country side, but this neither took up much of the slack nor it touched any of the qualitative questions. One Iranian journalist in his consideration of this aspect of the problem of the Iranian youth has written:

> Even if Iranian youth had political parties, heroin, and gambling, it would not be a bad idea if they could also find employment (Shahani, 1966, p. 30).

One of the acute pressure points in the form of education of Iranian youth occurred after the schooling was completed and the graduate must search for a place in society. The most serious facet of this situation concerned the Iranian educated abroad. As some studies (e.g., Zakikhani, 1978; Bill, 1963) indicate, political elite of Iran became very sensitive to the need to convince their educated young people to return. The government stressed the serious implication of losing scarce skills and talents.

In pursuing the graduates to return to Iran the Iranian government prepared movies, published special magazines and offered many attractive financial and occupational inducements. It is not accidental that it was an Iranian who directed the highly publicized United Nation Fund Study of the "brain drain". It was estimated that the country is

losing close to 1,000 educated Iranians per year to foreign countries (Zakikhani, 1978, p. 15).

Although such efforts to urge the graduates to return was taken seriously, it did not touch any of the important qualitative questions. Once returned, it was the foreign-educated Iranian who often became, as one writer has put it, "the most alienated member of his class" (Bill, 1963, p. 24). Much of the frustration was attributed to problems of readjusting to traditional patterns of personalism and influence welding as well as to employment, political, and ideological difficulties. Many also returned to Iran expecting only the highest positions and salaries. This type of returnee often felt he is entitled to influential posts in the system.

One of the serious studies in Iranian students was the UNESCO's 1963-64 study of educated Iranian returnees. Based on a preliminary sample of 1,174 graduate Iranian students educated in the United States, France and England, this extensive study revealed that only nine percent of the Iranians returning were "happy to be home again", and the rest of them were unhappy (1963-64, p. 27).

The fact that Iranian students seem to have problems of readjustment may say things about both the Iranian system and personality and alienation of the returning intellectuals. In this vein, UNESCO study reveals that 61 percent

of the Iranian returnees felt that they had changed "to a great extent" while abroad (p. 34).

Among Iranian students abroad whose families represent the lower-middle and middle class, some 50 percent do not return to Iran where, because of limited family connections, they face, as one Iranian writer points out, "meager work prospects and a consequent inability to better themselves" (Nafisi, 1966, p. 7).

Behavioral Pattern of the Iranian Youth and their Degree and Type of Adjustment to and Involvement with Political and Social Issues

The idea of the Iranian student alienation is by no means new. Much has been written by social scientists regarding alienation and discontent of the Iranian students. A review of relevant research indicates that student movement is associated with many students in many colleges and universities.

Borhanmanesh (1965, p. 7) has found that over, 67% of any Iranian student body were reported as involved in protest movements, and that the protest occurred disproportionately often in many colleges and universities.

Borhanmanesh's findings are compatible with Zonozi's research (1976) on student alienation and activism on the Iranian university campuses. Zonozi observed that strong political advocacy - has taken place since 1953 on many campuses in Iran. Zonozi in his survey of the state of acti-

vism as viewed by deans of students and equivalent officers at 78 percent of the countries four year colleges, 86% of the deans reported student activism over political rights, the issue which has evoked the most activism. Thirty two percent of the deans reported student activism over living group regulation, 68% over educational reforms, 74% over student participation in campus policy making, and 89% over academic freedom for faculty.

According to Bill (1963), the most alienated and explosive group within the professional middle-class in Iran is the student group. "The students are located at the key birth point of the new class for all members of this class were at some time students".

Zakikhani (1978) in his study of the Iranian students alienation and activism at American universities observed that a greater proportion of the Iranian students in American universities (73%) are alienated from themselves and their society as compared to nonalienated counterparts. Respectively, they feel more powerlessness, more isolation, more meaninglessnes, and more detachment from dominant cultural values and norms than nonalienated counterparts.

In terms of behavioral pattern and degree and type of adjustment to and involvement with political and social issues, review of relevant research indicates a differentiation between three patterns of adjustment of the Iranian youth to the contemporary social and political scene in

order to show the degree of involvement with political and social issues and the degree to which the individual accepts or rejects the dominant socio-political values and the institutionalized authority of the society:

a)   Alienated Passive Youth

This group of the Iranian youth is distinguished by their rejection of the traditional societal values and rebellion against the institutionalized structure of author- ity, but are uninvolved, nonparticipants in the political and social arena. Judging from the studies of Zonozi (1976), Zakikhani (1978), Bill (1963), Barhanmanseh (1965), this group represents the majority of contemporary Iranian youth. These young people do not accept the prevailing leitmotifs of the societal culture. They reject its values, refuse its roles, and tend to escape from the culture by opting out.

These young Iranians have much in common with those described by Keniston (1965) who studied alienated Harvard students in the late 1950's. Keniston's alienated students had an approach to life that was primarily egocentric and aesthetically oriented.   They concern themselves with a search for adventure, the creation of experiences, and the pleasures of setience and immediated responsivity.   The alienated passive are relatively unideological, having no positively formulated set of values. They live in the pre- sent and their personal present may have little continuity

with their personal history. These young people value their individuality and freedom. They distrust commitments which imply submission of the self to long-range compromising goals. Their regard for self-expression, their pessimistic evaluation of society, their concern with existential exper- ience, and their patent refusals to accept the hypocrises they project into adulthood combine to produce an adolescent sub-culture bent on escape from the conventional society and deeply involved with experiencing. It is not surprising that consciousness-expanding drugs and other forms of mystical experiences are sought by some of these adolescents who feel estranged from society and judge issue-oriented protests to be meaningless.

b) <u>Alienated Activist Youth</u>

Youth and students in this group reject major values of contemporary society and dedicate themselves to fight, demonstrate, and protest actively against policies and institutions of mainstream Iranian society that violate their ethic and sense of humane justice. Heterogeneous in political ideology (Islamic socialism, communism, consti- tutional monarchism, etc.), they write for action on common causes. Their rejection of authority extends to their selec- tive willingness, in the face of possible arrest and prob- able incarceration. These young Iranians reject theocratic nature of the present regime in Iran as misguided. They are optimistic about the effects their protests will

have on society. They deplore the dehumanizing forces of traditional societal values and reject authoritarianism and centralism of theocracy in favor of a commitment to participatory democracy in which political power is placed in the hands of those affected by decisions. Unlike the alienated, apathetic and/or passive adolescent for whom social concerns are irrelevant, a substantial part of the lives of the activists is regulated and determined by the issues of current concern. Although sharing the disenchantment with Iranian society and influences of existential philosophy that characterizes the non-activists, the activists are more concerned with the existential act as a way of achieving integrity whereas the alienated non-activists have been more concerned with existential perception as a route to a sense of oneness. This difference in orientation toward the outer or the inner world fundamentally separates the activists from the non-activists.

The results of the relatively few available studies of the Iranian student activists (e.g. Zonozi, 1976; Bill, 1963; Borhanmanesh, 1965; Zakikhani, 1978) yield quite consistent results. These young Iranians are superior students from socially and educationally advantaged homes. To a large extent, their political values and social ideals are consonant with the values of their parents who themselves are politically active. The activists describe their parents as permissive and stressing a rational approach in

their child-rearing practices. Perhaps because they were reared in child-centered homes where communication and understanding were important, these young people value dialogue and expect that acts of protest are not impulsive, isolated episodes but are part of a pattern in which their sense of authenticity seems to require that they speak out on social and political issues that offend their image of man and society.

c) Conformist activist and/or constructivist youth

Judging from the studies of Tehrani (1980), Mowland (1979), Zonozi (1976) and Zakikhani (1978) the young Iranians in this group are distinguished by their involvement with political, social, and religious issues and their acceptance of the traditional-religious (Islamic) values and authority structure. The political, social and religious commitments of these adolescents are directed to maintaining the status quo. Their activities may include restitutive work in volunteer activities, petitioning, letter-writing campaigns, active support of pro-Islamic candidates and policies, and techniques of counter-protest as they seek to reinforce the positions of traditional/religious institutional authority. Enlistment in such activities represents a kind of commitment to effect social change in ways that involve working within the existing framework of society. They show homogenity in their common altruistic concerns. They have the zeal of the revolutionary and feel committed

to work constructively to alleviate the ills of society. They are prepared to undergo discomfort, physical hardship, isolation, or even physical danger in order to contribute to the betterment of society. For these adolescents the structure and status of the Islamic movement provide security and ideological content. Homogeneous in ideology, these young students have been influenced by the politics and morals of Islam and have directed their energies toward maintaining the traditional/religious values that they see as responsible for Iran's growth.

The organizations attracting these young people tend to have a highly formalized and hierarchial authority structure. Young people in this group also are likely to depend on adults for direction and program. They ascribe more value to interpersonal relationships and are more oriented to altruistic or humanistic values. These young people have identified with and accepted the values of their parents, which are largely within the mainstream of societal opinion. They differ from the alienated activists primarily in that they tend to be task-oriented, do not categorically reject authority, and work in ways that do not necessarily challenge the institutions of society.

Hypotheses

The premise upon which any scientific study is based, including the present one, is the necessary link between observation and the systematic arrangement of these observations into intelligible schemes. In the world of common sense each new experience must first be evaluated against what is commonly accepted as a way of judging its meaning and importance. In other words, new experiences become meaningful only when related to those things which are already meaningful.

While the case of science is similar there are important differences. Scientific observations are made from a particular theoretical context. If made in ways which guarantee objectivity, these observations can serve to clarify and redefine the theory. Therefore, unlike common sense, scientific observation is not merely judged right or wrong according to accepted standards but constitutes a corrective process.

Theory and research are not opposing sides of the scientific enterprise as some have alleged. A more enlightened view sees theory and research as clearly reciprocal and interrelated parts of a single whole. Robert K. Merton's work (1968) has been particularly illuminating on this issue in two seminal essays in <u>Social Theory and Social Structure</u>. His purpose in these two essays is to

explain precisely those ways in which theory influences research and the obverse, how research affects theory. Among the functions of theory, according to Merton, are the following: (1) to provide a general context for inquiry necessary for the derivation of determinate hypotheses; (2) to effect conceptual clarification by way of making explicit the character of the data subsumed under a concept, resolving apparent antimonies in empirical findings, and constructing observable indicies of social data; (3) providing post factum interpretations of empirical data; (4) providing empirical generalizations which summarize observed uniformities of relationships between variables; (5) to formally state the assumptions and postulates upon which hypotheses are based; and (6) to codify, that is, to systematize empirical generalizations in apparently different spheres of behavior.

In our endeavor to determine if there is a significant difference in the alienation levels of the Iranian students in the United States who are politically and socially active and those who are not prone to participate in political and social activities, we are concerned that the facts make sense. This can be done through analysis which selects and orders the facts according to certain criteria. Therefore, the first step in an attempt to answer our question must be to examine the existing theories and hypotheses concerning the student activism and passivity.

Thus, the primary focus of the present study will be based on the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis I

There is a significant relationship between activism and alienation.

While no empirical study has tested this hypothesis in Iran, Schwartz's (1973) study of political alienation of American university students has provided a partial support for this hypothesis. Using a sample of American undergraduates at the University of Pennsylvania, Temple University, Drexel Institute of Technology and Atlantic County Community College, he tested a hypothesis that the attitude of alienation is significantly associated with both withdrawal and activism as behavior orientations. The findings which Schwartz presented, tend to support his basic hypothesis, that activism and passivity (withdrawal) can be understood as part of the same psycho-political process. His findings further confirms that perceived threat from value conflict (TVC), perceived, personal, political inefficacy (PI), and perceived systemic inefficacy (SI) are significantly associated with both passive (psychologically alienated) and active (politically alienated) students. That is, there is basic similarity in the psychological process of both passive and active alienation. Schwartz's findings have led

him to suggest that both active and psychologically alien-
ated (passive) students express feelings of estrangement,
apathy, disaffection, isolation, powerlessness, etc., from
certain aspects of their society but differ in the manner or
mode of expression of their alienation. The activists
actively attempts to transform his society; the
non-activist, in contrast has undergone a regressive
self-transformation that leaves his society relatively
unaffected.

Conceptualization of activism and passivity and their
association with the attitude of alienation as suggested by
Schwartz and the confirmation of his hypothesis by empirical
data have reduced, to some extent, confusion and ambiguity
over behavior orientations of the youth and the attitude of
alienation posed by Berger, Pullberg, Keniston, Koeppen,
Flacks and others. These authors often have contrasted
students who withdraws from interest in politics and parti-
cipation (whom they call passive and/or psychologically
alienated) with those who are activists in order to show how
these adolescents react to their social and political
grievances. These writers, however, have failed to explore
empirically any association between the attitude of alien-
ation and behavior orientation of the individual. Thus such
misconstruction often has given an impression that the youth
most involved in social and political activities do not seem
to be the type one would expect to be alienated.

Hypothesis II

The higher the level of activism the higher the socio-economic status.

One of the major factors which distinguishes political activist from non-activist is his/her social class. Several studies in the United States (Flacks, 1967; Keniston, 1967; Lipset, 1966; Schwartz, 1973; Sampson, 1967) and in Iran (Zakikhani, 1978; Bill, 1969, Nafisi, 1966; Borhanmanesh, 1965) have indicated that the current gourp of student activists is predominantly upper middle class, and frequently these students are of elite origin. They are not the downtrodden, the oppressed classes which a revolutionary Marxist theory would demand. As Flacks (1967) suggests "these are not a group of students who are marginal to the labor market, but rather the advantaged members of middle and upper-middle classes".

According to Schwartz (1973) one reason for this is the fact that people in upper SES categories are predicted to be more active in their orientations to politics than are those in lower social strata. "Upper and upper-middle class individuals seem more likely to play out their alienation in active modes, such as reformism, rebelliousness, because they have the resources and the relative economic and social invulnerability to do so because they have learned norms of

civic duty and participation that would make withdrawal a nonvalued option" (Schwartz, 1973, p. 23).

Furthermore, as suggested in Keniston's (1967) article, the content of many of the activistic behavior is more altruistic than egoistic or personal. These more advantaged youth demonstrated not because their own interests are threatened, but rather because they see others as the unwilling victims of societal injustices. In other words, the privileged status of the student protesters and the themes they express in their protest are not in themselves unique or surprising. Lipset (1966) finds that the student movements in developing nations – e.g., Russia, Japan, and Latin America – typically recruit people of elite background.

Flacks (1967, p. 60) suggests that the major reason why upper and upper middle-class professional families seem more likely to play out their alienation in active modes is that:

a. Upper and upper middle-class professional homes place a strong emphasis on democratic, egalitarian interpersonal relations.

b. There is a high degree of permissiveness with respect to self-regulation.

c. There is an emphasis on values other than achievement; in particular, a stress on the intrinsic worth of living up to intellectual, aesthetic, political, or religious-ideals.

In Iran too, as some studies (Bill, 1969; Nafisi, 1966; Borhanmanesh, 1965; and Zakikhani, 1978) have indicated, the current group of student activists are predominantly upper-middle and middle-class, and frequently they are of profes-sional group origin.

The 1956 and 1966 official censuses showed that during these ten years the new class increased in size by over 60 percent (pp. 309,310-35). According to the National Census of Population and Housing (1966) in 1956 approximately one out of every seventeen Iranians belonged to the professional middle-class. Ten years later, the proportion had come to be one in twelve (p. 35).

According to Bill (1963) the most alienated and explo-sive group within the professional middle-class is the stu-dent group. "The students are located at the key birth point of the new class for all members of this class were at some time students" (p. 9-10).

Flacks (1967) in his study of the Chicago sit-in found that such actions attract students predominantly from upper--status backgrounds. When compared with students who did not sit-in, the sit-in participants reported higher family incomes, higher levels of education for both fathers and mothers, and overwhelmingly perceived themselves to be upper-middle class. Moreover, certain kinds of occupations were particularly characteristic of the parents of sit-in participants. In particular, activists' fathers tended to be

professionals (college faculty, lawyers, doctors, engineers)
rather than businessmen white collar employees or blue
collar workers. Also of significance, activists' mothers
were likely to be employed, and were more likely to have
"career" types of employment, than were the mothers of
non-activists. Similarly the grandparents of activists
tended to be relatively highly educated as compared to the
grandparents of nonactivists. Most of the grandparents of
nonactivists had not completed high school; nearly half of
the grandparents of activists had at least a high school
education and fully one fourth of their maternal
grandmothers had attended college.

In brief, evidence both in Iran and in the U.S. point
to the fact that activists are not drawn from disadvantaged,
status-anxious, under privileged or uneducated groups; on
the contrary; they are selectively recruited from among
those young Iranians and Americans who have had the most
socially fortunate up bringing. They are characteristically
from families which are urban, highly educated, professional
and affluent; and psychologically and ideologically their
backgrounds are often very different from nonactivists.

Hypothesis III

> There is an association between activism and
> organizational membership.

As some studies (e.g. Flacks, 1967; Keniston, 1967) in
the U.S. suggest activism is related to the organization

(political, social, religious . . .) membership. For example some student organizations such as S.D.S. have the key organizational ingredient that may in time produce an organized student activist movement. According to Keniston (1967, p. 112).

> The protester must believe in at least minimal organization and group activity; otherwise, he would find it possible to take part, as he does, in any organized demonstrations or activities. Despite their search for more truly "democratic" forms of organization and action (e.g. participatory democracy), activists argue that group action is more effective than purely individual acts. To be sure, a belief in the value and efficacy of political action is not equivalent to endorsement of prevalent political institutions or forms of action. Thus, one characteristic of activists is their search for new forms of social action, protest and political organization (community organization, sit-ins, participatory democracy). That will be more effective and less oppressive than traditional political institutions.

Zakikhani (1978) in his study of Iranian students alienation at American Universities has found a positive relationship between activism and organization membership. Most of the activists were found among several political organizations such as Iranian student association (ISA), the organization of Iranian Moslem Students(OIMS), the Marxist oriented militant Fedaeen Khalg (The Fighters of the people) and left-wing Moslem Mujahedeen Khalg (The crusaders of the people).

Hypothesis IV

> The higher the level of activism, the more coherent the political ideology.

The other major factor which distinguishes activists from non-activists is political ideology.

Several studies conducted in the United States (Keniston, 1965; Flacks, 1967; Schwartz, 1973) indicate that alienated students and non-activists in contrast to activists, lack a program, purpose or coherent ideology of radical reform and revolution. According to Keniston (1968: 302-304), alienated and non-activists are too pessimistic and unconcerned to engage in any kind of organized protest. Their demonstration of dissent are private. Through nonconformity of lifestyle, behavior and ideology, through personal experimentation in hallucinogenic drugs and through efforts to enhance their own subjective experience, they show their disapproval of and disinterest in politics. They are convinced that society is beyond restoration and consider "dropping out" the only alternative solution.

In contrast to the politically pessimistic non-activists, student activists are highly committted to some social or political cause. According to Keniston (1968), the activists believe that the traditional social and political institutions in their society have failed and must be replaced by ne participatory and decentralizes institutions. In this sense, then, despite their criticism of existing political practices and social institutions, they are a political optimist.

Zonozi (1976) in Iran has found similar results to that of Keniston's. According to Zonozi (pp. 29-33), whereas the student activitsts are politically optimistic; have coherent program, purpose, and ideology of radical reform and revolution; denote commitment; indicate an optimistic confrontation with social injustice, the nonactivists lack a coherent program or ideology of social reform; unconcerned to engage in any kind of organized protests; denote lack of concern; and indicate a pessimistic negativism and nihilistic political apathy.

Hypothesis V

There is an association between activism and field of study. That is, a higher proportion of the activists will be found in vocational and nonacademic fields of specialization than will the nonactivist counterparts.

Another major factor which separates activists from nonactivists is their basic value commitments. Research on the association between major field of study and activism, however shows inconsistent results. Some studies have concluded that the basic value commitments of the activists tend to be academic and non-vocational. In contrast, other studies have identified academic and non-vocational fields of study as the basic value commitments of the protest-prone students. For example, Trent and Craise (1967) and Keniston (1967) argue that the basic value commitments of the activist tend to be academic and non-vocational. It has been argued that such students are rarely found among engineers, future teachers colleges, or students of business administration. As Keniston (1967, pp. 117-118) points out,

"their over all educational goals are those of a liberal
education for its own sake, rather than specifically
technical, vocational or professional preparation. Rejecting
careerist and familist goals, activists expouse
humanitarian, expressive and self-actualizing values. Nor
are such students distinctively dogmatic, rigid or
authoritarian. Quite the contrary, the substance and style
of their beliefs and activities tends to be open, flexible
and highly liberal. Their fields of academic specialization
are nonvocational. The social sciences and the humanities."
In contrast to Trent's, Craise's, and Keniston's findings,
Zakikhani (1978), Zonozi (1976), and Bill (1969), found that
the basic value commitments of the protest-prone student in
Iran tend to be vocational and non-academic.

Zonozi (1976, p. 35) has found that over 68% of
activists in Iran come from professional classes and their
field of academic specialization are vocational engineering,
natural sciences, mathematics, medicine, and business
administration.

In terms of academic achievements, some studies (Bay,
1967, p. 76; Keniston, 1967, p. 117) indicate that activists
tend to do better than nonactivists. That is, the higher the
students' grade point average, the more outstanding his
academic achievements, the more likely it is that he will
become involved in any given political demonstration, Zonozi
(1976, p. 31) in his study of activist and non-activist in

Tehran University has found similar results. A disproportionate number of activists reported higher GPA and better academic achievement than did nonactivists.

Activism also is related to the level of education. Lipset and Altbach 1966 and Keniston, 1967 have found that the most effective protest leaders have not been undergraduate, but teaching assistants, graduate and young faculty members. Zakikhani (1978) finds the similar results among activists in Iran. A disproportionate number of activists was found among graduate students (57%) than was among undergraduates. One reason for the positive relationship between level of education and activism as Keniston (1967, p. 122) mentions, is that "teaching assistants, graduated students and young faculty members tend to be in daily and prolonged contact with students, are close enough to them in age to sense their moods and are therefore in an excellent position to lead and organize student protests".

Hypothesis VI

There is a relationship between activism and media exposure.

Results of several studies have indicated distinct differences in the degree of exposure to the mass-media by the student activist and the non-activist.

Schwartz (1973, p. 191) has suggested that today's American student activists are not likely to want to screen out political stimuli and, hence, that there is not a beha-

vioral tendency for the activists to perceptually block political communications. Thus student activist will tend to seek significantly more, rather than less, political information.

In contrast to student activism, student passivity, according to Schwartz (1973), is significantly associated with low political involvement, low interesting politics, blockages to perceiving or learning political information, perceptual distortions of political phenomenon and vicarious or escapist use of the mass-media.

Zonzi's (1976) study of the Iranian student activists and non-activists indicates that the activists use the medias effectively; and they generally succeed in their goal of making themselves and their causes highly visible. Thus student activism is actually associated with a predisposition to seek political information from nonsystem sources. Zonozi's study has indicated that student activists who negatively evaluate newspapers tend to read more revolutionary, but not significantly more ordinary material.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

The main data collection technique used to gather the required information for our analysis of alienation and activism was a six page questionnaire composed of 44 items (see Appendix I). This questionnaire was designed to provide necessary information regarding the student's general background, socio-economic status, orientations, social involvements, political ideology and participation, and state of activism and passivity.

Our reliance on the mail questionnaire as a data collection technique seemed more appropriate for this study than other techniques. One reason for this is the nature of the study. Since we dealt with the individual's attitudes and opinions, this information could be best gained by utilizing a mail questionnaire. The second reason for using the questionnaire relates to the sample. Since we attempted to utilize samples which would be selected from a list of all the Iranian students' names in several universities, an interview would not be a feasible design for this purpose.

There are other reasons, as well, for utilizing the questionnaire such as the fact that a questionnaire is

172

generally cheaper than other methods. Also, as Moser and Kallon (1972) have pointed out, the mail questionnaire avoids the problems associated with using the interview method; there are several sources of interviewer errors which may seriously undermine the reliability and validity of the survey results.

Furthermore, due to the long history of political problems in Iran and the sensitivity of the students to those issues, a mail questionnaire provided a means of ensuring anonymity of response. The cover letter explained that names were not needed on the questionnaire and that responses would be anonymous.

Pre-Test

To ascertain if the students would understand the questions and directions, and to maximize the acceptability of questions a pre-test was conducted. A sample which was composed of 15 students discouraged me from utilizing the questionnaire in the English language. There were many students who found an English language questionnaire very difficult to understand and generally a large number of students had difficulty in understanding the items which were designed to measure political and social alienation. Thus, to avoid language difficulties the questionnaire was translated into Farsi (the Persian language). In order to

guarantee the accuracy and correctness of the translation, a Persian version of the questionnaire was back translated into English by the author and some Iranian colleagues who have had mastery in both Farsi and English. The back translated copy then was compared and contrasted to the original English copy and the errors and linguistic biases were corrected.

After the questionnaire was translated, copies were distributed to a group of students to determine if there were any difficulties in understanding the questions. They were asked to make suggestions regarding the content of the questionnaire. As a result, several items were changed or improved.

Sampling Procedure and Data Collection Technique

In getting the list of names and addresses of the Iranian students in our selected American institutions of higher education we faced some problems. In spite of our requests, the University of Michigan and Michigan State University neither released the list of the Iranian students' names and addresses nor agreed to send out our questionnaire to the Iranian students on their campuses.

Western Michigan University, however, extended all means of cooperation. It not only agreed to release the list of names and addresses, but also agreed to distribute

questionnaires to the Iranian students if I provided the required materials and addressed envelopes plus the cost of mailing.

Despite the lack of official cooperation at the University of Michigan and Michigan State University, Iranian students themselves and several student organizations in these universities were extremely cooperative. Some of these organizations such as the Iranian Muslim Student Association (IMSA) not only had access to many Iranian students in both universities but also had obtained such lists from university officials for their organization. They not only agreed to release the list of names and addresses of the students but also agreed to distribute questionnaires if I provided the addressed envelopes plus the cost of mailing.

Having determined the total number of the Iranian students enrolled in the University of Michigan (94), Michigan State University (116), and Western Michigan University (104), during the fall semester of 1983, I mailed a total of 314 questionnaires to the Iranian students in these universities.

Each student was asked to fill out the questionnaire and to return it to the researcher, with the understanding that the respondent's anonymity would be protected. Thus, completion of the questionnaire was voluntary and the students were assured that their responses would only be

presented as part of statistical analyses and that data obtained from the study would not by used by the author for other purposes. Because subjects for this study were obtained from only three universities and because the population under study was relatively small, assumptions of random sampling are not valid. This fact should be taken into consideration when interpreting the results of this study.

The present population consists of 234 males and 80 females (a total of 314 Iranian students at Western Michigan University, University of Michigan and Michigan State University). A total of 104 respondents, 81 males and 23 females were enrolled at Western Michigan University. A total of 94 respondents, 68 males and 26 females, were enrolled at the University of Michigan. A total of 116 respondents, 85 males and 31 females, were enrolled at Michigan State University during the fall semester of 1983.

Several procedures were utilized to gain the cooperation of the subjects. The questionnaire was written in Farsi so as to avoid problems for those students who had difficulty with the English language. A letter was sent to the student explaining the general purpose of the study and the student was asked to remain anonymous. The letter solicited the student's cooperation in participating in the study and a return stamped envelope was included with each

questionnaire. Within three weeks after the mailing of 314 questionnaires a total of 183 questionnaires were returned.

To increase and/or accelerate the rate of response return, follow up cards were sent to the same students who had received the questionnaires. Within 10 days after the mailing of the follow-up cards a total of 29 questionnaires were returned raising the total number to 212.

Of 104 Iranian students at Western Michigan University, 81 were male and 23 were female. A total of 77 questionnaires (64 males and 13 females) which constituted 74% of the sample were returned. Of 94 Iranian students at the University of Michigan, 68 were male and 26 were female. A total of 64 questionnaires (53 males and 11 females) which constituted 68% of the sample were returned. Finally, of the 116 Iranian students at Michigan State University, 85 were male and 31 were female. A total of 71 questionnaires (56 males and 15 females) which constituted 61% of the sample were returned.

Of the 212 questionnaires which were returned, seven were eliminated because of missing pages and four were not used because they were incomplete. Subsequently, the 201 completed questionnaires (164 males and 37 females) for all three universities, which constituted 64% of the total sample, were coded and computerized for statistical analysis purposes.

Given the Iranian students' sensitive situation in the United States in terms of uncertainty, unpredictability, insecurity, as well as ideology, time, personal characteristics and cynicism, this was a reasonably desirable rate of response return.

For the total sample the mean age of the respondents is 27 years of age. The mean age for males is 28 years and the mean age for females is 25 years. These age differences and possible male overrepesentation should be considered in the interpretation of findings.

Over half of our respondents (63%) are graduate students and 37% are undergraduates. About 64% are majoring in engineering fields, 12% physical sciences and math, 8% agriculture and biology, 5% medical and health sciences, 4% social sciences and education, 5% art and humanities, 1% business, and 1% other. This corresponds to the characteristics of the Iranian student population reported by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the United States Immigration and Naturalization Services and the Institute of International Education. This also refers to the representativeness of our survey sample and makes our generalization more accurate and reliable.

Measurement and Operationalization of Variables

The questionnaire consisted of a measure of political alienation adapted from Political Alienation Ideology Questionnaire (PAI) drawn by David Schwartz (1973) (3 items), social alienation, as operationally defined by the five-item Srole measure (5 items), index of activism (7 items), sex (1 item), age (1 item), level of education (1 item), major field of study (1 item), marital status (1 item), primary place of residence (1 item), ethnic identity (1 item), religious faith (1 item), length of stay in the United States (1 item), father's education (1 item) father's occupation (1 item), mother's education (1 item), mother's occupation (1 item), family social class (1 item), annual family income (1 item), media exposure (3 items), organization membership (2 items), and political ideology (3 items).

The questionnaire permitted measurement to be made on the following variables:

1. Political Alienation: An index composed of the following three items of the "agree strongly, agree, uncertain, disagree, disagree strongly" type, adapted from Schwartz's (1973) Political Alienation Ideology Questionnaire was utilized to measure political alienation. These items have been modified so the scale can be adapted to the Iranian student situation:

a)   When I think about the Iranian government and politics,
     I generally feel like an outsider.
b)   I generally identify myself with the Iranian government
     and politics.
c)   Many people feel they used to be a part of their
     government and politics, but no longer. I feel the same
     way.

     The scale for the following items: a and c is

established as follows:

Response		Score
1. Strongly Agree	high	Strong sense of alienation from
2. Agree		government and politics
3. Disagree		
4. Strongly disagree		Strong adherence
5. Don't know		to government and
	low	politics

     The scale for the item b is established as follows:

Response		Score
1. Strongly agree	high	Strong adherence to government
2. Agree		and politics
3. Disagree		
4. Strongly Disagree		Strong sense of alienation from
5. Don't know		government and
	low	politics

2.   Social Alienation: As operationally defined by the

     five-item Srole measure:

a.   There's little use for me writing to the Iranian public
     officials and government leaders because often they
     aren't really interested in the problems of the average
     person like me.

b. Nowadays I have to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.

c. In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average person like me is getting worse, not better.

d. I believe it's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.

e. These days a person doesn't really know whom he/she can count on.

These items also have been modified so they can be adopted to the Iranian student situation.

The scale for the following items: a, b, c, d, and e is established as follows:

Response		Score
1. Strongly Agree	high	Strong sense of alienation from
2. Agree		societal values and norms
3. Disagree		
4. Strongly disagree		Strong adherence to societal values
5. Don't know	low	and norms

3. Socio-political activism: an index composed of the following seven items of the "yes, no, don't know" type was utilized to measure socio-political activism:

Have you ever taken part in:

a) picketing for a student demonstration?
b) civil rights rally?
c) a political rally?
d) voting in an election?
e) a school related demonstration?
f) a project to help the disadvantaged?
g) a student organization(s)?

The scale for the following items: a, b, c, d, e, f,
and g is established as follows:

Response		Score
1. Yes	high	High involvement in social and political activities
2. No		Low involvement in social and political activities
3. Don't know	low	

5.   Preferred Political System/Ideology:

An index of these three items of the "agree strongly,
disagree strongly . . ." type was utilized to measure
respondent's preference for political system/ideology:

a)   In the process of conflict and struggle between the
     social classes or groups in Iran, I support those who
     try to maintain and/or establish an Islamic type of
     social life under the dominant political leadership of
     the religious leaders
     _____ strongly agree   _____ uncertain
     _____ agree   _____ disagree
                                     _____ strongly disagree

b)   In the process of conflict and struggle between the
     social classes or groups in Iran, I support those who
     try to maintain and/or establish a Capitalistic type of
     social life, similar to that of the Western societies,
     under the dominant political leadership of the
     capitalist political elite
     _____ strongly agree   _____ uncertain
     _____ agree   _____ disagree
                                     _____ strongly disagree

c)   In the process of conflict and struggle between the
     social classes or groups in Iran, I support those who

try to establish a Socialist mode of life under the dominant political leadership of the urban and rural workers

_____ strongly agree   _____ uncertain
_____ agree   _____ disagree
                         _____ strongly disagree

The scale for the item (a) was established as follows:

Response

1. Strongly agree   ·   Coherent
                                         Political
                                         Ideology

2. Agree

3. Uncertain

4. Disagree   Less/incoherent
                                         Political
5. Strongly disagree   Ideology

The scale for the item (b) was established as follows:

Response

1. Strongly agree   Coherent
                                         Political
2. Agree   Ideology

3. Uncertain

4. Disagree   Less/incoherent
                                         Political
5. Strongly disagree   Ideology

The scale for item (c) is established as follows:

Response

1. Strongly agree   Coherent
                         Political
                         Ideology

2. Agree

3. Uncertain

4. Disagree

5. Strongly disagree   Less/incoherent
                             Political Ideology

6. Media exposure and/or connectedness:

An index composed of these three items was utilized to measure the degree of attention paid by respondent to TV, newspapers, and magazines:

a) On the average, how often do you follow the news about Iran on TV?
         _____ most often   _____ seldom
         _____ often   _____ most seldom
                               _____ never

b) On the average, how often do you follow news about Iran in newspaper(s)?
         _____ most often   _____ seldom
         _____ often   _____ most seldom
                               _____ never

c) On the average, how often do you follow news about Iran in magazine(s)?
         _____ most often   _____ seldom
         _____ often   _____ most seldom
                               _____ never

The scale for the following items: a, b, and c is established as follows:

Response		Score
1. Most often	high	high degree of exposure to media
2. Often		
3. Seldom		
4. Most seldom		low degree of
5. never	low	exposure to media

7.   Organization Membership

     Organization membership will be identified as the organization preference. This item will be operationalized by the following questions:

     Do you belong to any political, religious, educational, voluntary, etc. organization?
     (   ) Yes   (   ) No
     If yes, please specify_____

8.   Major field of study:

     This variable will be measured by the following item:

     What is your major field of study?_____

9.   Level of education:

     The level of education will be operationalized by the following item:

     Undergraduate pursuing Bachelor's degree (   )
     Graduate pursuing Master's degree (   ) Graduate pursuing Doctoral degree (   ) Post Doctoral (   )
     Other (   )
     Please specify_____

10. Marital status:

     This variable is measured by the following question:

What is your marital status?

Choices of response are divided into seven categories:

never been married ( ) engaged ( ) married ( )
separated ( ) divorced ( ) widowed ( )
other ( )
Please specify_____

11. Religious preference:

Religious preference is operationalized by the following question:

What is your religious faith?
Muslim Shiism ( ) Muslim Sunnism ( )
Zoroastartianism ( ) Christian ( ) Jewish ( )
None ( ) Other ( )
Please specify_____

12. Sex and age:

Both sex and age as the demographic variables are self-reported data.

Questions 1 and 2 were designed to measure these variables.

13. Family socio-economic status:

Defined as family annual income, family social class, father's education, father's occupation, mother's education, and mother's occupation.

Family annual income is measured by the following question:

What was your approximate annual family income for the
past year—before taxes?

Less than 200,000 Rials (   ) Over 200,000 Rials (   )
Over 300,000 Rials (   ) Over 400,000 Rials (   ) over
500,000 Rials (   ) Over 600,000 Rials but less than
1,000,000 Rials (   ) over 1,000,000 Rials (   )

Family social class is measured by the following item:

In which of the following categories do you place your

family social class?

____ Lower   class,   including   workers,   peasants,
     craftsmen, and lower rank employees
____ Middle Class, including small land owners, small
     merchants, professional and middle rank employees
____ Upper-class, including big land owners, factory
     owners, businessman and big merchants, highly
     ranked bureaucratic, military, and religious
     leaders.

Father's education is measured by the following item:

What is your father's level of education?

Less than high school (   ) High school (   ) College
graduate (   ) Advanced or some education beyond
college (   )

Father's occupation is measured by the following item:

What's your father's occupation (job)?

Choices of response are divided into eight categories:

____ Small business   ____ Large business
____ Professional/technical   ____ Semi-professional

___ Farmer   ___ Military   ___Landowner   ___ Other

Mother's education is measured by the following item:

What is your mother's education?

Less than high school (   ) High school (   ) College graduate (   )   Advanced or some education beyond college (   )

Mother's occupation is measured by the following item:

What is your mother's occupation?

Choices of response are divided into four categories:

___ Housewife   ___ Teacher
___ Professional/Technical   ___ Other

14. Length of stay in the United States:

Length of stay in the United States is measured by the following item:

How long have you been in the United States? _____

Choices of response are divided into five categories:

_____ One year or less
_____ 2 years to 3 years
_____ 4 years to 5 years
_____ 6 years to 7 years
_____ 8 years or more

15. **Urbanization:**

This item is measured by the following questions:

What was your primary place of residence while growing up·(0-15 years old)?

(   ) Urban Areas   (   ) Rural Areas

Method of Data Analysis

Research studies differ in such things as the type of data collected, the kind of measurement utilized, and the nature and the number of groups used. These factors help decide which statistical test is appropriate for a particular research study.

Since the nature of data determines the level of measurement, it appears that our variables like media-connectedness, organization membership, level of alienation and activism, major field of study, socio-economic status, and political ideology can be treated as categories and measured at the nominal level.

Consequently, several statistical techniques were utilized to achieve the aim of this study. Percentage and frequency tables were used and a test of chi-square was utilized to determine whether there is a significant difference between the frequencies expected under

independence and the observed frequencies in our categories. The strength of the association determined by use of Cramer's V and/or Phi. Finally, a .05 was used as the level of significance in testing of our research hypothesis. The .05 refers to our chances of being wrong by rejecting the null hypothesis when it is in fact true.

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This chapter includes three sections. The first section presents the social and demographic characteristics of the subjects. The second section attempts to differentiate subjects (students) according to their level of media exposure (connectedness), political ideology, degree of social and political alienation, and the level of activism. Finally, the third section presents the tests of the hypotheses.

Social and Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

This section presents information about the subjects age, sex, level of education, major field of study, marital status, urbanization, religion, length of stay in the United States, family socio-economic status (SES), and organization membership.

Table 4-1 presents the distribution of subjects according to their sex: more than 81% of the students are male and less than 19% are female. The percentage of males in our sample (81%) however, compares less closely with the

191

percentage of females (19%) and thus overrepresenting males in the total sample. This is mainly due to overrepresentation of the Iranian male students in the United States. According to the Ministry of Higher Education of Iran, over 85% of the Iranian students attended American colleges and universities in 1981-82 were males (Ministry of Higher Education, "Report on Overseas Students", 1981-82 Tehran, Iran, 1983).

Table 4-1

Frequency and Percentage of Students According to Sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	164	81.6
Female	37	18.4
Total	201	100.0

Table 4-2 compares the percent of students in various age groups: only 0.5% of the sample is between the ages of 18 or under, 7% between 19 and 22, 39.8% between 23 and 26, 40% between 27 and 30, and 10.5% between 31 years or more. For the total sample (201), the mean age of the respondents is 26.9 years of age. The mean age for males is 29.6 years of age and the mean age for females is 25 years.

Table 4-2

Frequency and Percentage of Students According to Age

AGE	Frequency	Percentage
18 or Less than 18 Years	1	0.5
19 to 22 Years	14	7.0
23 to 26 Years	80	39.8
27 to 30 Years	81	40.2
31 or over	21	10.5
No Response	4	2.0
Total	201	100

As illustrated in Table 4-3, out of 201 students, 74 (36.8%) were undergraduate, 101 (50.3%) were graduate pursuing Master's degree, 23 (11.4%) pursuing Doctoral degree and 2 (1%) pursuing Post-Doctoral degree. The total number of graduate students in our sample (127) constituted 63% of the total sample.

Table 4-3

Frequency and Percentage of Students According to Level of Education

Academic Level	Frequency	Percentage
Undergraduate	74	36.8
Graduate Pursuing Master's Degree	101	50.3
Graduate Pursuing Doctoral Degree	23	11.4
Graduate Pursuing Post-Doctoral	2	1.0
Other	1	0.5
Total	201	100.0

The distribution of subjects according to their major field of study has been presented in table 4-4: 64% were majoring in engineering fields, 12% in physical science and math, 8% in agriculture and biology, 5% in medical and health sciences, 4% in social sciences and education, 5% in art and humanities, and 1% in business.

Table 4-4

Frequency and Percentage of Students According To Major
Field of Study

Major Field of Study	Frequency	Percentage
Engineering	127	64
Physical Science & Math	24	12
Agriculture & Biology	16	8
Medical & Health Sciences	11	5
Social Sciences & Education	8	4
Art & Humanities	11	5
Business	2	1
Other	2	1
Total	201	100.0

Table 4-5 Compares the percent of students in accordance with their marital status: 70% of students are unmarried, 1% engaged, 24% married, 2% separated, 1.5% divorced, and 0.5% widowed.

Table 4-5

Frequency and Percentages of Students According To Marital
Status

Marital Status	Frequency	Percentage
Never been married	141	70
Engaged	2	1
Married	48	24
Separated	4	2
Divorced	3	1.5
Widowed	1	0.5
Other	2	1
Total	201	100.0

As illustrated in Table 4-6, more than 88% of the
sample came from cities and only 8% have indicated rural
areas as their primary place of residence.

Table 4-6

Frequency and Percentage of Students According to Their Urbanization

Primary Place of Residence	Frequency	Percentage
Rural Areas	16	8
Urban Areas	178	88.5
No Response	7	3.5
Total	201	100.0

The distribution of subjects in accordance with their religious faith has been presented in Table 4-7: over 74% of students are Muslim Shiite, 1.5% are Muslim Sunni, 5.5% are Zoroastarian, 1% are Jewish, 2.5% are Christian, and 11.4% have no religious preference.

Table 4-7

Frequency and Percentage of Students According to Their
Religious Faith

Religion	Frequence	Percentage
Muslim Shiism	150	74.6
Muslim Sunnism	3	1.5
Zoroastarianism	11	5.5
Jewish	2	1
Christian	5	2.5
None	23	11.4
Other	7	3.5
Total	201	100.0

As illustrated in Table 4-8, out of 201 students 2.5%
have been in the United States for one year or less, 1%
between 2 and 3 years, 18.5% between 4 and 5, 47% between 6
and 7, and 29% for 8 years or more.

Table 4-8

Frequency and Percentage of Students According to Their
Length of Stay in the U.S.

Length of Stay	Frequency	Percentage
One year of less	5	2.5
2 - 3 years	2	1.0
4 - 5 years	37	18.5
6 - 7 years	94	47
8 or more years	59	29
No response	4	2.0
Total	201	100.0

Table 4-9 shows the distribution of subjects according
to their family income: 1% of the students have indicated
less than 200,000 Rials annual family income, 1.5% over
200,000 Rials, 2.5% over 300,000 Rials, 3.5% over 400,000
Rials, 5.5% over 500,000 Rials, 14.4% over 600,000 but less
than 1,000,000 Rials, and 64.60% over 1,000,000 Rials.

Table 4-9

Frequency and Percent Age of Students According to Annual
Family Income

Annual Income	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 200,000 Rials	2	1
Over 200,000 R.	3	1.5
Over 300,000 R.	5	2.5
Over 400,000 R.	7	3.5
Over 500,000 R.	11	5.5
Over 600,000 R. but less than 1,000,000 R.	29	14.4
Over 1,000,000 R.	130	64.6
No response	14	7.0
Total	201	100.0

Table 4-10 compares the percent of students according
to their family social class: only 9% of the students tend
to be drawn from the lower social strata, but over 56% have
placed their family social status in the middle-class and
33.3% in the upper social strata.

Table 4-10

Frequency and Percentage of Students According to Their
Family Social Class

Family Social Status	Frequency	Percentage
Lower-Class	18	9.0
Middle-Class	113	56.2
Upper-Class	67	33.3
No Response	3	1.5
Total	201	100.0

Student's father's level of education has been
presented in Table 4-11: over 13% of student's fathers only
have a less than high school education, 6% have at least
high school education, but 43.8% possess a college degree
and 34.8% have gone beyond the college degree and done some
advanced or graduate work.

Table 4-11

Frequency and Percentage of Students According to Their
Father's Level of Education

Level of Education	Frequency	Percentage
Less than high school	27	13.4
High school	12	6.0
College graduate	88	43.8
Advanced or some education		
beyond college	70	34.8
No Response	4	2.0
Total	201	100.0

Table 4-12 shows the distribution of subjects according to their father's occupation: 3.5% have indicated that their father's occupation are those of small business, 29.5% of big business , 33% of professional and high technical occupations, 2.5% of semi-professional occupations, 11.5 % of landowning, 7% of military, 3% of farmer, and 6% of other occupations.

Table 4-12

Frequency and Percentages of Students According to Their
Father's Occupation

Occupation	Frequency	Percentage
Small business	7	3.5
Large business	59	29.5
Professional/Technical	67	33.0
Semi-professional	5	2.5
Farmer	6	3
Military	14	7
Landowner	23	11.5
Other	12	6
No response	8	4.0
Total	201	100.0

Mother's level of education has been presented in Table
4-13: 26.5% of students have indicated that their mothers
have less than high school education as compared to 38% with
a high school education, 21% college education and 10.5%
advanced or graduate work.

Table 4-13

Frequency and Percentage of Students According to Their
Mother's Level of Education

Level of Education	Frequency	Percentage
Less than high school	53	26.5
High school	77	38
College graduate	42	21
Advanced or some education		
beyond college	21	10.5
No Response	8	4.0
Total	201	100.0

In Table 4-14 a comparison has been made between percent of students in accordance with their mother's occupation: 65% of students showed their mother's occupation to be that of a housewife, 18.5% teacher, and 7.5 percent of professional and/or technical professions.

Table 4-14

Frequency and Percentages of Students According to Their
Mother's Occupation

Occupation	Frequency	Percentage
Housewife	131	65
Teacher	37	18.5
Professional/Technical	15	7.5
Other	11	5.5
No response	7	3.5
Total	201	100.0

Table 4-15 shows the distribution of subjects according
to their organization membership: 55.2% of the respondents
replied they do not belong to any political, religious,
and/or educational organizations when they asked if they
belong to any of these organizations, but over 40% replied
they do.

Table 4-15

Frequency and Percentage of Respondents According to Their
Organization Membership

Response	Frequency	Percentage
No	111	55.2
Yes	83	41.3
No response	7	3.5
Total	201	100.0

Of those who showed membership in various types of organizations, over 20% affiliated with the political organizations, 12.9% with religious, and 3% with educational organizations. See Table 4-16.

Table 4-16

Frequency and Percentage of Respondents According to Their
Membership in Different Types of Organizations

Type of Organization	Frequency	Percentage
Political	41	20.4
Religious	26	12.9
Educational	6	3.0
Other	10	5.0
No response	118	58.7
Total	201	100.0

Media Exposure, Political Ideology, Social/Political

Alienation, and Level of Activism-

Presentation and Analysis

This section presents the summarized responses to
media-exposure, political ideology, social and political
alienation and activism questions.

Table 5-1 presents the summary of the responses to item
one on the media-connectedness questionnaire (See Appendix
I): 26% of the respondents indicated that they would most
often follow news about Iran on T.V., 15.5% of the students
indicated often, and 21% responded seldom. In contrast, 23%

of the students said they would most seldom follow news about Iran on T.V., while 10.5% indicated never.

Table 5-1

Frequency and Percentage of Responses to the T.V. Exposure Question: On the average, how often do you follow news about Iran on T.V.?

T.V. Exposure	Frequency	Percentage
Most often	52	26
Often	31	15.5
Seldom	43	21
Most seldom	46	23
Never	21	10.5
No response	8	4.0
Total	201	100.0

Table 5-2 shows the distribution of subjects according to their responses to the newspaper exposure (connected news) question: 26% of the students indicated that they would most often follow news about Iran in Newspaper, 15.5% often, 19.5% seldom, 25% most seldom, and 10% never.

Table 5-2

Frequency and Percentage of Responses to the Newspaper
Exposure Question: On the average, how often do you follow
news about Iran in newspaper?

Newspaper Exposure	Frequency	Percentage
Most often	52	26
Often	31	15.5
Seldom	39	19.5
Most seldom	51	25
Never	20	10
No response	8	4.0
Total	201	100.0

The summarized responses to item three on the media-exposure questionnaire (See Appendix I) has been presented in Table 5-3: 24% of the students indicated that they would most often follow news about Iran in magazines as compared to 17.5% who said often. In contrast, 14.5% of the respondents indicated that they would seldom follow magazine as a source of news about Iran, while 13% said most seldom as compared to 28% never.

Table 5-3

Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the Magazine
Exposure Question: On the average, how often do you follow
news about Iran in magazines?

Magazine Exposure	Frequency	Percentage
Most often	48	24
Often	35	17.5
Seldom	29	14.5
Most seldom	26	13
Never	57	28
No response	6	3.0
Total	201	100.0

Table 5-4 illustrates the distribution of subjects
according to their responses to the Islamic (religious)
political ideology question: 12.4% of the respondents have
agreed strongly with the statement that "in the process of
conflict and struggle between the social classes or groups
in Iran, I support those who try to maintain and/or
establish an islamic type of social life under the dominant
political leadership of the religious leaders," 8% have
agreed moderately, 44.3% have expressed uncertainty, 14.9%
have disagreed, and 11.4 have strongly disagreed.

Table 5-4

Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the Islamic
Political Ideology/Leadership Question: In the process of
conflict and struggle between the social classes or groups
in Iran, I support those who try to maintain and/or
establish an Islamic type of social life under the dominant
political leadership of the religious leaders".

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	25	12.4
Agree	16	8.0
Uncertain	89	44.3
Disagree	30	14.9
Strongly Disagree	23	11.4
No Response	18	9.0
Total	201	100.0

Table 5-5 presents the summarized responses to the item

two on the political ideology questionnaire (See Appendix

I): less then five percent of the students indicated that

they would strongly agree with the statement that " in the

process of conflict and struggle between the social classes

or groups in Iran, I support those who try to maintain and/

or establish a capitalistic type of social life, similar to

that of the Western societies, under the dominant political

leadership of the capitalist political elite", 1.5% agreed

moderately, 47.3% expressed uncertainty, 20.9% disagreed and

over 18% disagreed strongly.

Table 5-5

Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the Capitalistic Political Ideology/Leadership Question: "In the process of conflict and struggle between the social classes or groups in Iran, I support those who try to maintain and/or establish a Capitalistic type of social life, similar to that of the Western societies under the dominant political leadership of the capitalist political elite."

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	9	4.5
Agree	3	1.5
Uncertain	95	47.3
Disagree	42	20.9
Strongly disagree	37	18.4
No response	15	7.5
Total	201	100.0

The responses of the students to item three on the political ideology questionnaire (See Appendix I) have been presented in Table 5-6: over 11% of the respondents agreed strongly to support those who try to establish a socialist mode of life under the dominant political leadership of the

urban and rural workers, 13.9% agreed moderately, 46.8% felt

uncertainty, 9% disagreed, and 10.9% disagreed strongly.

Table 5-6

Frequency and Percentage of Responses to the Socialist
Political Ideology/Leadership Question: "In the process of
conflict and struggle between the social classes or groups
in Iran, I support those who try to establish a Socialist
mode of life under the dominant political leadership of the
urban and rural workers."

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	23	11.4
Agree	28	13.9
Uncertain	94	46.8
Disagree	18	9.0
Strongly disagree	22	10.9
No response	16	8.0
Total	201	100.0

Table 5-7 presents the summarized responses to item one

on the political alienation questionnaire (See Appendix I):

over 51% of the respondents strongly indicated that they no

longer identify themselves with the Iranian government and

politics, while 16.4% moderately expressed such a feeling.

In contrast, 10% of the respondents moderately identified

themselves with the government in Iran as compared to 11.9%

of the respondents who strongly expressed such a feeling.

Table 5-7

Frequency and Percentage of Responses to Political Alienation Question: "Many people in Iran feel they used to be a part of Iranian government and politics but no longer. I feel the same way."

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	103	51.2
Agree	33	16.4
Disagree	20	10.0
Strongly disagree	24	11.9
Don't know	11	5.5
No response	10	5.0
Total	201	100.0

Table 5-8 shows the distribution of subjects according to their responses to item two on the political alienation question: over 10% of the respondents agreed strongly with the statement that "I generally think of myself as a part of Iranian government and Politics", 9.5 agreed moderately, but over 54% disagreed and 18.9% disagreed strongly.

Table 5-8

Frequency and Percentages of Responses to Political Alienation Question: "I generally think of myself as a part of the Iranian government and politics."

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	22	10.9
Agree	19	9.5
Disagree	109	54.2
Strongly disagree	38	18.9
Don't know	7	3.5
No response	6	3.0
Total	201	100.0

The summarized responses to item three on the political alienation questionnaire (See Appendix I) are presented in Table 5-9: Almost thirty-five percent of the students strongly indicated that when they think about Iranian government and politics, they feel like an outsider, as compared to 35.3% of respondents who expressed such attitude moderately. In contrast, 10% of the students rejected the idea of being an outsider, while 10.4% strongly supported the notion of being an insider.

Table 5-9

Frequency   and   Percentages   of   Responses   to   Political
Alienation Question: "When I think about Iranian government
and Politics, I feel like an outsider."

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	70	34.8
Agree	71	35.3
Disagree	20	10.0
Strongly disagree	21	10.4
Don't know	11	5.5
No response	8	4.0
Total	201	100.0

Table 5-10 compares the percent of responses to item
one on the social alienation questionnaire (See Appendix I):
over 38% of the respondents strongly felt that government
officials and leaders in Iran are not really interested in
the problems of the average man as compared to 33.3% of the
students who maintained such attitude moderately. In
contrast, 8.5% of the respondents disagreed with such
notion, while over 10% strongly felt that government leaders
care about the problems of the average man.

Table 5-10

Frequency and Percentages of the Responses to Social Alienation Question: "There is little use for me writing to government officials and leaders in Iran because often they are not really interested in the problems of the average person like me."

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	78	38.8
Agree	67	33.3
Disagree	17	8.5
Strongly disagree	22	10.9
Don't know	8	4.0
No response	9	4.5
Total	201	100.0

In Table 5-11, the distribution of subjects according to their responses to item two on the social alienation questionnaire has been presented: over 28% of the repondants strongly indicated that they would like to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself, while, almost 44% favored such an attitude moderately. In contrast, 9.5% of the students rejected such a notion and 8.5 strongly indicated their disapproval.

Table 5-11

Frequency and Percentages of Responses to Social Alienation
Question: "Nowadays a person like me has to live pretty much
for today and let tomorrow take care of itself".

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	57	28.4
Agree	88	43.8
Disagree	19	9.5
Strongly disagree	17	8.5
Don't know	12	6.0
No response	8	4.0
Total	201	100.0

Table 5-12 shows the distribution of subjects according
to their responses to item three on the social alienation
questionnaire: over 29% strongly agreed with the statement
that "In spite of what some people say, the lot of the
average person like me is getting worse, not better", 46.3%
agreed moderately, but 7.5% disagreed, and 6% disagreed
strongly.

Table 5-12

Frequency and Percentage of Responses to Social Alienation
Question: "In spite of what some people say, the lot of the
average person like me is getting worse, not better."

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	60	29.9
Agree	93	46.3
Disagree	15	7.5
Strongly disagree	12	6.0
Don't know	9	4.5
No response	12	6.0
Total	201	100.0

Table 5-13 presents the summarized responses to item
four on the social alienation questionnaire (See Appendix
I): the percent of students who strongly agreed with the
statement that "It's hardly fair to bring children into the
world with the way things look for the future". is less than
28% as compared to 41.3% of the respondents who maintained
such attitudes moderately. In contrast, 7.5% of the students
optimistically confronted the problem, while 10.9% rejected
it strongly.

Table 5-13

Frequency and Percentage of Responses to Social Alienation
Question: " It's hardly fair to bring children into the
world with the way things look for the future."

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	56	27.9
Agree	83	41.3
Disagree	15	7.5
Strongly disagree	22	10.9
Don't know	15	7.5
No response	<u>10</u>	<u>5.0</u>
Total	201	100.0

Table 5-14 shows the distribution of subjects according
to their responses to item five on the social alienation
questionnaire: over 44% strongly agree with the statement
that " these days a person like me does not really know whom
he/she can count on.", less than 28% agreed moderately, 7.5%
disagreed and 10.4 disagreed strongly.

Table 5-14

Frequency and Percentages of the Responses to Social Alienation Question: "These days a person like me does not really know whom he/she can really count on."

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	90	44.8
Agree	56	27.9
Disagree	15	7.5
Strongly disagree	21	10.4
Don't know	12	6.0
No response	7	3.5
Total	201	100.0

Table 5-15 compares the percent of students in accordance with type(s) of social and political activities (involvement): over 40% of the students indicated that they have taken part in picketing for a student demonstration, 36.3% in a civil rights demonstration, 43.8% in political rally, 34.8% in voting, 30% in a school related demonstration, 42.8% in a project to help the disadvantaged, and 43.8% in a student organization.

Table 5-15

Percentage and Frequency of Students According to Their Type
of Social or Political Activities (involvement)

Type of Activity	Percentage	(N)
Picketing for a student demonstration	40.8	82
Civil rights demonstration	36.3	73
Political rally	43.8	88
Voting in an election	34.8	70
A school related demon- stration	30.0	60
A project to help the disadvantaged	42.8	86
A student organization	43.8	88

Test of Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis I

There is a significant relationship between
alienation and activism.

Tables 6-1 and 6-2 present analysis of data relating to
hypothesis I. Table 6-1 indicates the relationship between
social alienation and activism. We predicted that there is a
significant relationship between alienation and activism.
Since our chi-square value is greater than table value
(13.72 > 7.82) under predetermined level of significance
(.05), we accept this hypothesis. Thus, according to
results, a significant relationship between social
alienation and activism is not due to chance and there is a
meaningful association between these two variables.

The strength of the association between activism and
social alienation is 0.27608 (Cramer's V = 0.27608) which
indicates a relatively weak relationship between these two
variables.

Table 6-1
Association between Social Alienation
and Activism

Social Alienation

Count Row % Col %	High Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Low Strongly Disagree	Row Total
Activism					
Group I (active)	27 32% 35%	38 47.5% 49%	8 80% 10%	5 83% 6%	78 100%
Group II (non-active)	57 68% 56%	42 52.5% 41%	2 20% 2%	1 17% 1%	102 100%
Column Total	84 100%	80 100%	10 100%	6 100%	180 100%

X^2=13.72   P=0.0001   df=3   Cramer's V=0.27608

In Table 6-2 the association between political alienation and activism has been presented. As the results indicate, under predetermined level of significance (.05), we have a greater chi-square value (28.14) than table value (7.82). Therefore, the hypothesis, which assumed a relationship between political alienation and activism would not be rejected. Again, however, the strength of the

association between these two variables is not very strong (Cramer's V=0.39539).

Table 6-2
Association between Political Alienation
and Activism

Political Alienation

Count Row % Col %	High			Low	
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Row Total
Activism					
Group I (active)	21 27% 27%	33 44.6% 42%	16 84% 21%	8 80% 10%	78 100%
Group II (non-active)	56 73% 55%	41 55.4% 40%	3 16% 3%	2 20% 2%	102 100%
Column Total	77 100%	74 100%	19 100%	10 100%	180 100%

x^2=28.14   P=0.001   df=3   Cramer's V=0.39539

Hypothesis II

The higher the level of socio-economic status (SES), the higher the level of activism.

The analysis of data relating to hypothesis II has been presented in Table 6-3. As data indicates, it is evident that the value calculated for chi-square (x^2=42.06) under

predetermined level of significance (.05) is greater than table value (5.99) and therefore forces us to reject the null hypothesis in the favor of the research hypothesis. Thus, according to the results, the difference between level of SES in both groups is not due to chance and there is a real difference between them. That is, students in Group I (activists) have higher SES than students in Group II (Non-activists).

The strength of association between these two variables, is shown by Cramer's V (Cramer's V=0.48339) which indicates a moderate association between activism and socio-economic status.

Table 6-3
Association between SES and Activism

SES Count Row % Col % Activism	High	Middle	Low	Row Total
Group I (active)	61 78%	12 15%	5 7%	78 100%
Group II (non-active	30 29%	46 46%	26 25%	102 100%
Column Total	91	58	31	180

x^2=42.06   P=0.0011   df=2   Cramer's V=0.48339

Hypothesis III

There is an association between activism and organizational membership.

Table 6-4 presents analysis of data relating to hypothesis III. This hypothesis predicted a significant association between activism and organization membership. Since our chi-square value (110.73) is greater than table value (3.84) under predetermined level of significance (.05), we fail to reject this hypothesis. Thus, according to the results, Group I, in average, has higher organization membership than that of Group II.

The strength of association between activism and organization membership is relatively high (Phi = 0.78432) which indicates a strong relationship between these two variables.

Table 6-4
Association between Activism
and Organization Membership

Organizational Membership

Count Row % Col %	Yes	No	Row Total
Activism			
Group I (active)	76 97%	2 3%	78 100%
Group II (non-active	18 18%	84 82%	102 100%
Column Total	94	86	180

X^2=110.73   P=0.0001   df=1   Phi=0.78432

Hypothesis IV:

The higher the level of activism, the more coherent the political ideology.

In Table 6-5 the association between activism and political ideology has been presented. As the results indicate, our chi-square value (93.18) is greater than table value (7.82) under (.05) level of significance and thus, the hypothesis which assumes a significant relationship between

activism and political ideology would not be rejected. The results, therefore show that the difference between Group I and Group II is in right direction and that activists show more tendency toward a coherent political ideology than non-activists. Again, however, the strength of association between these two variables is high (Cramer's V =0.71949) which signifies a relatively strong association between activism and political ideology.

Table 6-5
Association between Activism
and Political Ideology

Political Ideology					
Count Row % Col %	Coherent Ideology Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Incoherent Ideology Strongly Disagree	Row Total
Activism					
Group I (active)	53 68%	23 30%	1 1%	1 1%	78 100%
Group II (non- active)	11 11%	18 18%	39 38%	34 33%	102 100%
Column Total	64	41	40	35	180

x^2=93.18   P=0.0001   df=3   Cramer's V=0.71949

Hypothesis V

> There is an association between activism and
> major field of study. That is, a higher
> proportion of the activists will be found in
> vocational and non-academic fields of
> specialization than the non-activist
> counterparts.

The analysis of data relating to hypothesis V has been presented in Table 6-6. As data indicated, it is evident that the value calculated for chi-square (x^2=48.92) under predetermined level of significance (0.05) is greater than table value (3.84) and therefore forces us to reject the null hypothesis. Thus according to results the difference between major field of study in both groups is not due to chance and there is a real difference between them. That is, a higher percentage of the activists are in vocational and/or technical fields than the non-activists.

The strength of association between activism and major field of study is strong enough (Phi=0.52132) to signify a high association between these two variables.

Table 6-6
Association between Activism and
Major Field of Study

Field of Study

Count Row % Col % Activism	Vocational/Tech	Non Voc./Tech	Row Total
Group I (active)	68 87%	10 13%	78 100%
Group II (non-active	35 34%	67 66%	102 100%
Column Total	103	77	180

x^2=48.92   P=0.0011   df=1   Phi=0.52132

Hypothesis VI

> **There is a relationship between activism and media exposure (connectedness).**

Table 6-7 presents analysis of data relating to hypothesis VI. This hypothesis predicted a significant association between activism and media connectedness. Since our chi-square value (52.44) is greater than table value (9.49) under predetermined level of significance (.05), we fail to reject this hypothesis. Thus, according to the results, Group I is more connected to media than Group II.

The strength of association between activism and media -exposure is relatively high (Cramer's V=0.5397) which indicates a strong relationship between these two variables.

Table 6-7

Association between Activism
and Media-exposure

Media-exposure (connectedness)

Count Row % Col %	Most Often	Often	Seldom	Most Seldom	Never	Row Total
Activism						
Group I (active)	42 54%	23 30%	11 14%	1 1%	1 1%	78 100%
Group II (non-active	13 13%	17 17%	54 53%	14 13%	4 4%	102 100%
Column Total	55	40	65	15	5	180

x^2=52.44   P=0.0001   df=4   Cramer's V=0.5397

In summary, the empirical evidence presented in this chapter supports all of the six hypotheses tested by the present study. Thus all evidence points to the generalization that in certain respects the student activists tended to differ markedly from the non-activist counterparts. More specifically, the activists tended to have higher socio-economic status (as measured by family

annual income, social class, and parents education and occupation), more membership in political, religious and/or educational organizations, a coherent political ideology, and a higher degree of media-connectedness than the non-activists. In addition, a higher proportion of the activists was found in vocational and technical fields of specialization than was the non-activist counterparts. However, as was predicted, the activists did not differ in a statistically significant sense from the non-activists in terms of the degree of social and political alienation, although slightly more of the non-activists were alienated than were the student activists.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY/CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS AND
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

One major aim of this study was to determine
if there is a significant difference in the
alienation levels of the Iranian students in the
U.S. who are politically and socially active and
those who are not prone to participate in social and
political activities. In this regard, certain notions
centered around the idea of alienation in two
distinct normative structures, one active and the
other passive, were explored. Accordingly, major
theories of alienation from various perspectives were
reviewed and their common themes and characteristics
relevant to the study of contemporary student
alienation and activism were discussed. A second aim
of this study was to compare and contrast activists
and non-activists by testing several propositions
about characteristics of alienated students in order
to depict whether there are meaningful differences or
similarities between family socio-economic status,
political ideology, basic value commitments, organizational

234

membership, and media exposure (conectedness) of active and passive students.

Stated another way, this study was an attempt to explore what is felt to be a third logical step in the development of the general theory of alenation and activism. Step one consists of Kenistion's (1965) basic formulation which makes a common distinction between a pattern of behavior which is activist and one which is non-activist by only showing how activists and non-activists react to their social and political grievances and fails to include an empirical measure of the alienation levels of those who are politically and socially active and those who are not prone to participate in socio-political activities. This often gives an impression that the youth most involved in social and political activities do not seem to be the type one would ewpect to be alienated. Step two consists of Schwartz's (1973) basic conclusion which potulates that not only are the attitudes of alenation significantly associated with both withdrawal and activism, but that withdrawal and activism can be understood as part of the same psycho-political process. Although Schwartz shows that slenated people who place high value on participation and involvement would tend to activism rather than to withdrawal and passivity he does not attempt to differentiate activists and non-activists on the basis of their ideo-logical, psychological, and socio-economic

characteristics, and the relationship of such characteristics to activist and non-activist behavior.

These first two steps establish that there are at least two common patterns of behavior, one activist and one non-activist. Step one however, views passivity as being a factor related to alienation. Step two in contrast, sees activism and passivity as being factors related to alienation.

Step three makes the assertion that, in addition to the fact that withdrawal and activism are part of the same psycho-political process, activists and non-activists differ in their level of SES, media-connectedness, political ideology, organization membership, and basic value commitments. They differ not in "being alienated", but in their "psychological, ideological and socio-economic backgrounds". Examination of the third step makes this study, in a real sense, an exploratory one.

The hypotheses tested in this study were:

1. There is a significant relationship between alienation and activism.
2. The higher the level of activism, the higher the socio-economic status (SES).
3. There is an association between activism and organization membership.
4. The higher the level of activism, the more tendency toward coherent political ideology.
5. There is an association between activism and field of study. That is, a higher proportion of the activists will be found in vocational and non-academic fields of specialization than will the non-activist counterparts.
6. There is a relationship between activism and media-exposure.

This study make use of the Iranian student population at the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, and Western Michigan University. The Iranian students enrolled in these universities during the fall semester of 1983 were surveyed in order to achieve the aim of this study. The analysis of the data showed strong support for all siz hypothesis outlined above.

The findings support the hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between alenation and activism. An additional interpretation of the data further points to the difference in responses of the activists surveyed tended to differ markedly from those who are not prone to participate in social and political activities, in certain respects. Although their level of activism did not exert a major influence on their alienation level, the activists tended to hold higher SES, have higher degree of media-connectedness, seek more membership from political, religious, and/or educational organizations, possess a coherent political ideology of radical reform, and seek more vocational and non-academic fields of study as their basic value commitments than did the non-activists.

From this study, therefore, the following conclusions and/or generalizations seem warranted:

1. Social and political alienation do not bear strong, consistant, direct and linear relationship to activism in our data.
2. Political ideology does account for substantial amounts of the variance in activism.

3. The level of an individual's socio-economic status (SES) is significantly related to the basic behavioral orientation toward social and political activities that he/she is likely to adopt-predicting especially well to activist orientations.

4. Activism tends to be significantly associated with a predisposition to seek information from mass-media. Levels of activism predict to the individual's information-seeking and political communications behavior.

5. Major field of study does account for substantial amounts of the variance on activism. Students in vocational and non-academic fields of study are more likely to adopt activistic behavior orientions than are the student non-activists.

6. The level of an individual's activism tends to be significantly associated with a predisposition to seed membership from political, religious and/or educational organizations.

Naturally , it is hoped that the validity of these generalizations will be tested by other scholars in other research contexts and that they will be modified in that process.

Theoretical Implications

The empirical evidence presented in Chapter V supports all six hypothesis tested in the current study.

The findings support the hypothesis that predicted there is no significant relationship between alienation and activism. If this case, the finding of the current study would support Schwartz's (1973) contention concerning the insignificant relationship of activism and alienation. Schwartz (1973) contends that withdrawal and activism are part of the same psycho-political process and that alienated people who place high value on participation tend to

activism rather than to withdrawal.

This then brings us to a brief consideration of the validity of this generalization to the Iranian students' situation. What follows is a speculative and interpretive summary of what happened in the Iranian political system prior to the 1978 revolution (the Shah era) and during the present regime to reinforce alienation particularly among students and intellectuals and to encourage, in recent years, active rather that passive outplay of that alienation. Much of the youth discontent in Iran (post revolution era) can be explained as the outplay of alienation in active modes, encouraged by socio-political trends which formerly (pre-revolution era) inhibited active (and inured toward passive) responses to alienation. Moreover, the conditions in and integration level of (revolutionary period) led to an increased value on participation among population sectors (including students) previously somewhat alienated but satisfied with private displacement of that alienation.

Thus an increase in alienation particularly among students and intellectuals followed by the politicization and activation of that alienation mostly during revolutionary era has led to an expansion of perceived leaderlessness and whereby led to an ideological fragmentation, radicalization, and alienation. If this is the case, one could conclude then that the Iranian students

seem chararterized by substantial and increasing alienated activist behavior.

Hypothesis II, which predicted a significant association between activism and socio-economic status (SES), was supported by the data. This finding is consistent with findings of previous studies (e.g., Lipset, 1966; Flacks, 1967; Keniston, 1967; Schwartz, 1973; Sampson, 1967; Bill, 1969; Nafisi, 1966; Borhanmanesh, 1965; ZakiKhane, 1978).

All these studies point to the fact that the current group of student activists is predominantly upper-middle class, and frequently these students are of elite origin. They are characteristically from families which are urban, highly educated, professional and affluent. One reason for this is the fact people in upper SES categories are predicted to be more active in their organizations to politics and social participation than are those in lower social strata. As Schwartz (1973) has concluded "upper and upper-middle class individuals seem more likely to play out their alienation in active modes, such as reformism, rebelliousness, because they have the resources and the relative economic and social invulnerability to do so because they have learned norms of civic duty and

participation that would make withdrawal a nonvalued option" (p. 23).

An additional interpretation of the data, however, again points to difference in responses of the activists and the non-activists. The findings support the hypothesis that "there is an association between activism and organization membership." This finding is consistent with the findings of previous studies (e.g., Flacks, 1967; Keniston, 1967; ZakiKhani, 1976).

These studies indicate that organization membership exerts a major influence on activism. That is, involvement in politics and social activities is affected by membership in political, religious and/or voluntary organizations. These organizations serve as a major channel for involving people in politics and social affairs. They serve as a source of new opinions; they can be the means of communicating ideas to a large section of the citizenry; they train persons in political skills and so help to increase the level of activism and interest in politics. Our data have indicated that more than 97% of the Iranian student activists belonged to political, religious and/or educational organizations. In contrast, the non-activists were not as likely as the activists to seek membership from such organizations. Only 18% of them belonged to these organizations.

Hypothesis IV, which predicted that political ideology does account for substantial amounts of the variance in activism was supported by the data. Sixty-eight percent of the activists revealed their ideological orientation (as either Islamic, Western oriented Capitalism, and or Marxism) as compared to only 11% of the non-activists. Our finding is consistent, however, with findings of previous studies (e.g., Keniston, 1965; Flacks, 1967; Schwartz, 1973; Zonozi, 1976). These studies reveal that political ideology and/or coherent program of radical reform exert a major influence on participation and does account for substantial amounts of the variance in activism. For example, Zonozi (1976) has concluded that whereas the non-activists lack a coherent program or ideology of social reform, denote lack of concern, and indicate a pessimistic negativism and nihilistic political apathy, student activists denote commitment, indicate an optimistic confrontation with social injustice, and have coherent program, purpose, and ideology of radical reform.

Hypothesis V, which predicted that a higher proportion of the alienated student activists will be found in vocational and non-academic fields of specialization than will the non-activist counterparts, was supported by the data. More than 87% of the Iranian student activists were majoring in vocational engineering, natural sciences, mathematics, medicine and in non-academic fields as compared

to only 34% of the non-activists. This finding, however, appears to be inconsistant with findings of Trent and Craise (1967) and Keniston (1967). Their findings indicate that the basic value commitments of the activists tend to be academic and non-vocational and that such stedents are rarely found among engineers, future teachers colleges, or students of medicine and business administation. As Keniston (1967) points out, "activists' overall educational goals are those of liberal education for its own sake, rather than specifically technical, vocational or professional preparation" (p. 117). In contrast to the findings of Trent and Craise (1967) and Keniston (1965), Zonozi (1976) concluded from his research that over 68% of student activists in Iran are from professional upper and upper-middle class families and their field of academic specialization is vocational engineering, natural sciences, mathematics and medicine. Zonozi's (1976) finding, however appears to be consistent with the finding of present study. What does their account for substantial difference in value commitments, of the student activists in Iran and in the United States. The exact reason, however is not clear. One factor involved may be family socialization and clan origin. Iranian student activists are predominantly from professional upper and upper-middle clan families and their clan and familial orientaion may well exert a major influence on their future career goals and professional preparations.

Hypothesis VI, which predicted that there is a significant relationship between activism and media exposure, was supported by the data. More than 83% of the student activists tend to seek significantly more, rather than less, information from media as compared to only 29% of the non-activists. Our findings, however, seem to be consistent with the findings of previous studies (e.g. Schwartz, 1973; Zonozi, 1976). As these studies point out, activism tends to be significantly associated with a predisposition to seek information from mass-media. Levels of activism predict to the individuals information seeking and political communication behavior. Thus, activists tend to seek significantly more information from media and use it more effectively than do the non-activists.

Research Limitations and Suggestions
for Future Research

The greatest shortcoming of most "alienation theory" is that it tends to oversimplify a complex phenomenon. As one author wrote: "What strikes one observer as 'youthful arrogance' seems to another 'refreshing candor'. Where one critic discovers a pathological condition in young people, another

rejoices in the in the 'sanity' of youths rejection of a 'sick society'" (McDonald, 1970, p. 22). Thus, some questions may be raised regarding limitations and shortcomings of the present study.

Although the data analyzed in this study deal specifically with general background, orientation, attitudes and opinions of the Iranian students in the United States, comparisons have not been made regarding the Iranian students from different universities in Iran who have had no previous experience in the Western world. Such a study could determine the influence o fthe fast activistic behavior of the Iranian students toward their society perhaps more effectively than this study has done.

While the relationships found in this research were rather strong and significant and the results were in the anticipated directions, replication is always desired. Replication is desired because the instruments exerted on the Iranian student situation are new and a real test of its reliability is, therefore, lacking. Replication is desired, too, because the notion of alienation in an activistic structure is new.

Although in our sample the response rate was fairly high (64%), there was a crucial limitation in regard to male-female percentage -- more than 80% were males and less than 20% were females. Therefore, in attempting to

generalize about the results of this study, male overrepresentation should be taken into consideration.

Finally, one major problem area which has not been treated in this study, but which deserves very high priority indeed, is the linkage between macro-systemic (political and social) phenomena and micro-political attitudes and behavior. What political and social conditions, events and trends make for alienated behavior and activist orientations. The present study gives only the partial (that is, micro level) answer. To provide a better answer would require both epistemological work and considerable research designed specifically to determine those dimensions of macro-systemic phenomena.

In addition it would be interesting if we relate the overall level of alienation and activism in a system, and distributions of various levels of alienation and/or activism across social groupings, to macro political events.

Although there are other limitations in this research, those mentioned above seem to be most important.

The present study in spite of its limitations, however, has been worthwhile. It was found that (1) the level of individual's social and political alienation tend to be significantly associated with activism; (2) political ideology bears strong and consistent relationship to activism; (3) the level of individual's SES does account for substantial amounts of variance in activism; (4) activism

tends to be significantly associated with a predisposition to seek information from mass media; (5) major field of study is related to the basic behavioral orientation that one is likely to adopt; (6) the level of an individual's activism tends to be significantly related with organizational membership. Finally if one accepts that a fundamental objective of the social science is to test plausible theories against the real world, this study could be interpreted as an attempt to do so.

What suggestions, then could be made for future research and study. The data permit many additional questions to be raised and propositions analyzed. For example, what other factors besides SES, political ideology, media connectedness, basic value commitment, and organizational membership do account for substantial amount of the variance in activism? Do other varieties of alienation, in addition to social and political, bear strong, direct and consistent relationship to activism? To what extent do the structural properties of societal institutions, exert influence on activist behavior?

Future research might also attempt to examine measures of socialization and current political and institutional identifications of the Iranian student activists. How significantly is alienated activist behavior associated with a willingness to engage in disorderly politics (use of violence) in order to achieve social change? Is the value

pattern expressed by activists correlated with those of their parents?

Future research might also profitably further explore the association between students' length of stay in the United States and their level of activism and alienation.

Finally, it would be helpful to have some research conducted similar to this research but in a different setting with different dimensions of alienation and activism. For example, future research might attempt to examine relationship between the activist political dimension of alienation and various measures of intellectuality, liberalism, interaction with others, and positive self-image. In like manner it might also attempt to discover an association (if any) between the psychological dimension of alienation and measure of psychological stability, self-esteem, and ability to interact with others.

While these suggestions seem to be speculative, their validity could be tested by other scholars in other research context and that they could be modified in that process. They do, however suggest avenues for future research.

Clearly the investigation of student alienation and activism deserves great attention from social and political scientists. Obviously, the possibilities for additional research in this area are numerous and require further theoretical sophistication and empirical investigation. Scholarly efforts must continue in designing and conducting

systematic studies of alienated behavior. For the research
done in this area can add much to the body of knowledge
regarding human behavior and social interaction.

APPENDICES

250

QUESTIONNAIRE AS SUBMITTED IN FARSI AND ENGLISH

WMU

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008

Department of Sociology

سپتامبر ۱۹۸۲

گرامی دوست دانشجوی هموطن

پرسشنامه پیوستی که در دسترس آن دانشجوی عزیز قرار دارد یکی ابزار جمع‌آوری اطلاعات مورد نیاز است که بمنظور مطالعه خصوصیات عینی و ذهنی مسئله بیگانگی (الیناسیون) سیاسی و اجتماعی دانشجویان ایرانی در امریکا و ارتباط آن باچگونگی وضع و شرائط فرهنگی، اجتماعی، و سیاسی جامعه ایران بکار خواهد رفت. همانطوریکه کم و بیش مسبوقید، پدیده بیگانگی دانشجویان ایرانی خارج از کشور، خصوصاً در سالهای اخیر، پدیده‌ای رو بتزاید بوده است. ولی مع‌الوصف چنین پدیده‌ای توجه معدود محققین داخلی و خارجی را به خود جلب کرده است و تلاش پژوهشگرانیکه بدین مهم دست گمارده‌اند بدلایلی عدیده کمیت و کیفیت مسئله را آنطور که باید بررسی ننموده‌اند. از اینرو کمی منابع علمی و مطالعات محققین در این زمینه و اهمیت این پدیده، نیاز ما دانشجویان به شناخت آن مرا واداشت که تا باین مهم دست گذارده و رساله دکتری خود را بدان تخصیص دهم.

بدیهی است انجام و اتمام این مهم نه تنها بهمت و دقت با دادههای مورد نیاز و اطلاعات مورد نظر منوط است بلکه نیازمند همکاری و معاونت تمام دانشجویان ایرانی منظور در این تحقیق میباشد. بنابراین دانشجویان عزیز در تکمیل این پرسشنامه بایستی بنکات زیر کاملاً توجه کنند:

۱ـ هر سوال را با گذاردن علامت(x) و یا کلمه مربوطه در محل تعیین شده در کنار هر سوال پاسخ دهند.

۲ـ سعی کنند که بتمام سوالات پاسخ داده و سوالی را بیجواب نگذارند.

۳ـ حد امکان به سوالات پاسخی روشن، منطقی، و صریح بدهند.

۴ـ از ذکر و امضا اسم و یا آدرس خود بر روی پرسشنامه مستقیماً خودداری فرمایند.

از اطلاعات جمع‌آوری شده بوسیله این پرسشنامه تنها برای انجام این پژوهش آن هم بصورت کلی استفاده خواهد شد.

در خاتمه از همکاری دوستانه آن دانشجوی عزیز در پاسخ به سوالات و عودت این پرسشنامه صمیمانه تشکر و قدردانی مینماید.

علیرضا محسنی تبریزی
دپارتمان جامعه شناسی
دانشگاه میشیگان غربی

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

لطفا به سئوالات زیر پاسخ دهید :

۱- جنس: (یکی را علامت بزنید)   مرد ( )   زن ( )

۲- سن : ـــــــ سال

۳- پایه تحصیلی: (یکی را علامت بزنید)   دانشجوی دوره لیسانس ( )   دانشجوی
دوره فوق لیسانس ( )   دانشجوی دوره دکتری ( )   دانشجوی دوره فوق
دکتری ( )   دیگر ( )   لطفا مشخص کنید ـــــــ

۴- رشته تحصیلی : ـــــــ

۵- تاریخ پایان این دوره تحصیلی : ـــــــ

۶- وضعیت تاهل : (یکی را علامت بزنید)   مجرد ازدواج نکرده ( )   در مرحله
نامزدی ( )   متاهل ( )   در حالت متارکه ( )   مطلق یا مطلقه ( )
همسر فوت شده ( )   دیگر ( )   لطفا مشخص کنید ـــــــ

۷- منطقه سکونت تا سن پانزده سالگی : (یکی را علامت بزنید)   منطقه شهری ( )
منطقه روستائی ( )

۸- هویت قومی : (یکی را علامت بزنید)   فارس ( )   کرد ( )   ترک ( )
لر ( )   بلوچ ( )   گیلک ( )   مازندرانی ( )   عرب ( )   دیگر
( )   لطفا مشخص کنید ـــــــ

۹- وضعیت مذهبی : (یکی را علامت بزنید)   مسلمان شیعه ( )   مسلمان سنی ( )
زرتشتی ( )   مسیحی ( )   کلیمی ( )   بی منهب ( )   دیگر ( )
لطفا مشخص کنید ـــــــ

۱۰- طول مدت اقامت در امریکا ـــــــ سال

۱۱- آیا فرزندی دارید ؟ (یکی را علامت بزنید)   بلی ( )   خیر ( )

۱۲- اگر بلی تعداد ـــــــ

۱۳- سطح تحصیلات پدر : (یکی را علامت بزنید)   کمتر از دیپلم دبیرستان ( )
دیپلم دبیرستان ( )   لیسانس دانشگاه یا کالج ( )   تحصیلات عالیه ماورای
لیسانس ( )   دیگر ( )   لطفا مشخص کنید ـــــــ

۱۴- شغل پدر : ـــــــ

۱۵- سطح تحصیلات مادر : (یکی را علامت بزنید)   کمتر از دیپلم دبیرستان ( )
دیپلم دبیرستان ( )   لیسانس دانشگاه یا کالج ( )   تحصیلات عالیه ماورای
لیسانس ( )   دیگر ( )   لطفا مشخص کنید ـــــــ

۱۶- شغل مادر : ـــــــ

۱۷- میزان تقریبی درآمد خانواده در سال گذشته : (یکی را علامت بزنید)   کمتر از
۲۰۰۰۰ ریال ( )   بالای ۲۰۰۰٬۰۰۰ ریال ( )   بالای ۳۰۰۰ ریال ( )
بالای ۳۰۰۰٬۰۰۰ ریال ( )   بالای ۵۰۰۰٬۰۰۰ ریال ولی کمتر از ۱۰۰۰۰ ریال
( )   بالای ۱۰۰۰۰٬۰۰۰ ریال ( )

۱۸ـ در کدام یک از طبقه بندی ها یزیر باپهگاه اجتماعی خانواده خود را قرار می‌دهید؟ (یکی را علامت بزنید)

ـــ طبقه پایین شامل کارگرانکناورزانه منمتکران و کارکنان جز٠

ـــ طبقه اجتماعی متوسط شامل خرده مالکین بازرگانان متوسط شهری صاحبان صنا - عیحرفه ای و فنی و کارمندان سطوح متوسط

ـــ طبقه اجتماعی بالا شامل مالکان عمده، تجار عمده، مدیران موسسات و رهبران سیاسی منظامی و دینی سطوح بالا

۱۹ـ منبع در آمد در امریکا ؛ (یکی را علامت بزنید) خانواده ( ) خود ( )
دولت ( ) دیگر ( ) لطفأ مشخص کنید ـــــــــــــــ

۲۰ـ بطور متوسط تا چه میزان اخبار مربوط به ایران را از طریق تلویزیون دنبال می‌کنید؟ (یکی را علامت بزنید)

( ) همه مواقع
( ) اغلب
( ) گاهگاهی
( ) بندرت
( ) هرگز

۲۱ـ بطور متوسط تا چه میزان اخبار مربوط به ایران را از طریق روزنامه دنبال می‌کنید؟ (یکی را علامت بزنید)

( ) همه مواقع
( ) اغلب
( ) گاهگاهی
( ) بندرت
( ) هرگز

۲۲ـ بطور متوسط تا چه میزان اخبار مربوط به ایران را از طریق مجله دنبال می‌کنید؟ (یکی را علامت بزنید)

( ) همه مواقع
( ) اغلب
( ) گاهگاهی
( ) بندرت
( ) هرگز

۲۳ـ چه واکنشی نسبت به این پرسش که دانشجویان ایرانی بایستی بدون توجه به شر- ائط اجتماعی سیاسی ها قتصادی عملی ایران بعد از فراغت از تحصیل در امریکا به کشور خود مراجعت کننده دارید؟ (یکی را علامت بزنید)

( ) بشدت موافق
( ) موافق
( ) نامسشن
( ) مخالف
( ) بشدت مخالف

۲٤ـ در جریان تضاد و مبارزه بین طبقات با گروهای اجتماعی ایران من از سهتمی
حمایت خواهم کرد که در جهت استقرار پك حكومت سرمایه داری تحت رهبری غالب
سرمایه داران با ماجیان اراضی و منابع شغری می کند :

( ) بشدت موافق
( ) موافق
( ) بینظر
( ) مخالف
( ) بشدت مخالف

۲٥ـ در جریان تضاد و مبارزه بین طبقات با گروهها ی اجتماعی ایران من از سهتمی
حمایت خواهم کرد که در جهت استقرار پك حكومت منهبی تحت رهبری غالب رهبران
دینی تلاش می کند :

( ) بشدت موافق
( ) موافق
( ) بینظر
( ) مخالف
( ) بشدت مخالف

۲٦ـ در جریان تضاد و مبارزه بین طبقات با گروهها ی اجتماعی ایران من از سهتمی
حمایت خواهم کرد که در جهت استقرار پك حكومت سوسیالیستی تحت رهبری غالب
کارگران و کشاورزان تلاش می کند :

( ) بشدت موافق
( ) موافق
( ) بینظر
( ) مخالف
( ) بشدت مخالف

۲۷ـ من منافع خود را مقدم بر منافع دیگران و خانواده ام می دانم :

( ) بشدت موافق
( ) موافق
( ) بینظر
( ) مخالف
( ) بشدت مخالف

۲۸ـ آیا در انجمن یا سازمان دانشجویی،فرهنگی،سیاسی،مذهبی،ورزشی،و غیره عضویت دارید؟
(یکی را علامت بزنید) بــلـی ( ) خیــر ( )

۲۹ـ اگر بلی لطفاً منعی کنید : ـــــــــــــــــــــــ

۳۰ـ الف • زمانی که در مورد حکومت و سیستم سهامی کشور فکر میکنم غالباً خود را
از آن بیگانه میبینم (یکی را علامت بزنید)
بشدت موافق ( )
موافق ( )
بینظر ( )
مخالف ( )
بشدت مخالف ( )

۳۰ـ ب • وقتی در مورد ساخت و حکومت سهامی کشور می اندیشم اکثراً خود را جزئی
از آن سیستم میدانم (یکی را علامت بزنید)
بشدت موافق ( )
موافق ( )
بینظر ( )
مخالف ( )
بشدت مخالف ( )

۳۰ـ ب • خیلیها اوقات خود را جزئی از سیستم و حکومت سیاسی کشور حس میکنند
ولی من دیگر • من نیز بدینگونه حس میکنم (یکی را علامت بزنید)
بشدت موافق ( )
موافق ( )
بینظر ( )
مخالف ( )
بشدت مخالف ( )

۳۱ـ الف • بازگو کردن مشکلات و کمبودهای جامعه به زمامداران قوم و مدیرنشینان سیاست
عملاً بینتیجه است چه آنها کوچکترین علاقه ای به منافع و مشکلات طبقات
دیگر جامعه ندارند (یکی را علامت بزنید)
بشدت موافق ( )
موافق ( )
بی نظر ( )
مخالف ( )
بشدت مخالف ( )

۳۱ـ ب • فکر میکنم که انسان باید به امروز بیاندیشد میبه فردا که فاند چه بازی
کند روزگار (یکی را علامت بزنید)

) (بسخت موافق
) (موافق
) (بی‌نظر
) (مخالف
) (بسخت مخالف

۲۱ب۰ علیرغم پندار بعضی‌ها فکر می‌کنم وضع و شرائط کلی طبقات محروم و پائین جامعه هر روز بهتر و بهتر می‌شود (یکی را علامت بزنید)

) (بسخت موافق
) (موافق
) (بی‌نظر
) (مخالف
) (بسخت مخالف

۲۱ت۰ فکر می‌کنم داشتن بیه چندان معتبر بنظر نمی‌رسد چه همه خواهد از فردائی مبهم و بی‌اعتماد حکایت می‌کند (یکی را علامت بزنید)

) (بسخت موافق
) (موافق
) (بی‌نظر
) (مخالف
) (بسخت مخالف

۲۱ث۰ فکر می‌کنم به عمری کام تنها ده‌ایم که کمتر می‌توانیم روی کسی حساب کنم (یکی را علامت بزنید)

) (بسخت موافق
) (موافق
) (بی‌نظر
) (مخالف
) (بسخت مخالف

۲۲ـ آیا تاکنون در فعالیتها ی زیر شرکت داشتید؟

الف: اعتصاب دانشجوئی بعنوان برپاکننده و یا اداره‌کننده بلی ( ) خیر ( )
بی‌نظر ( )

ب : تظاهرات برای کسب حقوق اجتماعی۰ بلی ( ) خیر ( ) بی‌نظر ( )

پ : راهپیمائی سیاسی۰ بلی ( ) خیر ( ) بی‌نظر ( )

ت : شرکت در انتخابات با دادن رای۰ بلی ( ) خیر ( ) بی‌نظر ( )

ث : پروژه یا برنامه‌ای برای کمک به مستمندان و معلولین چندزدکان و غیره ۰
بلی ( ) خیر ( ) بی‌نظر ( )

ج : انجمن یا سازمان دانشجوئی۰ بلی ( ) خیر ( ) بی‌نظر ( )

از همکاری شما سپاسگزارم ۰

WMU

Department of Sociology

September, 1983

Dear Fellow Iranian student:

The phenomenon of the Iranian students alienation in the United States in particular and in other foreign educational institutions in general has been, specially in recent years, on a steady increase. Nevertheless, such problem has received a very little scholarly attention, investigation and sophistication from the native and the foreign scholars. Thus, lack and/or poverty of a comprehensive study of the Iranian youth alienation encouraged me to allocate my dissertation to this issue.

No doubt, the usefulness of this study depends not only on the accuracy and quality of the data which the present questionnaire was designed to obtain, but also on the cooperation and colaboration of all Iranian students who are included in this study.

The present questionnaire is designed to get your personal attitudes and view points, and also asks some questions about your background. In order for the study to be valid, it is important that you:

1. Answer each question and respond to each statement by placing and check mark and/or word on the line provided next to the question which best reflects your attitude, feeling and response.
2. Give frank answers to all questions.
3. Do NOT sign your name on any part of this questionnaire. No one but you will know what you have written.

Once again, your friendly cooperation in responding and returning this questionnaire is greatly appreciated in advance.

Sincerely,

Alireza Mohseni-Tabrizi

QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS

1. Your sex: (check one) Male ( )   Female ( )

2. Your age: _____ years

3. Level of Your Education: (check one) Undergraduate
   Pursuing Bachelor's degree ( )   Graduate Pursuing
   Master's degree ( )   Graduate Pursuing Doctoral
   degree ( )   Post Doctoral ( )   Other ( )
                                    Please specify: _____

4. Your Major Field of Study:

5. Year you expect to complete the degree you are now
   pursuing: _____

6. What is your marital status? (check one)   Never been
   married ( )   Engaged ( )   Married ( )
   Separated ( )   Divorced ( )   Widowed ( )
   Other ( )
        Please specify: _____

7. Do you have children? (check one)   Yes ( )   No ( )

8. If yes, how many children do you have? _____

9. What was your primary place of residence while growing
   up (0-15 years old)? (check one)   Urban areas ( )
   Rural areas ( )

10. Which of the following categories describes your ethnic
    identify? (check one)   Fars ( )   Kurd ( )
    Lure ( )   Turk ( )   Baluch ( )   Gilak ( )
    Mazandarani ( )   Arab ( )   Other ( )
                                    Please specify: _____

11. What is your religious faith? (check one)
    Muslim Shiism ( )   Muslim Sunnism ( )
    Zoroastarianism ( )   Jewish ( )   Christian ( )
    NONE ( )   Other ( )
                Please specify: _____

12. How long have you been in the United States up to now?
    _____

13. What is your Father's level of education? (check one)
    Less than high school ( )   High school ( )
    College Graduate ( )   Advanced or some education

beyond college (·)

14. Your Father's occupation (Job): _____

15. Your mother's level of education (check one)   Less
    than high school ( )   High school ( )   College
    graduate ( )   Advanced or some education beyond
    college ( )

16. Your mother's occupation (Job): _____

17. What was your approximate annual family income for the
    past year -- before taxes? (check one)   Less than
    200,000 Rials ( )   Over 200,000 Rials ( )
    Over 300,000 Rials (·)   Over 400,000 Rials ( )
    Over 500,000 Rials ( )   Over 600,000 Rials but
    less than 1000,000 Rials ( )   Over 1000,000 Rials ( )

18. In which of the following categories do you place your
    · family social class? (check one)
    _____ Lower class, including workers, peasants,
           craftsmen, and lower rank employees ·
    _____ Middle-class, including small land owners,
           small merchants, professional and middle rank
           employees
    _____ Upper-class, including big land owners, factory
           owners, businessmen and big merchants, highly
           ranked bureaucratic, military, and religious
           leaders

19. What is your source of income in the U.S.? (check one)
    Family ( )   Self ( )   Government ( )
    Other ( )
           Please specify: _____

20. On the average, how often do you follow the news about
    Iran on T.V.? (check one)
    ( ) Most often
    ( ) Often
    ( ) Seldom
    ( ) Most seldom
    ( ) Never

21. On the average, how often do you follow the news about
    Iran in the newspaper(s)? (check one)
    ( ) Most often
    ( ) Often
    ( ) Seldom
    ( ) Most seldom
    ( ) Never

22. On the average, how often do you follow the news about
    Iran in magazine(s)? (check one)
    ( ) Most often
    ( ) Often
    ( ) Seldom
    ( ) Most seldom
    ( ) Never

23. Most of the Iranian students in the U.S. should return
    to Iran after the completion of their education,
    regardless of how good or bad the socio-economic and
    political conditions of society are (check one)
    ( ) Strongly agree
    ( ) Agree
    (•) Uncertain
    ( ) Disagree
    ( ) Strongly disagree

24. In the process of conflict and struggle between the social
    classes or groups in Iran, I support those who try to
    maintain and/or establish an Islamic type of social life
    under the dominant political leadership of the religious
    leaders (check one)
    ( ) Strongly agree
    ( ) Agree
    ( ) Uncertain
    ( ) Disagree
    ( ) Strongly disagree

25. In the process of conflict and struggle between the
    social classes or groups in Iran, I support those who
    try to maintain and/or establish a capitalistic type
    of social life, similar to that of the Wester societies,
    under the dominant political leadership of the capitalist
    political elite (check one)
    ( ) Strongly agree
    ( ) Agree
    ( ) Uncertain
    ( ) Disagree
    ( ) Strongly disagree

26. In the process of conflict and struggle between the
    social classes or groups in Iran, I support those who
    try to establish a socialist mode of life under the
    dominant political leadership of the urban and rural
    workers (check one)
    ( ) Strongly agree
    ( ) Agree
    ( ) Uncertain
    ( ) Disagree
    ( ) Strongly disagree

27. I give priority to my own interests rather than to the interests of others or my family (check one)
( ) Strongly agree
( ) Agree
( ) Uncertain
( ) Disagree
( ) Strongly disagree

28. Do you belong to any political, religious, educational, voluntary, etc. organization? (check one)
( ) Yes ( ) No

29. If yes, please specify: _____

30a. Many people in Iran feel they used to be a part of Iranian government and politics, but no longer. I feel the same way (check one)
( ) Strongly agree
( ) Agree
( ) Disagree
( ) Strongly disagree
( ) Don't know

30b. I generally identify myself with the Iranian government and politics (check one)
( ) Strongly agree
( ) Agree
( ) Disagree
( ) Strongly disagree
( ) Don't know

30c. When I think about Iranian government and politics, I generally feel like an outsider (check one)
( ) Strongly agree
( ) Agree
( ) Disagree
( ) Strongly disagree
( ) Don't know

31a. There's little use for me to write to Public Officials— local, state or national - because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average person like me (check one)
( ) Strongly agree
( ) Agree
( ) Disagree
( ) Strongly disagree
( ) Don't know

31b. Nowadays a person like me has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself (check one)
( ) Strongly agree
( ) Agree
( ) Disagree
( ) Strongly disagree
( ) Don't know

31c. In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average person like me is getting worse, not better (check one)
( ) Strongly agree
( ) Agree
( ) Disagree
( ) Strongly disagree
( ) Don't know

31d. It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future (check one)
( ) Strongly agree
( ) Agree
( ) Disagree
( ) Strongly disagree
( ) Don't know

31e. These days I don't really know whom I can count on (check one)
( ) Strongly agree
( ) Agree
( ) Disagree
( ) Strongly disagree
( ) Don't know

32. Have you ever taken part in:
a. Picketing for a student demonstration?
( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Don't know
b. civil rights demonstration
( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Don't know
c. a political rally
( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Don't know
d. voting in an election
( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Don't know
e. a school related demonstration
( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Don't know
f. a project to help the disadvantaged
( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Don't know
g. a student organization(s), serving as an officer
( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Don't know

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adorno, W. T. <u>Prismen</u>. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1969.

Adorno, W. T. <u>Negative dialectic</u>. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1966.

Anderson, J. <u>Studies in empirical philosophy</u>. Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1963.

Applebaum, R. <u>Theories of social change</u>. Chicago: Markham, 1970.

Arasteh, R. <u>Rebirth of youth in the age of cultural change</u>. (In Persian.) Tehran: Ellmi, 1973.

Aresteh, R. <u>Education and social awakening in Iran</u>. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969.

Aresteh, R. The education of Iranian leaders in Europe and America. <u>International Review of Education</u>, 1963, <u>8</u> (3-4), 444-450.

Ardabili, H. <u>Problems of modernization of education in Iran</u>. (In Persian.) Tehran: Ebtehadj, 1975.

Astin, A. Determinants of student activism. In J. Foster & D. Long, <u>Protest: Student Activism in America</u>. New York: William Morrow, 1979.

Baldwin, G. B. The foreign-educated Iranian: A profile. <u>Middle East Journal</u>, 1963, <u>17</u>, 264-278.

Barakat, H. Alienation: A process of encounter between utopia and reality. <u>British Journal of Political Science</u>, 1969, <u>20</u>, 73-91.

Bay, C. Political and apolitical students: Facts in search of a theory. <u>Journal of Social Issues</u>, 1961, <u>23</u> (3), 76-91.

Becker, E. <u>Beyond alienation -- A philosophy for the civics of democracy</u>. New York: George Braziller, 1967.

Becker, E. <u>The revolution in psychiatry</u>. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1964.

263

Becker, E. The birth and death of meaning. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1962.

Bell, D. The end of ideology. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1960.

Bell, D. Sociology: A guide to modern usage. American Scholar, 1966, 35, 699-702.

Berger, P. L. A rumor of angels. New York: Doubleday, 1969.

Berger, P. L., Berger, B., & Kellner, H. The homeless mind. New York: Doubleday, 1973.

Berger, P. & Neuhaus, R. Movement and revolution. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970.

Bill, J. The socio-economic foundations of power in contemporary Iran. Middle East Journal, 1963, 17, 400-418.

Bill, J. Iran and the crisis of 78. Foreign Affairs, 1978-79, 57, 323-342.

Blauner, R. Alienation and freedom: The factory worker and his industry. Chicago: Phoenix Books, 1967.

Block, J. H., Hann, N., & Smith, M. B. Activism and apathy in contemporary adolescents. New York: Allyn & Bacon, 1968.

Bottomore, T. B. & Ruble, M., eds. Karl Marx: Selected writings in sociology and social philosophy. London: Penguin Books, 1969.

Borhanmanesh, M. A study of Iranian students in southern California. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1965.

Braungart, R. G. Family status, socialization, and student politics: A multivariate analysis. American Journal of Sociology, 1971, 77, 108-130.

Brookover, W. & Erickson, E. Sociology of education. Chicago: Dorsey Press, 1975.

Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., Miller, W. E., & Stokes, D. E. The American voters. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Camus, A. The rebel. New York: Vintage, 1958.

Camus, A. _The stranger_. New York: Knopf, 1946.

Cassirer, E. _Kant and Rousseau_. Hamden: Archon, 1945.

Charvet, J. _The social problem in the philosophy of Rousseau_. Cambridge: University Press, 1974.

Clark, P. & Mowlana, H. Iran's perception of Western Europe: A study in national and foreign policy articulation. _International Interaction_, 1978, _4_, 99-123.

Comte, A. _System of positive polity_. London: Unwin Books, 1957.

Comte, A. _The crisis of industrial civilization_. London: Penguin Books, 1974.

Corwin, R. G. _A sociology of education_. New York: Appleton, 1965.

Corwin, R. G. _Education in crisis: A sociological analysis of schools and universities in transition_. New York: Wiley, 1974.

Coser, L. A. _Masters of sociological thought_. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971.

Cottam, R. Goodbye to America's Shah. _Foreign Policy_, 1979, _34_, 3-14.

Crookston, B. B. A study of attitudes concerning university relationships with students. _National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal_, 1967, _5_, 134-139.

Dahrendorf, R. _Essays in the theory of society_. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968.

Dean, G. D. Alienation: Its meaning and measurement. _American Sociological Review_, 1961, _26_, 758.

DeGrazia, S. _The political community: A study of anomie_. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Demenach, J. M. Alienation. In I. Feuerlicht, _Alienation from the past to the future_. London: Greenwood Press, 1978.

Dostoevsky, F. _Crime and punishment_. New York: Modern Library, 1950.

Douvan, E. & Adelson, J. The adolescent experience. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Durkheim, E. The division of labor in society. New York: Macmillan, 1933.

Durkheim, E. Suicide: A study in sociology. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1951.

Durkheim, E. Sociology and philosophy. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1953.

Durkheim, E. Montesquieu and Rousseau -- Forerunners of sociology. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960.

Erickson, E. H. Childhood and society. New York: Norton, 1950.

Erickson, E. H. Identity and the life cycle. Psychological Issues, 1959, 1 (1), 30-31.

Erickson, E. H. Alienation. International Encyclopedia of Social Science, 1962, 62.

Etzioni, A. The active society. New York: Free Press, 1968.

Feldman, K. A. & Newcomb, T. M. The impact of college on students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Feuer, L. What is Alienation? The career of a concept. In Stein, M. & Vidich, A., Sociology on trial. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1963.

Feuer, L. The conflict of generations. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Feuerbach, L. The essence of Christianity. New York: Ungar, 1957, 1973.

Feurlicht, I. Alienation from the past to the future. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1978.

Finney, H. C. Political libertarianism at Berkeley: An application of perspectives from the new student left. Journal of Social Issues, 1971, 27, 35-62.

Fishman, J. & Solomon, F. Psychological observations on the student movements. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.

Flacks, R. The liberated generation: An exploration of the root of student protest. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1967, 3 (3), 52-75.

Flacks, R. Social and cultural meaning of student revolt. *Social Problems*, 1970, 17, 340-357. Reprinted in Mizruchi, 1973.

Fortas, A. The rules of revolt. *Blue Print for Health*, 1969, 22, 82-87.

Fredrickson, L. C. *A study of adolescent values*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967.

Freud, S. Dostoevsky and parracide. *Collected papers*, 5. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Freud, S. *Civilization and its discontents*. New York: Norton, 1961.

Friedenberg, E. Z. *The vanishing adolescent*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1959.

Friedenberg, E. Z. *Coming of age in America*. New York: Vintage Books, 1963.

Fromm, E. *Man for himself*. Greenwich, CT: Holt, 1947.

Fromm, E. *Escape from freedom*. New York: Avon Books, 1948.

Fromm, E. *The sane society*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1955.

Fromm, E. *The art of loving*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1960.

Fromm, E. Psychoanalysis and Zen Buddhism. In D. T. Suzuki, E. Fromm, and R. De Martino (Eds.), *Zen Buddhism and psychoanalysis*. New York: Grove Press, 1960.

Fromm, E. *Fear of freedom*. London: Unwin Books, 1966.

Fromm, E. *Socialist humanism, an international symposium*. New York: Doubleday, 1966.

Fromm, E. *Marx's concept of man*. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1969.

Gaiser, G. The present quandary of German novelists. In R. Heitner (Ed.), *The contemporary novel*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1967.

Gamson, W. *Power and discontent*. Chicago: Dorsey Press, 1968.

Gerth, M. & Mills, C. W. *Max Weber – Essays on sociology*. New York: Oxford, 1946.

Geschwender, J. & Rinehart, J. Socialization, alienation, and student activism. *Youth and Society*, 1974, 5 (3), 303-324.

Geschwender, B. A. & Geschwender, J. Relative derivation and participation in the civil rights movements. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, 1971.

Glazer, N. The alienation of modern man. *Commentary*, 1947, 3, 378.

Goete, J. V. *West-east-divan*. London: A. Rogers, 1957.

Goodman, P. *Growing up absurd*. New York: Random House, 1960.

Gouldner, A. Anti-minotaur: The myth of a value-free sociology. In I. Horowitz (Ed.), *The new sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Gouldner, A. *The coming crisis of Western sociology*. New York: Basic Books, 1970.

Hadden, J. The private generation. *Psychology Today*, 1969, 3, 22-28.

Hauser, A. *Mannerism*. London: Unwin Books, 1965.

Hegel, G. *Lectures on the philosophy of history*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1923, 1956, 1975.

Hegel, G. *The phenomenology of mind*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1931.

Hegel, G. *The philosophy of right*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942.

Hegel, G. *Early theological writings*, ed. R. Kroner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Hegel, G. *Political writings*, ed. T. M. Knox. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

Hegel, G. *Science of logic*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1969.

Hegel, G. Philosophy of mind. London: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Hegel, G. Aesthetics. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Heidegger, M. Being and time. London: SCM Press, 1962.

Heiemann, F. H. Existentialism and the modern predicament. New York: Random House, 1958.

Heine, H. Werke. Salzburg: University Press, 1968.

Heist, P. Intellectual and commitment: The faces of discontent, Berkeley Center for the Study of Higher Education. Los Angeles: Berkeley University Press, 1965.

Heist, P. The dynamics of student discontent and protest. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, New York, 1966.

Hemingway, E. The sun also rises. New York: Modern Library, 1926, 1954.

Henry, J. Culture against man. New York: Random House, 1963.

Hesse, H. Magister ludi (The bead game). New York: Ungar, 1949.

Hobbs, T. Leviathan or the matter -- Forms and the power of a commonwealth, ecclesiastical and civil. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946.

Hobbs, T. Philosophical rudiments concerning government and society. London: Putnam's Sons, 1951.

Hoffer, E. The true believer. New York: Harper, 1951.

Hoffer, E. First things, last things. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Hofstadter, R. Anti-intellectualism in American life. New York: Knopf, 1963, 1970.

Hofstadter, R., in A. Alvarez, Under pressure: The writer in society. Harmondsworth: Middlesex, 1965.

Horowitz, I. L. On alienation and the social order. Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, 1966-67, 27, 230-237.

Horton, J. The dehumanization of anomie and alienation: A problem in the ideology of sociology. The British Journal of Sociology, 1964, 15, 283–300.

Horton, J. & Thompson, W. Powerlessness and political negativism: A study of defeated local referendum. American Journal of Sociology, 1962, 67, 485–493.

Ibrahim, Y. H. Behind Iran's revolution: Too much spending, too soon. New York Times, Economic Survey, February 4, 1979, 60–70.

Illich, I. Deschooling society. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Israel, J. Alienation from Marx to modern sociology. Boston: Allynn & Bacon, 1971.

Jacob, P. E. Changing values in college. New York: Harper, 1957.

Jacobs, R. & Landau, S. The new radicals. New York: Vintage, 1966.

Jaspers, K. Philosophy. Berlin: Zimmens Press, 1956.

Johnson, F. Alienation -- Concept, term, meaning. New York: Seminar Press, 1973.

Jones, R. E. The alienated hero in modern French drama. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1962.

Josephson, E. & Josephson, M. Man alone: Alienation in modern society. New York: Dell, 1962.

Kafka, F. The metamorphosis. New York: Chocken, 1967.

Kahler, E. The tower and the abyss. New York: Viking Press, 1957.

Kant, I. Critique of pure reason. London: Colonial Press, 1963.

Kaplan, M. Alienation and identification. New York: Free Press, 1976.

Katz, D. The functional approach to the study of attitudes. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1960, 24, 163–204.

Kaufman, A. S. On the meaning of alienation. Inquiry, 1965, 8, 141–165.

Kaufman, H. Administrative decentralization and political power. _Public Administration Review_, 1969, _1_, 3-15.

Kaufman, W. Introduction. In R. Schacht, _Alienation_. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970.

Kaufman, W. _Without guilt and justice_. New York: Doubleday, 1973.

Keniston, K. American students and the political revival. _The American Scholar_, 1962, _32_, 40-64.

Keniston, K. _The uncommitted_. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1965.

Keniston, K. The pressure to perform. _The Intercollegian_, 1965, _83_ (1), 8-10.

Keniston, K. The faces in the lecture room. In R. S. Morison (Ed.), _The American university_. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

Keniston, K. The psychology of alienated students. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, New York, 1966.

Keniston, K. _Young radicals: Notes on committed youth_. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968.

Knoff, W. A psychiatrist reads Camus' "The Stranger." _Psychiatric Opinion_, 1979, _6_, 19-25.

Koeppen, S. The republican radical right. _Annals_, 1969, 76.

Kon, I. S. The concept of alienation in modern sociology. In P. Berger (Ed.), _Marxism and sociology_. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.

Kornberg, A. & Brehm, M. Ideology, institutional identification, and campus activism. _Social Forces_, 1971, _49_, 445-459.

Kuhn, T. S. _The structure of scientific revolutions_. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Lambert, C. L. _What is Important for You?_ Unpublished report. Corvallis: Oregon State University, 1971.

Lang, K. Alienation. In J. Gould and W. Kolb (Eds.), _A dictionary of the social sciences_. New York: Free Press, 1964.

Lefebvre, H. The sociology of Marx. London: Penguin Press, 1968.

Lefebvre, H. In I. Feuerlicht, Alienation from the past to the future. London: Greenwood Press, 1978.

Lerner, D. Changing Iran: The forces behind the scenes. The New World, September 12, 1978, 9.

Levi, A. W. Philosophy and the modern world. Bloomington, IN: University Press, 1959.

Levi, C. Christ stopped at Eboli. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1947.

Levi, M. B. The alienated voter: Politics in Boston. New York: Holt, 1960.

Lewis, D. M. The alienation of university students: A study of powerlessness in the area of grade achievement. Kalamazoo, MI: Western Michigan University, Department of Sociology, 1977.

Lichtheim, G. Marxism: An historical and critical study. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961.

Lichtheim, G. Alienation. In D. Sills (Ed.), International encyclopedia of the social sciences. New York: Macmillan & Free Press, 1968, 264-268.

Life. Change yes, upheaval no. 1971, 70, 23-30.

Lifton, R. J. Japanese youth: The search for the new and the pure. The American Scholar, 1960, 30, 332-344.

Lifton, R. J. Youth and history: Individual change in post-war Japan. In E. Erickson (Ed.), The challenge of youth. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

Lifton, R. J. Individual patterns in historical change. Comparative Studies in Society and History, 1964, 6, 369-383.

Lipset, S. M. University students and politics in under-developed countries. Comparative Education Review, 1966, 10, 132-162.

Lipset, S. M. & Altaback, P. Student politics and higher education in the U.S. Comparative Education Review, 1966, 10, 320-349.

Lock, J. The second treatise of government. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1952.

Long, P. The new left. Boston: Porter Sargent, 1969.

Lovejoy, A. O. The meaning of romantic in early German romanticism, in Essays on the history of ideas. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1916.

Lowith, K. From Hegel to Nietzsche. London: Rinehart & Winston, 1941, 1965.

Lukacs, G. History and class consciousness. London: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

MacIver, R. M. The ramparts we guard. New York: Macmillan, 1950.

Mailer, N. Advertisement for myself. New York: Putnam, 1959.

Mannheim, K. Ideology and utopia. London: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1936.

Mannheim, K. The democratization of culture, in Essays on the sociology of culture. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1956.

Mannheim, K. The problem of generations. Psychoanalytic Review, 1970, 57, 383-384.

Marcuse, H. Reason and revolution, Hegel and the rise of social theory. New York: Oxford University Press, 1941.

Marcuse, H. One dimensional man. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.

Marx, K. Selected readings in sociology and social philosophy, ed. T. N. Bottomore & M. Rubel. London: Watts, 1956.

Marx, K. Economic and philosophic manuscripts of 1849. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1959.

Marx, K. Thesis on Feuerbach, 11, Selected Works. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1962-1969.

Marx, K. Selected writings in sociology and social philosophy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Marx, K. Toward the critique of Hegel's philosophy of law. In L. D. Stone & K. H. Guddat (Eds.), Writings of the young Marx on philosophy of law. New York: Anchor Books, 1967.

Marx, K. & Engels, F. The German ideology. Mowcow: Progress, 1976.

Medill, E. & Ridley, J. Status, anomia, political alienation and political participation. American Journal of Sociology, 1962, 68, 205-217.

May, R. Man's search for himself. New York: Norton, 1953.

McDonald, D. Youth. Center Magazine, 1970, 3, 22-33.

McLeish, J. The lecture method. Cambridge: Cambridge Institute of Education, 1968.

Mclellen, D. Marx and the missing link: On the importance of the grundrisse. Encounter, 1970, 35 (5), 262-274.

Mclellen, D. (Ed.). Marx's grundrisse. London: Macmillan, 1971.

Mclellen, D. The thought of Karl Marx: An introduction. London: Macmillan, 1971.

Medacker, J. & Pollack, E. Emerging educational issues: Conflicts and contrasts. New York: Little Brown, 1974.

Mehra, N. The resident student. Edmonton: The University of Alberta, 1971.

Meier, D. L. & Bell, W. Anomia and differential access to the achievement of life goals. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24 (2), 189.

Merton, R. K. Mass persuasion. New York: Harper, 1946.

Merton, R. K. Social theory and social structure. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1959, 1968.

Merton, R. K. Adult roles and responsibility. In N. J. Smelser & W. T. Smelser (Eds.), Personality and social systems. New York: Wiley, 1968.

Meszaros, I. Marx's theory of alienation. London: Merlin, 1970, 1972.

Michael, D. N. *The next generation.* New York: Random House, 1963.

Mill, J. S. *Auguste Comte and positivism.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1961.

Miller, A. *Death of a salesman,* in *Collected plays.* New York: Viking Press, 1957.

Miller, C. R. & Butler, E. W. Anomie and eunomia: A methodological evaluation of Srole's anomie scale. *American Sociological Review,* 1966, 31 (3), 400-406.

Miller, C. R. & Butler, E. W. Reply to Henry. *American Sociological Review,* 1967, 32 (1), 117-118.

Miller, G. A. Professionals in bureaucracy: Alienation among industrial scientists and engineers. *American Sociological Review,* 1967, 32 (5), 755-768.

Miller, R. D. *Schiller and the idea of freedom.* London: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Mills, C. W. *White collar.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.

Mills, C. W. *The causes of world war III.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1958.

Mills, C. W. *The sociological imagination.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Mills, C. W. *Power elite.* London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Ministry of Labor, Investigation of the problems of manpower. *Annual Report,* 1964-1977, 2-8, Tehran, Iran.

Mitchell, J. C. Theoretical orientation in African urban studies. In M. Bauton (Ed.), *The social anthropology of complex societies.* London: Tavistock, 1966.

Mizruchi, H. E. *Success and opportunity: A study of anomia.* New York: Free Press, 1964.

Mizruchi, H. E. An introduction to the notion of alienation. In F. Johnson (Ed.), *Alienation: Concept, term, and meanings.* New York: Seminar Press, 1973.

Mogar, R. E. Value orientations of college students. *Psychology Reports,* 1964, 15, 734-770.

Mowlana, H. Technology versus tradition: Communication in the Iranian revolution. _Journal of Communication_, 1979, 29, 107-112.

Montesquieu, C. L. _Persian letters_. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973.

Moore, S. _The critique of capitalist democracy_. New York: Paine-Whitman, 1957.

Moser, C. A. & Kalton, J. _Survey methods in social investigation_. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Murchland, B. _The age of alienation_. New York: Random House, 1971.

Nafisi, A. & Tabatabi-i, I. _An examination of the problems and difficulties of Tehran secondary and university students_. Tehran: University Press, 1966.

Naville, P. Alienation and analysis of the modern world. _Review_, 1962, 4 (1), 56.

Neal, A. G. & Rettig, S. On the multi-dimensionality of alienation. _American Sociological Review_, 1967, 32 (1), 54-64.

Nettler, G. A measure of alienation. _American Sociological Review_, 1952, 22, 670-677.

Nettler, G. A further comment on anomie. _American Sociological Review_, 1965, 30, 762-763.

Neumann, F. _The democratic and the authoritarian state_. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1957.

Neumann, F. Anxiety and politics. In E. Josephson & M. Josephson, _Man alone_. New York: Dell, 1962.

Nisbet, R. _Community and power_. New York: Oxford Press, 1962.

Nisbet, R. _New York Times Book Review_, November 14, 1965, 1.

Nisbet, R. _The sociological tradition_. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Nisbet, R. _The social bond_. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Offer, D. _The psychological world of the teenager_. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Ollman, B. Alienation: Marx's conception of man in capitalist society. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Olsen, E. M. No categories of political alienation. Social Forces, 1969, 98, 288-299.

Parade. New gap. September 4, 1970.

Pappenheim, F. The alienation of modern man. New York: Monthly Review, 1959.

Pareto, V. The mind and society. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1935.

Parkin, F. Middle class radicalism. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968.

Parsons, T. The structure of social action. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1949.

Parsons, T. Youth in the context of American society. In E. Erikson (Ed.), The challenge of youth. Garden City: Doubleday, 1965.

Penn, J. R. Values and attitudes as measures of intergenerational differences. Ph.D. dissertation, Oregon University, 1972.

Peterson, R. The scope of organized student protest in 1964-1965. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1966.

Petrovic, G. Alienation. In P. Edwards (Ed.), Encyclopedia of philosophy. New York: Macmillan, 1967.

Plant, R. Hegel. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1973.

Ransford, H. E. Isolation, powerlessness, and violence: Study of attitudes and participation in the Watts riot. American Journal of Sociology, 1963, 73, 581-591.

Riesman, D. The lonely crowd. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

Rokeach, M. Beliefs, attitudes, and values: A theory of organization and change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Rose, A. M. Alienation and participation: A comparison of group leaders and the mass. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 834-837.

Rosenberg, H. _The tradition of the new_. New York: Horizon Press, 1959.

Rosenberg, H. It can happen to anyone. _New York Times Book Review_, Dec. 20, 1964, 5.

Rosenfeld, I. & Schorer, M. Quoted in N. Podhoretz, _Making it_. New York: Random House, 1967.

Roszak, T. _The making of a counter culture_. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1969.

Rousseau, J. J. _The social contract and discourses_. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1950.

Rousseau, J. J. _The social contract_. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Roussopoulos, D. _The new left in Canada_. Montreal: Black Rose, 1970.

Russell, B. _Philosophical essays_. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1967.

Sahib al-Zamani, N. _Javani-yi purranj (Suffering youth)_. Tehran: Amir-Kabir, 1965.

Saint Simon, H. _Social organization, the science of man, and other writings_. New York: Harper, 1964.

Sampson, E. Student activism and the decade of protest. _Journal of Social Issues_, 1967, _23_ (3), 1-33.

Sartre, J. P. _Being and nothingness_. New York: Washington Square Press, 1966.

Sartre, J. P. _Between existentialism and Marxism_. New York: National Library, 1974.

Schaar, J. _Escape from authority_. New York: Basic Books, 1961.

Schacht, R. _Alienation_. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967, 1970.

Schachtel, E. On alienated concept of identity. In E. & M. Josephson (Eds.), _Man alone_. New York: Dell, 1962.

Schiller, F. _On the aesthetic education of man_. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Schumpeter, J. _Capitalism, socialism, and democracy_. New York: Harper, 1950.

Schwartz, D. C. Political recruitment: A comparative essay
     in theory and research. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation,
     M.I.T., 1965.

Schwartz, D. C. Political alienation and political behavior.
     Chicago: Aldine, 1973.

Schwarz, E. Hermann Hesse, the American youth movement, and
     problems of literary evaluation. Publications of the
     Modern Language Association of America, 1970, 85, 981.

Scott, M. B. The social sources of alienation. In I. L.
     Horowitz (Ed.), The new society. New York: Oxford
     University Press, 1964.

Seeman, M. On the meaning of alienation. American Sociolo-
     gical Review, 1959, 24, 783-791.

Seeman, M. Alienation. Psychology Today, 1971, 5, 483.

Shahani, K. The pain of youth and its cure. Khandaniha,
     1966, 4, 27.

Shechner, M. Daily Californian, November 22, 1966, 2.

Shils, E. Authoritarianism: Right and left. In R. Chris-
     tie and M. Jahoda (Eds.), Studies in the scope and
     method of "the authoritarian personality". Glencoe,
     IL: Free Press, 1954.

Shils, E. The intellectuals and the powers. Chicago:
     University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Simmel, G. Essays on sociology, philosophy, and aesthetics.
     New York: Harper, 1965.

Slater, E. P. The pursuit of loneliness: American culture
     at the breaking point. Boston: Beacon, 1970.

Smith, A. Wealth of nations. London: J. M. Dent & Sons,
     1960.

Smith, A. An inquiry into the nature and causes of the
     wealth of nations. New York: Random House, 1776.

Smith, H. & Coner, W. Area handbook for Iran. Washington,
     D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Sorokin, P. Contemporary sociological theories. New York:
     Harper, 1928.

Srole, L. A comment on anomy. American Sociological Review,
     1965, 30 (5), 757-762.

Srole, L. Social integration and corollaries: An exploratory study. _American Sociological Review_, 1965, _30_ (5), 768-776.

Statistical Center of Iran, National Census of Population and Housing. _Official report_, 1964-1977. Tehran, Iran.

Sykes, A. G. _Alienation: The cultural climate of modern man_. New York: Braziller, 1964.

Sypher, W. _Loss of the self in modern literature and art_. New York: Random House, 1964.

Taylor, H. The student revolution. _Phi Delta Kappan_, 1969, _51_, 62-67.

Tehranian, M. Iran: Communication, alienation, revolution. _Intermedia_, March 1979, _7_, 6-12.

Thompson, W. E. & Horton, J. E. Political alienation as a force in political action. _Social Forces_, 1959-1960, _38_, 190-195.

Thoreau, M. D. _Walden_. New York: Time, Inc., 1962.

Tillich, P. _Dynamics of faith_. New York: Harper, 1958, 1962.

Tocqueville, A. _Democracy in America_. New York: Knopf, 1962.

Tonnies, F. _Community and association_. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, 1957.

Tonnies, F. _Custom_. New York: Free Press, 1961.

Touranie, A. _The post industrial society_. New York: Random House, 1971.

Trent, J. & Craise, J. Commitment and conformity in the American college. _Journal of Social Issues_, 1967, _23_ (3), 34-51.

Trent, J. & Medsker, L. _Beyond high school: A study of 10,000 high school graduates_. Berkeley, CA: University Press, 1967.

United Nations Institute for Training and Research. _Brain-drain from five developing countries_. New York: United Nations, 1963-1971.

Urick, R. V. _Alienation_. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Victor, G. _Invisible man-faces of alienation_. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Watts, W. & Whittaker, D. Some socio-psychological differences between highly committed members of the free speech movement and the student population at Berkeley. _Journal of Applied Behavioral Science_, 1966, _2_ (1), 41-62.

Weber, M. _The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism_. London: Unwin, 1930.

Weber, M. _Essays in sociology_. New York: Oxford, 1946.

Weber, M. _The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism_. New York: Scribners, 1958.

Weiss, A. F. Self-alienation: Dynamics and therapy. In E. & M. Josephson, _Man alone_. New York: Dell, 1962.

Weisskopf, A. W. _Alienation and economics_. New York: Random House, 1971.

Wolff, K. H. _George Simmel 1858-1918_. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1959.

Young, T. V. The social support of current Iranian policy. _Middle East Journal_, 1952, _6_ 128-143.

ZakiKhani, M. _Alienation of Iranian students at American universities_. Unpublished master's thesis, Western Illinois University, 1978.

Zeitlin, I. _Ideology and development of sociological theory_. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

Zonis, M. Political elite and political cynicism in Iran. _Comparative Political Studies_, 1968, _1_ (3), 351-371.

Zonozi, A. _Motaahed-va-namotaahed, reesheh-hayeh tazahor (Committed and uncommitted, the roots of protest)_. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Tehran, 1976.