ALIENATION AND THE PERCEPTION

OF PERSONALITY

By

CORNELIS GEORGE BOEREE

Bachelor of Arts
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania
1974

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1979

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
July, 1980

ALIENATION AND THE PERCEPTION

OF PERSONALITY

Thesis Approved:

_____
Thesis Adviser

_____

_____

_____

_____
Dean of the Graduate College

1069459

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my major adviser, Dr. Bob Helm, for his encouragement and guidance, not only through this study but throughout my career as a graduate student, and to the other members of my committee, Dr. William W. Rambo, Dr. Larry Hochhaus, and Dr. George Edward Arquitt for their assistance and friendship.

I would also like to thank my wife, Judy, and my daughter, Jenny, for their help, patience, and above all love, throughout these four trying years. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The alien, the outsider among insiders, remains alien
as long as he is unable to put aside his old social
grammar and assume the grammar of the surrounding society.
His inability to anticipate what others will do
contributes to ever-increasing feelings of anxiety,
irritation, powerlessness. His inability to present
himself in such a way that others understand him isolates
him further, and prevents him, in fact, from learning what
he needs to know. He may huddle in the warmth of his
fellow aliens, strike back, or retreat from the offending
society entirely, physically or psychologically. The
thesis here proposed is that alienation is the condition
of the individual who finds himself an alien in his own
society.

The purpose of this study is threefold: (1) to
develop a well-grounded theory of alienation; (2) to
examine the specific relationship of expressed alienation
and descriptions of personality; and (3) to contribute to
the development of a viable semantic analysis technique.
The organization is quite simple: Chapter II examines
"instrumentality," that manner of living oriented toward

1

the achievement of ends by means not structurally integral to these ends. A case is made for the existence of an historical tendency toward instrumentality by tying it to various obvious tendencies, such as increasing technology, merchant economies, the factory system, population increase and the bureaucratic mechanisms it engenders. Finally, I define alienation in terms of failure in an instrumental world, where the natural, non-instrumental satisfactions of personal production and familistic associations may well be minimal. Chapter III reviews the empirical literature concerning alienation, beginning with discussions of assumptions and the varieties of alienation. Chapter IV looks at the empirical literature concerning person perception, leading to the hypothesized bridge between alienation and shallow perceptions of others similar to children's inexperienced perceptions. Chapter V attempts to experimentally validate this hypothesis by examining the relations of expressed alienation and semantically analyzed written descriptions of self and others.

It is my sincere hope that you enjoy this paper and the ideas it presents, and that it contribute in some small way to our understanding of the human condition.

CHAPTER II

THE CONCEPT OF ALIENATION

It is no simple task to tie together the many philosophical-sociological-historical-economic definitions, psychological operationalizations, popular millenialistic warnings, and subjective experiencings of alienation, using as twine a theory conceived prior to consideration of the problem. Alienation never was and never will be a unitary phenomenon. It has more in common with things like personality and mental illness and culture: It is hard to pin down but undeniably <u>there</u>. So I beg the reader's patience. It <u>will</u> all come together in the end.

Theory

In <u>Glass Beads</u> (Boeree, 1979), I outlined a theory, the main points of which are as follows:

1. Following Hjelmslev (1961), mind consists of "nothing but" <u>relations</u>, objects and acts being collections of point-signals on the sensory-motor "surface," which in turn are organized into meaningful gestalts through the use of rule systems, all of which may be modeled with a network notation such as that devised by Lamb (1966).

2. The interaction of mind with environment involves

the continuous presentation of cognitive structure in anticipation of sensation, some anticipation manifesting itself as action, and irreconcilable incongruities being accepted into cognitive structure through adaptation. (See Neisser, 1976, for a similar conception.)

3. Incongruence in or inaccuracy of anticipation is directly experienced as irritation, ranging from mild annoyance to terror (depending on the extent and duration of the incongruence); The resolution through adaptation (i.e. the growth of structure) is directly experienced as pleasure, ranging from mild effectance to the "Eureka" experience.

From this it can be seen that, insofar as one's "model" of the world is full, accurate, and consistent, one interacts without irritation--or pleasure. In fact, I would contend one would interact without awareness! But this is hardly a _human_ existence; Our knowledge of the world--and ourselves--_cannot_ be "full, accurate, and consistent;" It--and we--are simply too big, too complex, and we shall always be presented with events which lead to irritation, and the potential for growth and pleasure. We may orient our lives to avoiding unpleasantness and hide from irritation; or we may orient our lives to growth.

Production

In order to deal with a number of problems associated with alienation, we must add a corollary to these three

points. The theory allows that image-making can occur
independently of the environment without learned
interiorization. It also allows for exteriorization of
of image-making through action: We can see the horse in
the marble and struggle to set him free!

> Consider the artist. . . when he tries to express
> and to articulate an image. It is initially so
> identified and intertwined with him that he must
> endure pain and struggle to release it and give
> it a life of its own. . . . Yet out of this
> alienation a work of art may be born which is
> animated by the life the artist has breathed into
> it. In this moment he finds that his production
> is no longer severed from him but is taken back
> into his life, enriching and kindling it
> (Pappenheim, 1959, p. 92).

We are productive (as well as rational) creatures, and we
can grow through "external" interactions as well as
through "internal" ones, and so find producing pleasant.
Listen also to Hegel (1942):

> The thing's relation to me is neither fleeting
> nor superficial, for it is essentially
> transformed through my productive or "forming"
> activity in such a way that it bears my imprint.
> I have "put my will into it"; I have made it
> reflect my will, my personality (1942, section
> 42).

And listen to Marx, as interpreted by Schacht (1970):

> Essentially considered, labor for Marx is
> productive activity through which the individual
> objectifies and thus realizes himself,
> simultaneously expressing and developing himself
> as an individual personality. It is what
> it should be only when it has no other end than
> than this (p. 93, emphasis added).

Natural and Instrumental Will

But what if one's actions are no longer ends in-and-of themselves, but become means to other ends? First, we need to define will:

> . . . the set of internally labelled decisions and anticipated results, proposed by application of data from the system's past and by the blocking of incompatible impulses or data from the system's present or future (Deutsch, 1964, p. 246).

That is to say, will is the setting aside of some things (whether a part of the environment, the environment as a whole, or a part of one's self) in order to devote oneself to some other thing. Will is saying no.

Now, there is a natural will, a setting-aside which is done because, through experience, we have come to know that that setting-aside allows for and heightens the pleasure of resolution. This may involve the innate, such as rolling a crumb of chocolate over one's tongue, or cooking, or fore-play in sex. Or it may be a cognitive event, such as puzzling over (or putting-up-with) the build-up to a joke, or contemplating a thought. or it may be an event involving production: Struggling with the wood/clay/marble/canvas/words in the effort to realize a conclusion congruent to the image. In all these examples, the activity prior to one's "reward" is intimately related to the "reward." This is the same as what Toennies (1957) calls Wesenwille.

Toennies also considers something called Kuerwille,

which I shall translate as _instrumental will_. This is the
will involved in setting aside present irritation in order
to achieve a future pleasure _artificially_ connected to the
irritations, where pleasure is _not_ the result of resolving
the irritating situation.

> The awareness of means and ends as two separate
> and independent categories is the very core of
> _Kuerwille_, whereas both are blended and remain
> undifferentiated in _Wesenwille_ (Pappenheim, 1959,
> p. 71).

Instrumental will is the careful assessment of pros and
cons and prudent choosing, self-conscious, rational,
deliberate.

We must not be overly romantic about natural will as
opposed to instrumental will. Instrumental will has
always been with us and always will be. And one can live
one's life well, derive great satisfaction, living it in
the instrumental way. There are, after all, also always
natural enjoyments awaiting us--perhaps.

Natural and Instrumental Association

Human beings are social beings--if not by nature, then
by the fact that surviving through infancy entails at least
a few years of company. One's first society is generally
"a social unit which does not primarily come into being
through conscious design: one finds oneself belonging to it
as one belongs to one's home" (Pappenheim, 1959, p. 66).
Like the relationship of mother and child, separation may
come, but it develops from a unity. I am, of course,

speaking of Toennies' (1957) <u>Gemeinschaft</u>, the natural
association.

Naturally, we have a contrasting association, the
<u>Gesellschaft</u> or instrumental association. Pappenheim
(1959, p. 66) defines it so: "a relationship contractual
in its nature, deliberately established by individuals who
realize that they cannot pursue their proper interests
effectively in isolation and therefore band together."
Despite occasional unity, it is separation that prevails
here: One enters an instrumental association with only a
fraction of one's being, whatever corresponds to the
specific purpose of that organization.

The parallel between natural and instrumental <u>will</u>
(<u>Wesenwille</u> and <u>Kuerwille</u>) and natural and instrumental
<u>association</u> (<u>Gemeinschaft</u> and <u>Gesellschaft</u>) is hardly
meant to be hidden: A natural association is one wherein
each member relates to each other member in terms of
natural will; An instrumental association is one wherein
each member relates to each other member in terms of
instrumental will. In a natural association each seeks
the other because the presence of the other is felt to be
good, and an individual cannot be replaced without
changing the group (can you "break-in" a new brother?).
In an instrumental association each seeks the other as a
means to some ends other than the association itself, and
any individual can be replaced by another insofar as the
other serves the same ends, by imparting to him the "rules"

of the position.

The Growth of Instrumentality

Although both the smoothness and the inevitability of the trend have no doubt been exaggerated, I think it is undeniable that the world has been moving for some time toward the instrumental. The observations of historians and anthropologists on this progress are uncountable: Traditional to modern, rural to urban, preindustrial to postindustrial, all the standard progressions have contained within them the distinction between the natural associations of "primitive" communities and the social usury of today. Listen to Redfield (1947) on "folk society" and compare it to our own:

> . . . small, isolated, nonliterate, and homogeneous, with a strong sense of group solidarity. The ways of living are conventionalized into that coherent system we call a "culture." Behavior is traditional, spontaneous, uncritical, and personal; there is no legislation or habit of experiment and reflection for intellectual ends. Kinship, its relationships and institutions, are the type categories of experience and the familial group is the unit of action. The sacred prevails over the secular; the economy is one of status rather than the market (p. 294).

Let us temper this distinction by noting that people have been complaining about the things we see as symptoms of alienation for some time: The ancient Athenians saw fit to condemn Socrates for "alienating" their young men; The ancient Hebrews apparently had such a hard time with "intergenerational conflicts" that they had to come up

with the the fifth commandment; And Aristotle had this to say about the "political apathy" of his day: "That which is common to the greatest number has the least attention bestowed upon it. Everyone thinks chiefly of his own, hardly ever of the public, interest" (Politics, ii, 3).

Further evidence from cyclical theorists indicates that there has been at least one other highly instrumental society: the Roman Empire. Sorokin's (1937) analysis, for example, brings to light the disproportionate number of writings emphasizing the ills of the society of the Empire, as well as the parallel growth of "alienated" schools of thought such as Skepticism and Cynicism, and the "pseudo-Gemeinschaft" religious cults of the era. Further, non-historical considerations point out that there is a continuum of similar nature in present-day civilizations, for example, Hall's (1977) low-high context dimension and Benedict's (1934)--or Nietzsche's, or Szent-Gyorgyi's--Dionysian-Apollonian distinction.

The difficulty is, as I mentioned, that instrumental will and association is coexistent with natural will and association, and it is the particular balance in a particular time and place and people that makes alienation more-or-less likely. Let us now turn to some possible reasons for the increasing prevalence of instrumentality, beginning with Toennies' (1925) observations on what he sees as the transitional era in which Hobbes lived:

Man still has his center in his family, in his

community and in his social estate. Monetary
economy is still weak and therefore individual
ownership has not yet reached an acute stage.
Slowly, in a process which is often impeded and
interrupted, further development erodes these
conditions. Feelings and ideas which prevailed
heretofore, begin to change. The individual
centered on himself and what belongs to him
increasingly becomes the predominant type of man
in society. He thinks, he calculates, he reckons
his advantage. To him everything becomes a
means to an end. Notably his relationships to
other men, and thus to associations of all kinds,
begins to change. He dissolves and concludes
pacts and alliances according to his interests,
i.e. as a means to his ends. Although he finds
it difficult to extricate himself from certain
relationships into which he was born, he
reflects on their usefulness and in his thoughts,
at least, makes them dependent on his will.
(p. 265)

Commodities

First, we note that our progress toward instrumentality

is paralleled by increased use of money (and now credit),

increased importance of the merchant, and increased selling

of labor. We must consider the growth of capitalism and

the basis of this system, the commodity. Pappenheim (1959),

discussing Marx, says this:

Marx considers the essence of the commodity the
separation of use value from exchange value.
No article, it is true, can become a commodity
without having use value, that is without having
specific properties which make it fit to serve
some consumer's needs. Although this use value
is a prerequisite for the object's conversion
into a commodity, qua commodity the object has
only exchange value. (p. 85)

So, a thing used "not for itself" but as a means to an end

(i.e. instrumentally) is a commodity. And who uses things

in such a fashion? Merchants. And the trend from self-

sustaining folk-economies to the mercantile economy of capitalism is as inevitable as the sun-rise, because it is driven by a brand of instrumental will which propogates particularly well when demonstrably successful: Greed.

It is difficult to keep books based on barter. An obvious solution is to translate all values (exchange values) into some common denominator, something small, hard, easy to weigh and carry: precious metals. And, stamped into uniform shapes and sizes, we barely need books at all. This is money, and this is what Engels (1902) has to say about it:

> The commodity of commodities, that which holds all other commodities hidden in itself, the magic power which can change at will into everything desirable and desired (p. 35).

This conception of money was given further validation when paper money became common, when the treasury stopped printing the words "pay to the bearer. . . ," and finally when all money is perhaps in the process of being replaced by the tacit agreement represented by the credit card.

Now, what are these things that become commodities but the products of our labor? And what could be easier than the step from selling our creations to selling our creating (especially in exchange for "the magic power")-- unless it be the buying? Work becomes "not the satisfaction of a need but only a means to satisfy other needs" (Marx, 1963, p. 125). The worker

> . . . does not fulfill himself in his work but denies himself, has a feeling of misery rather

than well-being, does not develop freely his
spiritual and physical powers but is physically
exhausted and spiritually debased (Marx, 1963,
p. 125).

Technology, Science, and Education

Something else has paralleled the trend to
instrumentalism: Technology. First, let us return to the
product. As we said, a product is an extension of oneself,
an exteriorization of the image within. Tools (and
techniques, on a more abstract plane) are special forms
of product which are used to create other products. They
may be seen as, very literally, extensions of ourselves.
But they contain in their very nature the seed of
instrumentality.

Now, it used to be that a producer pretty much made
his own tools as they were needed, and his products bore
the stamps of not only his individuality but that of his
tools as well. But this is inefficient, and inefficiency
is the bugaboo of merchants and capitalists, not to
mention princes and generals. And so there came into the
world an invention as inevitable as money, the "technique
of techniques," the factory system.

With the standardization of the product and the tools
that make it, and with the fragmentation of the productive
process by the assembly line, production is no longer the
realization of the worker's images, is no longer a
manifestation of natural will. The worker has become, in

fact, the most replaceable part in a strictly instrumental system. The danger is that the instrumentality has a distinct tendency to seep back down the tool and into the human being at the end.

Closely attached to the growth of technology is the growth of science, not as an extension of philosophy into the physical realm by enthusiastic gentleman amateurs, but as a standardized method for discovery in response to the demand for new commodities. Rather than wait for the intuitive synthesis of experience into new knowledge, which requires very special people in special situations, let us rather find efficient techniques that can be performed by anyone and, much like a computer giving the illusion of intelligence by being dumb very quickly, we are bound to come across the genius's insights at lower cost.

Also tied to technology is higher education. There used to be an ideal, expressed best by Cardinal Newman:

> It is the education which gives a man a clear
> conscious view of his own opinions and
> judgements, a truth in developing them, an
> eloquence in expressing them, and a force in
> urging them. It teaches him to see things as
> they are, to go right to the point, to
> disentangle a skein of thought, to detect what
> is sophistical, and to discard what is
> irrelevant (quoted in Muller, 1970, p. 223).

The university is now, unashamedly, a means to an end, a training ground for businessmen, engineers, lawyers, professionals of all fields, or often enough, a care-taking service for over-extended adolescents. These are

not evils in and of themselves, except that they seem to
have crowded out the ideal altogether. In commencement
addresses everywhere, university presidents proclaim that
the education formerly available only to the upper class
is now available to everyone. In point of fact, <u>that</u>
kind of education is now available to <u>no</u>-one, and all that
is left is an expanded trade school.

Population and Bureaucracy

The third major trend is population. The boom in
the world's population has a reciprocal relationship with
the trends we have discussed already: It is
industrialization, capitalism, and technological innovation.
that, to a significant degree, allow for the increase in
national and world population; Yet, without the steadily
increasing market this boom provides, the very concept of
quantitative progress may not have arisen. Even Redfield
(1941, p. 364) admits that social change is a result of
"increase of contacts, bringing about heterogeneity and
disorganization of culture."

The size of a society such as ours means that there
will be a great distance from prince to peasant, and that
laws must be written concerning the mythical acts of the
average man. And the real individual is often force-
fitted into some category in order that the bureaucratic
intermediaries can function as <u>just</u> representatives of
their prince. So bureaucracy, so often blamed for the

state of the world, is perhaps the only rational response to the disintegration of more immediate power structures.

Big government, big business, big labor, the big city--all symbolize the anonymity of one among so very many. And it is this anonymity that makes Machiavelli the text of preference for making one's way.

Freedom?

There is one more possible reason for the trend to instrumentality: It may, at least in part, be what people want; It may represent, symbolically or in actuality, and certainly ironically, freedom from the miserable existence people have lived since descending to the savannah.

> Shocked, embarrased and horrified, "we" deny what I as an individual know that I have always wanted--to be irresponsible in the truest sense, to be without obligations, to be for myself alone (Pawley, 1974, p. 42).

But the fact that A is preferred over B does not make A flawless or even viable. The question before us now is what is wrong with an instrumental society?

The Problem with Instrumentality

It must be acknowledged that we can do quite well in life even with commodities, the nine-to-five, massive technology, and cumbersome bureaucracies. For the majority of people living in our instrumental society, the ends for which they put up with so much irritation

are satisfying, the myths they use to explain away those irritations are well developed, and they find daily respite in the natural company of family and friends. Let us examine each of these.

Others

"Other people" are highly generative events in one's environment, extremely difficult to anticipate and adapt to, and hence potentially the source of a most extreme irritation. It takes a great deal of socialization to develop within oneself accurate "models" of human beings, and a great deal of conformity--agreeing to rules--to keep the generativity at a comfortable level. The degree to which you can deal with others in terms of "empathy"--i.e. assuming they think as you do--is the degree to which these measures are successful. This is home. In Gemeinschaft society it extends far beyond family and friends. In Gesellschaft society there is a very real danger of losing it altogether.

When someone interacts with you--no matter how pleasantly--but you know his pleasant manner is a means to an end, the surface manifestations of this person provide less immediate information about him and anticipation becomes increasingly difficult. The interaction changes from a pleasant experience to a question of "what does he want?" Irritation builds up until you discover his ends.

In a society of people such as this--people whose actions belie underlying motives--daily interaction is irritating to some extent. There is an "edge" to interpersonal relationships. We play games. The degree of irritation depends very much on how skilled you are at interpreting motives as well as how aware you are prior to an interaction of the ends of that interaction.

The result of long-term exposure to (or socialization in) this game is to <u>always</u> <u>doubt</u> the surface of inter-actions. It is, in fact, considered <u>naive</u> to trust others, their word, their outer appearances. We teach our children to never judge a book by its cover, don't take candy from a stranger, all that glitters is not gold, it's only a movie, etc. Mind you, these are <u>good</u> admonitions in our culture, if you wish your child to survive.

But consider: Can your child trust <u>you</u>? Generally speaking, within our very tiny nuclear (and "sub-nuclear") families, we tend to be honest, open, and to never treat each other as means to an end. But we often fail to leave the games at the door. It may take only one experience of mistrust on the part of a child to set him to thinking of even his family as game-players. And, being less well trained by simple virtue of not having "been around" as long, he is likely to be very innaccurate at making inferences as to your motivations. Suddenly, security--<u>home</u>--is a shaky proposition.

Myths

Irritation need not be dissipated--it is not stored. But it causes us considerable long-term distress when we cannot distract ourselves from the irritating incongruity. In the process of exercising our instrumental wills, we are _not_ occupying the delay in gratification with activity structurally integral to the end, but with something _else_. Now, if that something else is interesting in its own right, if it involves a puzzle or a challenge, or if it allows contact with friends, the delay is not so bad. But if the something else requires little involvement, little use of consciousness, our awareness naturally drifts to the unresolved incongruities of our never-complete model of the world and ourselves, i.e. we begin to think about the gap between what is and what we wish it would be.

We deal with our choice to delay with what I have unabashedly called _myths_. These include all the familiar reasons (defenses, diversions) people use to explain why they put up with things they would not otherwise put up with: Religious ideas of ultimate reward for suffering; philosophies of duty to country, family honor, or mankind; conceptions of progress, toward dozens of possible earthly paradises or just toward the continuing possibility of progress; conceptions of punishments for not continuing; conceptions of oneself as striving after fulfillment/ achievement/glory/_the_ life-style, and so on. Insofar as

we have these myths integrated in the larger context of ourselves, so do we have what these myths serve to see us through integrated. These myths lend meaning to instrumentality.

But often the myth weakens in some way. We encounter other myths, discuss them with others, read, think. Or our daily irritations exceed the limits our myth accounts for. Suddenly, like the man who having lost his faith comes to dread his death, we come to dread our lives.

Failure

What happens when the means to some end are not known or are unavailable, or the ends have beeen artificially inflated or are withheld altogether, when the acts of instrumental will _fail_? Failure, although a possibility in all aspects of life, has an especially harsh feel to it when it is the culmination of an extended, willful act of denial, so harsh, in fact, that the only strictly psychological full development of the concept of alienation--Klinger, 1976--considers failure the essence of the problem. I shall consider it only a potential _trigger_ for a fuller realization of the fragility of instrumental society, a realization that things, work, people, yourself have been means for so long and to such a degree that, ends withdrawn, these "means" can no longer be experienced for themselves. Instrumental living is like sucking your thumb while

awaiting the breast: It's not bad, really; but should
the breast fail to make its appearance, it becomes
acutely evident that thumbs give no milk.

> If the goal system of Western affluence breaks
> down, what lies beneath it is not a renewed
> sense of community through scarcity, but an
> absolute social collapse without the security
> of interpersonal and inter-family support
> (Pawley, 1974, p. 185).

Alienation

So, what happens when your lack of skills prevents
you from attaining all those advertised ends, or when
those ends aren't forthcoming?--you feel powerless. And
when your myths and distractions no longer allow you to
deal with the irritations incumbent in a life of denial?--
you ask what justice is there. And when, knowing that you
cannot trust in appearances, you find yourself
insufficiently skilled at life in a social world to
fend-off the terror of interaction?--you withdraw into
shyness. And when you discover you have no haven of
natural associations, no home?--you feel meaningless.
And what happens when all these things come together in
an overwhelming realization of the emptiness of your
life?--you Stop.

This is alienation. It is not a misperception of
reality. It is, rather, an all-too-accurate perception
of the failings of instrumental society. The novelist
Kurt Vonnegut, Jr. (1974) sums it up for us:

(People) want lives in folk societies, wherein
everyone is a friendly relative, and no act or
object is without holiness. Chemicals make
them want that. Chemicals make us all want
that. Chemicals make us furious when we are
treated as things rather than as persons.
When anything happens to us which would not
happen to us in a folk society, our chemicals
make us feel like fish out of water (p. 179).

CHAPTER III

ALIENATION: THE EMPIRICAL LITERATURE

The difficulty in reviewing alienation research
lies in its vagueness: The topic tends to drift off
imperceptibly into general unhappiness, or job
dissatisfaction, or depression, and so on. In looking
at alienation in relation to some variables you need to
cut off discussions rather abruptly and arbitrarily to
avoid going on forever; In other cases, you may never
mention alienation at all and yet feel obligated to
discuss certain relationships. Let us begin by
discussing that vagueness.

Assumptions

Social philosophers, theorists, and critics--
especially Marxists--have criticized the empirical work
in alienation on three points. First, they point out
that alienation is treated as a psychological state of
an individual, whereas Marx was concerned with alienation
as a structural condition of bourgeois society (Schacht,
1970; Israel, 1971; Marx, 1963). I mentioned this in the
previous chapter, acknowledging that Marx's Entfremdung
roughly corresponds to what I have called instrumentality,

and defining alienation as an awareness of and discomfort with extensive instrumentality and relative lack of naturalness in one's life--i.e. as a subjective, psychological state. I agree that, in science and philosophy, it is useful to have a one-to-one correspondence between words and concepts. Inability to deal with a lack thereof in a constructive fashion, however, is hardly a sign of scientific rigor or philosophical sophistication.

The second criticism concerns the "multidimensionality" of alienation as used by social scientists:

> The apparent diversity of the things subsumed under the term--when it is discussed at all-- is usually handled simply by adopting the expedient of suggesting "the concept of alienation" (and corresponding phenomena) to be "multidimensional" (Schacht, 1970, p. 155).

As I mentioned earlier, alienation is not a unitary phenomenon. We have differences in manner of experiencing alienation, such as Seeman's (1976) powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, cultural estrangement, and social isolation (to be discussed in detail below); differences in focal aspect of society, such as Feuer's (1963) alienation of class society, competitive society, industrial society, man's society, race, and generations; Josephson and Josephson's (1973) distinction between conditions of alienation and the states of alienation, or Barakat's (1969) between social sources, psychological properties, and behavioral consequences of alienation;

focal activities (Keen, in Manley, 1969) such as speech, promises, work, reproduction, civility, hope in the future, and respect for ecology; and Scott's (1965) distinctions as to sources--lack of commitment to values, absence of conformity to norms, loss of responsibility in roles, and deficiency in control of facilities. (See Johnson, 1973, for a review.) We can also look at the manifestations of affect (e.g. anger, depression, loneliness, schizoid symptomology, etc.), and at the "population" of alienation (e.g. the isolated individual, small groups, the retreatist community, the ghettoized community, the "amorphous" community of the counter-culture, etc.).

There is, however, a unity in alienation which is found in what has variously been called "structure," "function," or "aetiology" (interestingly, the same people that criticize the use of the concept alienation apparently have no trouble with these words!): First, negatively, alienation is unhappiness not due to organic dysfunction, or to some misperception of reality, or as a reaction to specific events; Secondly, alienation is unhappiness due to, once again, the realization of the failings of instrumentality (or some other interpretation of source and development); And thirdly, there remains the possibility that, like different infections can be reduced by the same hand-washing, the varieties of alienation may have a common resolution.

The third criticism concerns the practice of

operationalization so dear to empiricists. McClosky and
Schaar (1965, p. 24), for example, in discussing their
alienation test quite honestly admit that "the items
define, by their content, our conception of anomy," and
Neal and Rettig (1963) talk about developing a better
understanding of alienation through the use of multi-
dimensional scaling. I agree with this criticism insofar
as operationalizations, while often essential to
experimental techniques, must be operationalizations of
something--a theoretical concept. I must point out to
the social critic, however, that a "test" of alienation
consisting of utterances we might agree alienated people
might utter is only barely an operationalization at all.
Insofar as alienation is considered a subjective
phenomenon, and people are capable of putting those
experiences into words, a well constructed questionnaire
should be quite able to "tap" alienation. It is a good
sight better than either unemployment rates or galvanic
skin responses, at any rate.

Concerning the social critics' points generally, I
must add that man remains the measure at least of his own
happiness or misery, and there comes a point at which we
must settle--or set aside--our semantic quibblings in order
to begin thinking about him.

One additional criticism comes not from the social
critics, but from fellow empiricists: These point to the
lack of predictive ability of the discussed

operationalizations, the lack of significant consequences of the subjective experiencings of alienation, the lack of cause-effect linkages. This requires three responses: First, a lack of significant consequences of such an experience is not terribly serious when the experience is the consequence with which we are concerned; Secondly, one "problem" in society is not necessarily the effect of some other "problem," but may reflect the structure of society operating at its best (there is, for example, an excellent argument that class differentiation is inevitable in a capitalistic society); And thirdly, like the robins in springtime, alienation appears again and again as a social phenomenon and as a significant variable in the empirical literature.

For reviews of these objections, as well as full discussions of alienation, please see Schacht (1970), Israel (1971), Johnson (1973), and Geyer and Schweitzer (1976). To summarize, approaching alienation as either a variable in an experimental equation or as an event of purely philosophical concern, we lose alienation as a real pain experienced by real people in a real, and very busy indeed, world.

Varieties of Alienation

Seeman (1959, 1967, 1969, 1975, 1976) is so often cited in the literature that any review would be incomplete without discussing his thoughts in some detail.

He postulates six (formerly five) varieties of alienation:

Powerlessness

Powerlessness is a "low expectancy that one's own behavior can control the occurance of personal and social rewards" (Seeman, 1959, p. 784), "the sense of low control versus mastery over events" (Seeman, 1975, p. 93), that experience expressed in items like "I have no control over things." It is Seeman's interpretation of Marx and Weber that finds its expression in powerlessness. Regarding the approach taken in this paper, it might be interpreted as an inability to generate actions which lead to a desired end; Instrumentality has failed; I have done x (unpleasant) in order to receive y (pleasant), but y has not been forthcoming.

Meaninglessness

Meaninglessness is a "low expectancy that satisfactory predictions about future outcomes of behavior can be made" (Seeman, 1959, p. 786), "the sense of incomprehensibility versus understanding of personal and social affairs" (Seeman, 1975, p. 93), that experience expressed in items like "I don't understand the world anymore." It is Seeman's interpretation of Mannheim's thesis concerning the increase of functional as opposed to substantial rationality. We may see it as an inability to anticipate events in our efforts to reach desired ends; I do not have

an accurate image-model of my society; I cannot anticipate the results of my own actions.

The distinction between powerlessness and meaninglessness is understandable, for example in terms of systems theory, because of the strong differentiation between input and output. "Glass Beads," however, barely distinguishes between the image which anticipates sensation and the image which generates action. Indeed, the same image can, and usually does, participate in both perception and behavior. Meaninglessness and powerlessness are both expression of the "harshness" of failure in instrumental society which I mentioned in the preceding chapter.

Normlessness

Normlessness is "a high expectancy that socially unapproved means are necessary to achieve given goals" (Seeman, 1959, p. 788), that experience expressed in items like "you have to play dirty to win." It is Seeman's version of Durkheim's and Merton's anomie. Normlessness shares aspects of both the preceding concepts--a discrepancy between what I want and what I have--and the following concepts--I think of myself or want to be a full-fledged member of society, but disagree with them concerning the means which are effective.

Cultural estrangement

Cultural estrangement is "the individual's rejection
of commonly held values in the society (or subsector)
versus commitment to going group standards" (Seeman, 1975,
p. 93), assigning "low reward value to goals or beliefs
that are typically highly rewarded in the given society"
(Seeman, 1959, p. 789). It is Seeman's interpretation of
the sociological tradition of the role of the intellectual.
For us, like normlessness is conflicting means, cultural
estrangement is conflicting ends: The instrumental
"establishment" has ends with which I disagree, has no
values other than self-service, has no rules in the sense
of ethical principles, requires one to reject the natural
and pick up the instrumental.

Self-estrangement

Self-estrangement is "the individual's engagement in
activities that are not intrinsically rewarding versus
involvement in a task or activity for its own sake"
(Seeman, 1975, pp. 93-94), that experience expressed in
items such as "I don't get any pleasure from my work."
It is Seeman's interpretation of early Marx and Fromme.
Self-estrangement is the realization that I am engaged in
irritating activities that do not resolve themselves
naturally; It is the simple paradox of "I do x and I do
not want to do x."

Social isolation

Social isolation is "the individual's low expectancy for inclusion and social acceptance, expressed typically in feelings of rejection or repudiation" (Seeman, 1959, p. 789), "the feeling of loneliness and yearning for supportive primary relationships" (McClosky and Schaar, 1965, p. 30). This is also a matter of simple paradox, and forms the crux of normlessness and cultural estrangement as well: "I am or want to be a member of society, but there are signs that I am not a member and may never be." It is the lack of natural associations during significant portions of one's day or one's life. Schacht (1970) makes the points that none of the researchers concerned with this aspect of alienation seem to require a loss of previous closeness or make a distinction between choice and non-choice of loneliness. The responses to these objections are obvious: The definitions above (and others) include with loneliness such qualifiers as "yearning" and "rejection;" The great majority of people in the world have experienced closeness at some point, hence can compare; And even those who have never experienced closeness (and so, according to Schacht, cannot experience loss) may have seen it in others, may indeed have the yearning built-in, or--most likely-- be so severely disturbed that loneliness would be the least of their problems.

We might summarize by classifying Seeman's (1975) six forms of alienation into categories created from the discussion of the previous chapter (e.g. the individual's difficulties concerning ends, means, or a lack of naturalness, in regards to production or association). But a lack of certainty on my part and a lack of clarity on Seeman's, not to mention the artificiality of any such categorization, would deprive the attempt of any real meaning. Better to be broadly **vague** when it is the nature of the event under investigation: "I am engaged (deeply) in a (largely) instrumental life, which in itself is not so bad; but it has come to pass that the ends I desire are not forthcoming (by means available to me) and/or the means are not known to me (to achieve those ends), which in itself would be merely a matter of failing and starting again; but the natural pleasures of production and familistic associations are unavailable--I have nothing to fall back on."

Work

Apropos of the historical development of the concept of alienation, the area of greatest concentration of research is the relation of alienation to work. Although simple opinion polls indicate that work is liked--leading some to insist that the problem is mythical (Fein, 1973, for instance), it is undeniable that many people hate their work (Terkel, 1974) and that this dislike is reflected in

absenteeism, turnover, strikes, and sabotage (Walton, 1973; Cummings and Manring, 1977). An analysis of fiction in U.S. magazines indicated that in 1890, 27% of the plots presented work as a source of frustration, compared to 57% in 1955 (Martel, 1968). Finally, there is evidence that the quality of the workplace has important effects on the general quality of life (see Taylor's bibliography, 1973, and Smith and Cranny, 1968).

When the U.S. Department of Labor (1974, p. 16) asked a sample of workers what was very important in their work, they received the following responses (in descending order of frequency):

1. "Work is interesting;"
2. "Enough help and equipment to get the job done;"
3. "Enough information to get the job done;"
4. "Enough authority to do my job;"
5. "Good pay;"
6. "Co-workers are friendly and helpful;"
7. "Opportunities to develop my special abilities;"
8. "Job security is good;"
9. "Can see the results of my work;"
10. "Responsibilities are clearly defined"
(p. 16).

Obviously, a good salary is not the only thing workers seek in their employment. We must also consider the worker's expression of his uniqueness, his sense of purpose or contribution, his identification with his co-workers and the company, and his sense of control over his activities (Blauner, 1964). Lacks in these areas correspond well to our conceptions of self-estrangement, meaninglessness, social isolation, and powerlessness

respectively, i.e. to alienation. The opposition of these
to the conception of work as a means to the satisfaction of
extrinsic needs is such that some (Shepard, 1971, for
example) use "instrumental work orientation" as an index
of alienation.

Before continuing, I must note the differences between
the theoretical approach taken in the previous chapter
and the approach most often used to explain differences
in needs in the work setting--Maslow's (1954). Maslow's
hierarchy of needs progresses from the "lowest" (first to
require satisfaction)--existence needs--through security,
social, esteem, and autonomy needs, to the "highest"--
actualization. In terms of the previous chapter, the
existence needs are those "somatic events" which demand
attention, as are the security needs. Maslow's social
and esteem needs resemble the tendency toward natural
associations, while autonomy and actualization needs
resemble the tendency toward natural will in production or
in cognitive activities. Notice that there is no
theoretical need for (nor empirical evidence of) any
hierarchical arrangement here, but simply a matter of
people being drawn to these as preferable over instrumental
functioning by the satisfactions they bring in either the
personal, creative area or the social area. Hence, one
would expect, once people are beyond the distractions of
existence and security needs, that their individual makeup
and history would direct them toward seeking satisfaction

in associations, in production, or in both

Intrinsic satisfactions

This is the area most related to Marx's concerns.
The research indicates that people indeed thrive in
challenging jobs, jobs wherein they exercise their
initiative, thought, judgement (Kohn and Schooler, 1973).
Higher skilled, specialized workers show less alienation
(Blauner, 1964; Shepard, 1969, 1973; Fried, 1973), and a
sense of personal causation appears to be quite important
to healthy general psychological functioning (DeCharms,
1968; Kohn and Schooler, 1973). Further, intrinsic factors
appear to be important to performace as well: Work
redesigned to provide greater intrinsic satisfaction
("job enrichment") has been tied to increased quality and
greater productivity as well as greater satisfaction
(Herzberg, 1966; Paul, Robertson, and Herzberg, 1969;
Ford, 1973; Strauss, 1974, among others). The demand for
intrinsic satisfactions in work is becoming increasingly
widespread, especially among younger workers (Aronowitz,
1973), and appears to be spreading to other areas of life
as well (Sheppard and Herrick, 1972).

The major concern regarding intrinsic satisfactions
is the effect of technology (see Shepard, 1977, for a
review). The key study here is Blauner's (1960): He
examined the relationships of four "contributing
characteristics" (technology, division of labor,

bureaucratization, and economic structure) in four
industries (printing, textiles, automobile, and chemicals),
to powerlessness (workers unable to control their job
activities), meaninglessness (workers only minutely
contribute to the final product), social alienation
(workers do not belong to close work groups), and
self-estrangement (work viewed as a means to an end).
He expected and found an inverted U of alienation, from a
low in the "craft" of printing, to highs in the
mass-production of textiles and cars, to another low in the
highly automated, continuous process chemical industry.
Shepard (1969, 1973) found the same U-curve in focussing
on specific man-machine relations in industry, as well as
in office employees (1971); Kirsch and Lengermann (1971)
found it in white collar bank employees; Cotgrove (1972)
and Vamplew (1973) found it in a range of jobs within
chemical processing plants.

To be honest, not all research is supportive.
Susman (1972 a and b) found that lower alienation does not
follow with each automation improvement: as it gets very
high, alienation increases again. Form (1972, 1973) and
Tudor (1972) found no relationships between technological
complexity and aspects of alienation. Unfortunately,
measures of the complexity of actual man-machine
relationships (where complexity means involvement of the
worker's intellectual facilities!) are not presently
available, so the relation of this complexity and

intrinsic satisfaction remains uncertain.

Social benefits

Unfortunately, inasmuch as I suggested that the existence of natural associations at the workplace should be just as satisfying (varying with individuals) as intrinsic satisfaction, the literature on social benefits is small indeed. Pearlin (1962) found that nursing personnel who had close relationships with fellow workers at the job suffered significantly less from work alienation than those who did not--<u>regardless</u> of other aspects of their work. Fullan (1970), in a study of the varying effects of technology on "worker integration" (the degree to which individuals feel isolated or related through interaction), found the same U-curve mentioned before, with continuous process workers appearing most integrated. This raises the possibility that the <u>social</u> relations certain technologies permit may be confounded with intrinsic satisfactions as a contributor in combating alienation. Finally, there is some indication that satisfactions of association in terms of feeling a part of a company <u>as a community</u> can vary quite independently of satisfaction in the immediate job (Osako, 1977, in Japan).

Myths

Job involvement is <u>not</u> the opposite of job

alienation; nor is it the same as intrinsic motivation or general job satisfaction (Lawler and Hall, 1970). Rather, in terms of the previous chapter, it is the efficiency of the myths one uses to put up with instrumental living. Saleh and Hosek (1976) point out four versions in the literature:

1. Work as a central life interest (as in Dubin, 1956 and Lawler and Hall, 1970);

2. Active participation in job (Bass, 1965);

3. Performance central to self-esteem (Siegel, 1969; Lodahl and Kejner, 1965);

4. Performance consistent with self-concept (Vroom, 1964).

A general review of job involvement is available in Rabinowitz and Hall (1977), and a discussion of the concept in Kanungo (1979).

In support of my interpretation, we find job involvement tied to early socialization (Lodahl and Kejner, 1965), relatively unaffected by changes in work environment (again, Lodahl and Kejner, 1965), by job enlargement (Lawler, Hackman, and Kaufman, 1973), or by external stresses (Hall and Mansfield, 1971). We do find it related to the personality variable of locus of control (Runyon, 1973). We find it related to age (Schwyhart and Smith, 1972; Jones, James, and Bruni, 1975; Hall and Mansfield, 1975), except where the effects of association of maturity with responsibility and the effects

of generational differences might be expected to be minimal (i.e. with engineers, Lodahl and Kejner, 1965, and in Israel, Mannheim, 1975). Education appears to have little effect on job involvement (Siegel and Ruh, 1973; Jones, James, and Bruni, 1975). As one would expect from the centrality of the work ethic in the traditional male role, men are more job involved than women (Siegel, 1969). Finally, when job involvement is compared directly with the Protestant ethic (Weber, 1947), we find a close relationship (Lodahl, 1964; Bass and Barrett, 1972).

So, as we might expect, people are more satisfied with work as far as they are job involved (Lodahl and Kejner, 1965; Weissenberg and Gruenfeld, 1968; Schwyhart and Smith, 1972; Gannon and Hendrickson, 1973). Lawler and Hall (1970), however, found no relationship between involvement and performance, and the relationship with turnover and absenteeism is low or non-existent (Farris, 1971; Siegel and Ruh, 1973; but Patchen, 1965, did find negative correlations).

Myths are easier to believe in when they are accompanied by success (I, of course, imply no causality here!). Bray, Campbell, and Grant (1974) found that successful managers became increasingly involved as their success continued (see also Hall and Nougaim, 1968). This relates well to Klinger's (1977) views regarding failure as the essence of alienation.

Powerlessness

Organizational structure also influences alienation:
For example, as the size of the organization and the
proportion of managers increases, so does alienation (e.g.
Pravetz, 1976); as formalization and specialization
increase, so does alienation (Wagoner, 1976); as jobs are
tightly controlled and highly structured, alienation
increases as well (Miller, 1967; Bonjean and Grimes, 1970;
Kirsch and Lengermann, 1972). Conversely, when workers
are offered more responsibility, autonomy, and above all
control, we find alienation decreasing (Kolaja, 1961;
Hunnius, Garson, and Case, 1973; both in Yugoslavia; please
note that their results are not an effect of the "party
line"--Blumberg, 1968, did not get these results in
Poland). Further, alienation appears to be very low in
the self-employed (Sheppard and Herrick, 1972). Also, it
must be noted that reactions vary with individual values
(Mobley and Corke, 1970), especially workers' belief in
the importance and validity of authority in regards to
their work (Pearlin, 1962; Sheppard and Herrick, 1972).
Although some insist that workers who control their
organization are simply sharing in their own exploitation
(Aronowitz, 1973, and others), lack of power in one's
work is generally supported as a cause of alienation.

Extrinsic satisfactions

Some researchers insist that one can be satisfied
with one's work for its extrinsic rewards alone (Middleton,
1963; Miller, 1967; Goldthorpe, Lockwood, Bechhofer, and
Platt, 1968; Duncan Schuman, and Duncan, 1973), and while
this extreme a statement is debatable, few people will
deny that extrinsic rewards contribute to general
satisfaction. More money generally means more satisfaction
(Sheppard and Herrick, 1972) and less absenteeism and
turnover (Porter and Steers, 1973). Promotions do the same
(Hahn, 1975). However, most wealthy people continue to
work (Macarov, 1970), and most workers say they would
continue to work if they became rich (Morse and Weiss,
1955--notice the highly hypothetical nature of the
question, however!). Even more convincing is the U.S.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's (1973)
New Jersey Graduated Work Incentive Experiment, wherein
1200 poor families received guaranteed minimum incomes of
varying amounts, with no significant differences in work
behavior resulting!

Summary

To summarize, people work for many reasons: The
satisfaction intrinsic to production; the social
satisfactions one finds in one's work mates; in keeping
with one's self-image; or for the money. One becomes

alienated when the ends are withdrawn and the myths
crumble and the lack of natural satisfactions in both one's
production and one's social relations become evident. We
find in the literature some support for this interpretation
and, I believe, no contradictions. Let us now look at
alienation in other areas of life.

The City

Although research concerning alienation in contexts
other than work is hardly as dense, it is not lacking
either. The city, for instance, has attracted alienation
researchers because of the expectation that one might find
social isolation (due to introverted architecture,
divisive urban design, and isolating mobility, perhaps)
and the meaninglessness incumbent upon being one among
so many.

In fact, however, these expectations appear to be
poorly grounded. Loneliness, the "alienation from
expressive relations" (Aiken and Hage, 1966, p. 497), is
not so pervasive: Greer (1962), Sussman (1972), Fried
(1973), and Wellman (1973) found that city dwellers have
many primary ties in neighbors. A sense of belonging is
also not lacking (Bell and Held, 1969; Portes, 1971;
Laumann, 1973; Kasarda and Jonowitz, 1974). In fact, many
people express great satisfaction in both the number of
acquaintances and the freedom from small-town closeness
one finds in the city, what Granovetter (1973) calls the

"strength of weak ties." With the complex communications networks of urban (and now essentially all) society, we find the arrival of the "small world," ala MacLuhan (see Milgram, 1967; Traverse and Milgram, 1969; Korte and Milgram, 1970). Fischer (1973) found urban living had a minimal effect on anomie. Finally, despite Kitty Genovese, research has discovered that urbanites are not so necessarily aloof (Latane and Darley, 1968; Milgram, 1970).

Philliber (1977), in examining patterns of alienation in the inner city, notes that low income area inhabitants have a generalized response to society's bureaucracy--that is, the consumer system, police, and political system are seen as parts of a whole unrelated to them. The orientation to the neighborhood, however, is independent of these others. This suggests that city dwellers feel alienated in regards to those aspects of the city from which they are objectively "alienated," and recognize the value of their natural association. In fact, Wilson (1971) found inner city blacks to express less anomie than the surrounding neighborhoods, presumably because of the value the former place on their natural associations. The city may contain alienating circumstances (work, power, school, crime), but is itself a source of alienation only to the stranger.

Minorities, Women, and the Aged

It is among "second-class citizens" that the

comparison between the alienated and the alien has its best representation. Appalachian poor (Polansky, Borgman, and de Saix, 1972) or African tribesmen on a desert preserve (Turnbull, 1972) are faced with dealing with a social system they are unable to master: You can't "get in" if you don't change; you can't change if you don't "get in." Further, improvement in life circumstances seem unlikely to raise mastery (Feagin, Tilly, and Williams, 1972), much as job enrichment applied from without often fails to add to intrinsic satisfaction.

"The alienated man is acutely aware of the discrepancy between who he is and what he believes he should be" (Levin, 1960, p. 59). The alienated expect less of their desires to be fulfilled, expect not to achieve academically, not to find independence, and (especially among women) not to find love or affection (Lombardo and Fantasia, 1978). Hence, we should expect to find the alienated among those groups where those expectations are, for any number of reasons, validated: the poor, the lower class, blacks (Dean, 1961; Middleton, 1963; Bradburn, 1969; Lystad, 1972; Sheppard and Herrick, 1972; Bean, Bonjean, and Burton, 1973).

Further, alienation, especially powerlessness, is associated with (moderate--Campbell, 1971) hostility toward the majority culture--i.e. whites (Ransford, 1968; Seeman, Bishop, and Grigsby, 1971). Again, the bases in reality are revealed by the stronger hostilities expressed

by men and working women (Crain and Weisman, 1973).

The literature regarding women is limited. Housework appears to be more alienating than outside work (Nelson, 1977). But, if unsatisfying marriages and high divorce rates reflect alienation (we would expect, since these lower the amount of natural association in people's lives, that there is such a relationship), we find other sources: The more hours wives work outside the home, the less satisfying the marriage (Hicks and Platt, 1970) and the more likely divorce (Levinger, 1965); working out of necessity increases these effects further (Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Orden and Bradburn, 1969); and strong work commitments on the part of both partners does likewise (Bailyn, 1970). Only where the marriage partners work together does satisfaction increase (Blood and Wolfe, 1960).

The literature regarding age is usually in terms of general happiness. There appears to be a gradual decline between the 20's and the 40's, a plateau from the 40's to the 60's, and an accelerated decline from the 70's on (Gurin, Veroff, and Feld, 1960; Dean, 1961; Bradburn, 1969). Although the preceding studies are survey studies-- with a possible confusion of age and generation--Britton and Britton (1972) followed people 65 years old and older for nine years, and found the general life satisfaction went down for 60%, in comparison to the 29% indicating an increase. Harris (1975) asked people for the best years

o

in their lives, and found that the older the person the less likely they were to pick their own age. Moderating the results somewhat, Bradburn (1969) found that our emotional lives become "more serene" as we get older, and Chiriboga and Lowenthal (1974), among others, point to the great unhappiness and rampant depression among teenagers. More tied to alienation, and quite obvious in today's world, social isolation is a significant problem among the elderly (Rosow, 1967; Tunstall, 1967).

Criminality

In discussing criminality and alienation, we meet with a number of definitional difficulties. Anomie may be defined as a social, structural situation where norms have lost their regulatory power, which reveals itself in the form of instability, lack of order, general "hedonistic" or "egoistic" tendencies, and even anarchy. This kind of anomie might be measured in terms of high rates of deviance, divorce, criminal activities, and so forth (e.g. Yinger, 1973). More precisely, it might be measured in terms of widespread disrespect for norms (Johnson, 1960), or as the converse of "the degree of consensus within the community (or subunit) concerning the behavior that is prescribed, proscribed, or permitted to members" (Seeman, 1976, p. 279; used in Jessor, Graves, Hanson, and Jessor, 1968). This leads to a transitional definition:

Anomie is . . . a breakdown in the cultural

> structure, occurring particularly when there
> is an acute disjunction between the cultural
> . . . goals and the socially structured
> capacities of members of the group to act in
> accord with them (Merton, 1957, p.65).

The purely subjective forms of anomie fall into a number
of categories:

1. The rejection of societal norms (implying a
   replacement with other norms) as in Keniston
   (1965), Lowry (1962), and Putney and Middleton
   (1962);

2. An acknowledgement or belief that the norms of
   "polite" society do not work, as in Neal and
   Crout (1970, 1975) and Seeman (1959);

3. Adherence to (and incorporation of) conflicting
   norms, as in Dean (1961);

4. A feeling that the norms are weak or unclear, as
   in McClosky and Schaar (1965) and MacIver (1950);

5. A literal lack of norms (unless one considers an
   end of pure self-interest and a means of pure
   instrumentality to constitute a norm--I don't).

In addition, we find anomie as a component in measures of
general discontent (Srole, 1956), personal morale
(Kornhauser, 1965), misanthropy (Rosenberg, 1956) and
cynicism (Lyons, 1970).

Unfortunately, the research is less interesting than
the debate over definitions. First of all, we find
normlessness highly associated with social class factors
such as education (e.g. Mizruchi, 1964; Nelson, 1968;

Bullough, 1969). We find it related to prejudice
(Lutterman and Middleton, 1970), to sabotage in the work
place (U.S. Department of Labor, 1974), and to traffic
violations in high schoolers (Pelz and Schuman, 1973).
We find less crime during major civil rights activity
among southern urban blacks--i.e. more involvement, less
alienation (Solomon, Walker, O'Connor, and Fishman, 1965).
Generally speaking, we find the ignoring of rules
associated with problems in believing in them.

A recent and interesting development in the research
involves examinations of the relationships between
alienation and juvenile delinquency. Jones (1977) found
the interaction of powerlessness and parent-child belief
differences to be a strong predictor of drug use. Vales
(1973) further tied the variables with the "triple
failure" to (1) model from appropriate adults, (2) reach
desired goals or obtain social benefits, and (3) develop
relationships with non-addicts (validated with black and
white Americans and Puerto Ricans). Finally, mention
must be made of the interesting thesis that schools create
delinquents because of their success, not failure: In
this society, schools are set the goal of preparing
adolescents, especially those of the lower classes, for
alienated work and lives. When the adolescents reject
this future--i.e. become alienated--they turn to
delinquency (Liazos, 1978). Again we see that alienation
is an experience of the general instrumentality of our

society, and not the effect of some problematic cause.

Learning

Lystad (1972) noted that alienated people generally feel powerless to change and appear to have a poorer command of the facts they need to get out of their situation. One might interpret this to mean that the uninformed are driven by their ignorance toward alienation. The literature suggests, however, that the alienated (actually external locus of control) simply make less use of the information (Phares, 1968; Bickford and Neal, 1969; Holian, 1972; Maimon, 1970), and seek less information (Davis and Phares, 1967; Lefcourt and Wine, 1969). Conversely, when workers believe their skills make a difference, they pay more attention to the task (Lefcourt, Lewis, and Silverman, 1968). Somewhere along the line, this sense of futility is learned.

In keeping with the education literature indicating general advantages of more innovative schooling, Dillon and Grout (1976) specifically noted that traditional schools are closely associated with the alienation of pupils, even when comparing white middle class schools with low income black schools. Cohen (1974), examining the increased alienation toward schools at earlier ages and across socioeconomic lines, notes the introduction of rote learning at increasingly early ages, lack of adult-child relationships, and the breakdown of trust in society. She

offers five suggestions, well in keeping with the overall
literature:

1. Increase interpersonal contact;
2. Use learning materials which encourage creativity;
3. Teach skills when children are ready for them;
4. Involve the parents in school activities;
5. Develop a sense of commitment to ethical behavior
    and a sense of purpose.

Parsons (1951, p. 233) said alienation is "a possible
product of something going wrong in the process of value
acquisition through identification." The key seems to be
the "social isolation" involved in separating children from
adults (see most especially Bronfenbrenner, 1970). Mackey
and Ahlgren (1977), for example, examined ninth graders
from four diverse communities (urban-rural, working class-
upper class), and found three coherent dimensions to their
expressions of alienation: personal incapacity, cultural
estrangement, and guidelessness. Rahav (1977), noting the
relationship of the low status of youth and delinquency,
suggests increased social contact between age groups. One
wonders why so many people expect their children to hold
traditional values dear, when they send them away (to
day-care, nurseries, baby sitters, and School) at the
earliest opportunity!

In regards to the general "mental health" of the
alienated, Dean and Lewis (1978) note significant
negative correlations between alienation and emotional

maturity, and Smith (1970) and Gillis and Jessor (1970) note that successful therapy experiences decrease externality. Yoder (1977) suggests that the therapist should persuade clients to accept the "challenge of closeness," in that the tendency to deal with others in an instrumental fashion may need to be unlearned.

Intellectuals and Universities

Cultural estrangement and related concepts such as alienation defined as "the predicament of unresolved alternatives" (Regin, 1969, p. 47) or uncomfortable differences in views, tastes, etc. (Hajda, 1961), are particularly the domain of the alienated intellectual. This phenomenon is hardly new--intellectuals have frequently been in the position of decrying accepted social values. Stromberg (1976) documents in particular the self-conscious estrangement of intellectuals and artists at the beginning of this century, one which he believes presages a massive movement today. In fact, Inglehart (1971) finds people in six European countries moving away from "acquisitive values." Keniston (1965) finds the youth of the early 1960's rejecting the norm that "playfulness, fantasy, relaxation, creativity, feeling, and synthesis take second place to problem-solving, cognitive control, work, measurement, rationality, and analysis" (p. 366; see also Mills, 1973, and Touraine, 1971). Later research by Keniston (1968) and Yankelovich

(1972) found less rejection of basic values but still widespread disillusionment. The problem with such evaluations is that many people alienated from the "majority" culture are deeply devoted to some "minority" or "deviant" culture, or to a deeper meaningfulness beneath the majority culture. Schacht (1970) makes a good argument against Nettler's (1957) and Middleton's (1963) assumption that cultural estrangment means a lack of appreciation of mass media, popular education, conventionalized religion, etc.: One need not be alienated for this. Finally, let me mention that alienation is sufficiently rampant to reach the eyes of MMPI users, although they dismiss it as a glamorization of lack of commitment (Schubert and Wagner, 1975).

Universities are places we expect to see the effects of alienation. Indeed, alienated students seem to have no long-range goals, put-off making basic decisions (Orlofsky, Marcia, and Lesser, 1973), and refuse "conventional commitments, seeing them as unprofitable, dangerous, futile, or merely uncertain and unpredictable" (Keniston, 1965, p. 52). They prefer to satisfy the needs of the moment. Their sense of alienation in the academic situation exerts more influence on their attachment to the university than do perceptions of university goals and academic environment (Long, 1976). Beyond the university, a college education is likely to mean more dissatisfaction in the industrial work place (Sheppard and Herrick, 1972),

especially in reaction to a lack of control (Kirsch and Lengermann, 1972). On the other hand, the connection so often assumed between the complaints of low community and activism has been repeatedly shown to be weak (Gales, 1966; Keniston, 1967; Kirby, 1971; and Touraine, 1974).

A recent study by Long (1977) summarizes for us by outlining the progress of alienation in the university (considered as a political system):

1. Student's negative views of the university (e.g. authoritarianism on the part of the administration);

2. Student's academic alienation (e.g. powerlessness, meaninglessness, and cynicism);

3. Student's desires for reform (e.g. structural changes, student participation, etc.).

Long found that 76% of the students sampled expressed academic alienation, and concludes his study startlingly by suggesting that the university is a "primary inhibitor" of the student's political, social, and psychological development!

Political Alienation

Political alienation tends to be seen as a matter of powerlessness, "the feeling that one is unable to control or even understand the social, economic, and above all, political events and structures which affect him" (Schacht, 1970, p. 165). An overall increase in feelings of

powerlessness in the past decade is well documented (Rotter, 1971; Converse, 1972; Duncan, Schuman, and Duncan, 1973; House and Mason, 1974). Harris (1973) in particular notes that in 1966, 37% of those polled agreed with the statement "what you think doesn't count anymore," while in 1973 the figure increased to 61%. Although individual powerlessness tends to be fairly stable, it is also quite responsive to real events: To mention only the obvious, receiving a draft letter (McArthur, 1970) or suffering a political defeat (Gorman, 1968) markedly increases one's sense of powerlessness.

A lack of power, however, is seldom seen as alienating when the social forces are seen as benevolent. People love benevolent dictators, even in their gods. Political alienation must be seen as "a reaction to perceived relative inability to influence or to control one's social destiny" (Thompson and Horton, 1960, p. 191, emphasis added), as something illegitimate (Clark, 1959; Levin, 1960; Horton and Thompson, 1962).

Does this sense of illegitimacy lead to activism, though? Perhaps so, if not tied to the sense of inevitability accompanying alienation. As is, however, powerlessness correlates with inactivism (Gore and Rotter, 1963; Strickland, 1965; McWilliams, 1973). Where we do find activism is where an understanding of low social control is combined with a sense of high personal efficacy (Caplan, 1970; Forward and Williams, 1970). As

Seeman (1976) notes, though, our operationalizations have not caught up with these subtleties. Again, we see alienation as reactions to reality, where people do not confuse "self and system, work and politics, achievement and failures, luck and talent, or personal competence and civic competence" (Seeman, 1976, p. 271).

A further distinction that must be dealt with is that between "input" and "output": Gamson (1968) points out that "input alienation" or powerlessness is not the same as "output alienation," distrust or perceived normlessness (also Olsen, 1969; McDill and Ridley, 1962; Finifter, 1970). Paige (1971) and House and Mason (1974) support the utility of the distinction by noting that activism results when there is low powerlessness and high distrust (note the objections in the previous paragraph, however). Rotter defines "interpersonal trust" for us nicely (1971, p. 344): "An expectancy held by an individual or group that the word, promise, verbal or written statement of another individual can be relied on," and notes (Hochreich and Rotter, 1970) the rather obvious significant decline in trust over recent years (see also Long, 1978).

One final aspect of political alienation is meaninglessness: "The actor is caught in a substantially 'meaningless' setting whose ambiguity, complexity, and unstructuredness he must somehow manage to make comprehensible for action" (Seeman, 1976, p. 278). Levin (1960) notes that political alienation occurs when we must

choose from alternatives which do not offer real differences, i.e. make decisions in an informationless field.

Conclusion

As the reader has no doubt noticed, the research does not quite solve all the problems of lack-of-definition with which we began this chapter. What the research does show, however, is that alienation is there, in fact appears to be widespread and spreading, and that despite the many precedent, coincident, and consequent associated events, it has strong roots in reality and a phenomenological unity.

CHAPTER IV

PERSON PERCEPTION: THE EMPIRICAL LITERATURE

Person perception begins, like object perception, with an ability to generate an image with which to anticipate a specific individual's spatial, modal (color, scent, etc.), and temporal presence. As with objects, when we encounter new people we draw on images of others in developing new images, and so, from experience, we come to classify people in categories of anticipatory commonalities--the roles, status, normative categories of our culture.

Although these cultural rule systems aid to some extent in reducing uncertainty, the individuals within any particular role categorization are none-the-less individuals. Although the end of a wave of the hand is easily deduced from the beginning of that wave, more often than not the events at "t+1" are less obviously drawn from events at "t", and events at "t+n" frequently seem to bear no relation to those at "t" at all. And so we attempt to attribute internal "mechanisms," "mediational variables," more-or-less stable attitudes, traits, patterns of unseen events which bridge the gap between "t" and "t+1" and beyond.

There is one "layer" of anticipation deeper: The
cultural categories of the first paragraph can be seen
in object perception as "use meaningfulness;" and the
attributional categories of the second paragraph can be
seen as parallel to the seeking after causal explanations.
The major distinction between person and object perception
is that, although we appear to have a tendency to place
ourselves as generative beings within the bounds of almost
any image we are using in interaction--i.e. we tend to
animism and anthropomorphism--it is in person perception
that this tendency rightly and most fruitfully belongs.
To the degree that cultural and attributional rule systems
are well-developed regarding any person or group of people,
we may introject ourselves into these rule-systems in order
to broaden them to the full "width" anticipation of an
other person demands. This is the assumption of empathic
understanding, or just empathy.

A review of the person perception literature is made
difficult by (1) an almost embarrassing surfeit of
articles on certain topics (e.g. the effects of appearance
on impressions), (2) an even more embarrassing deficit of
work on other topics (e.g. impression development in
ongoing interactions), and (3) the fact that everyone is
busy "perceiving persons" on a day-to-day basis, with the
result that there is little surprising to be said. (Is
there such a thing as an armchair theorist in a field
where data is available to everyone on a continuous

basis?) What follows is an inventory of articles which are either "classical," particularly relevant, or just curious.

Target's Appearance

Most people assume that appearance is important information with which to develop an impression of others (Stone, 1962). The structure of a face, for example, is used to infer personality (Secord, 1958; Secord and Muthard, 1955; Secord, Dukes, and Bevan, 1954; Samuels, 1939). Even variations in body influence our attributions (e.g. Kretschmer, 1936; Sheldon, 1940, 1942; Baer, 1964).

A great deal of inferring is done based on attractiveness: First, we tend to agree on who is beautiful (Dion and Berscheid, 1972); we see pretty people as nicer (Dion, 1972), as more intelligent (Clifford and Walster, 1973), and generally better (Dion, Berscheid, and Walster, 1972); and, despite what we might say (e.g. Vreeland, 1972), we like them better (Walster, Aronson, Abrahams, and Rottmann, 1966) and prefer them as social partners (Berscheid, Dion, Walster, and Walster, 1971). Fortunately for those of us less blessed, the longer the term of acquaintance, the less overwhelming the effects of attractiveness seem to be (Argyle and McHenry, 1971). We also assume that an individual expresses himself through his appearance (Stone, 1962). For example, conventional dress elicits more trust (Keasey, Tomlinson,

and Keasey, 1973), the use of lipstick is (in 1952) indicative of liberality (McKeachie, 1952), and so on. Even photographs of outfits alone elicited complex attributions (Gibbins, 1969). And, of course, wearing glasses means you are more intelligent, reliable, industrious, etc. (Thornton, 1943, 1944; Manz and Lueck, 1968). Finally, this process of inference is reversible: Personality sketches evoke images of individuals which can be surprisingly stable within and uniform between subjects (Secord, Stritch, and Johnson, 1960; Fischer and Cox, 1971).

Target's acts

Expressive behaviors on the part of the target are also used to infer more covert structures: Since Darwin pointed out the relation of animal expression and intention, studies have been designed to demonstrate the same in humans. Despite early negative results on judging emotions from pictures of faces (Landis, 1929), investigators have gone on, because of the "intuitive" obviousness of it, to produce significant positive results (Schlosberg, 1954; Engen and Levy, 1956; Triandis and Lambert, 1958; Engen, Levy, and Schlosberg, 1957; Osgood, 1966; etc.). Motion pictures proved helpful (Kozel, 1969). Simplifying the task to judgements of stress versus non-stress helped (Howell and Jorgenson, 1970). Actors' portrayals worked best of all (Kozel and

Gitter, 1968). The relations of expression to emotion
appear to be consistent cross-culturally (Ekman and
Friesen, 1971), at least between Americans and New Guinea
tribesmen. When compared with the effects of "context,"
facial expression has been found to be less important
(Frijda, 1969), and of an importance which varies as to
its relative "strength" (Ekman, Friesen, and Ellsworth,
1972).

People also form impressions from voice, even though
reality would indicate a low correlation (Allport and
Cantril, 1934; Taylor, 1934; Fay and Middleton, 1936,
1941; Veness and Brierly, 1963). The more predictable
inferences include judgements of class (Pear, 1957),
reactions of increased dislike by prejudiced individuals
of voices accented representatively (Anisfeld, Bogo, and
Lambert, 1962), and judgements concerning the amount of
anxiety expressed in speech disturbances (Lalljee, 1971).
We do, however, go on to infer age, aptitudes, intelligence,
personality traits, and emotions as well (as summarized
in Kramer, 1963). Some attempt has been made at isolating
the components of voice responsible to varying attributes:
Phillis (1970) discovered that high pitch was read as good
and small, low as bad and large, and a rapid cadence as
good and large; Scherer (1971) noted that a loud voice
was interpreted as implying an extroverted and assertive
personality. Finally, a raising of the voice's pitch is
(and accurately too, apparently) thought to reflect lying

(Ekman, Friesen, and Scherer, 1976; Kraus, Geller, and Olson, 1976).

Gesture, or "body language," has for some time been popularly thought to be a reflection of one's "true" feelings, and research has to some extent supported this view. This "non-verbal leakage" (Ekman and Friesen, 1974) communicates stress (Ekman, 1964) and appears to be a more valid indicator than the face (Ekman and Friesen, 1969). Significantly, gestures can also conceal, as when we carefully control our "nerves" (Kraus, Geller, and Olson, 1976). Apparently, we agree on interpretations of the gestures and movements of stick figures (Sarbin, 1954) and even geometric figures (Heider and Simmel, 1944; confirmed by Thayer and Schiff, 1969; also Tagiuri, 1960, and Bassili, 1976). Concerning relaxation and "body orientation," the research is ambivalent: Mehrabian found it tied to eye contact (1967) and interacting with liking and disliking (Mehrabian, 1968). More predictably, openness of arrangement of limbs (interestingly labeled "accessibility") led to attributions of pleasantness by men of women (Mehrabian, 1968). Finally, marriages tend to be happier when the partners are more accurate in interpreting each other--or vice versa (Kahn, 1970).

Also properly a matter of gesture is eye contact: We find photos more pleasant when the target is looking at us (Tankard, 1970); in films or live, the more eye contact the more we like the target (LeCompte and Rosenfield,

1971); and eye contact is less welcome in bad interactions
(Ellsworth and Carlsmith, 1968). Staring, however, is
bad: we try to remove ourselves from its weight as
quickly as possible (Ellsworth, Carlsmith, and Henson,
1972) and it makes us angry (Ellsworth and Carlsmith,
1975).

Social Context

There appears to be culturally defined appropriate
distances for specific types of interactions (Hall 1963,
1964, 1969), also known as "personal space," violation
of which causes anxiety and attributions of strangeness
(Sommer, 1969; Filipe and Sommer, 1966). In photos,
standing closer to the camera is preferred (Mehrabian,
1968). And one's location in a broader sense is attended
to--e.g. the "head of the table" conveys authority and
its attending qualities (Davenport, Brooker, and Munro,
1971).

Concerning the social "atmosphere" in which we judge
others, the literature seems to indicate that we, by and
large, ignore it (McArthur, 1972, 1976; Nisbett and
Borgida, 1975; Ruble and Feldman, 1976; Willis and Harvey,
1977). We also ignore "baserate" information, i.e. what
the probable course of events is to be (Kahneman and
Tversky, 1973). Generally, we appear to be indifferent to
abstractness (Nisbett, Borgida, Crandall, and Reed, 1976)
and turn to it only in the absence of more concrete

information (Feldman, Higgins, Karlovac, and Ruble, 1976; Tagiuri, 1969).

Often enough, we come prepared to perceive an individual with second-hand information: We bring into the interaction a "social context." Indirect information establishes an expectancy (Kelley, 1950) which in turn influences perception (Warr and Knapper, 1966b). For example, prior labeling of a photo as being of an enemy or a friend leads to different descriptions (Haire, 1955). The credibility of the source (Rosenbaum and Levin, 1968b, 1969) and how the information is presented (Warr and Knapper, 1966a) influence the degree to which we rely on the information. Indeed, common reputation has a great influence on our reactions (Jones and Schrauger, 1970)-- despite the fact that these pre-judgements are typically impoverished both in content and organization (Bromley, 1966a).

Context of Traits

Especially when forming an impression of someone from sets of indirect information but presumably also when organizing our direct impressions, the traits we arrive at form contexts for each other. Most of the research in this area involves presenting people with lists of trait names (in varying order) and examining the resulting "total impression" and implied additional characteristics. First, the meaning of a trait depends

on the other traits a person is thought to have (Asch, 1946; Kaplan, 1971). Connotations of traits change in differing contexts (Hamilton and Zanna, 1974); the implications of traits do likewise (Wyer, 1974). Secondly, it appears that some traits are more important than others, which importance is known as the centrality of the trait (Asch, 1946). The simplest explanation for this was put forth by Bruner and Tagiuri (1954) and later Cronbach (1955): People have ideas about what traits go together, i.e. an implicit theory of personality. This is supported in Wishner (1060), Schneider (1973) and Berman and Kenney (1976). Repeated examinations indicate a major central role for the quality dimension "warm-cold" (Asch, 1946; replications in Mensch and Wischner, 1947 and Veness and Brierly, 1963, and a similar naturalistic demonstration by Kelley, 1950).

Thirdly, we find interpretation of trait lists varying according to order, with a fairly strong primacy effect (Asch, 1952). This is generally thought to be a matter of reinterpreting later information to fit consistently into a progressively developing image (Luchins, 1957; Asch, 1952). Support for this interpretation come from Haire and Grunes.(1950), who simply asked subjects how they go about forming an impression from a list of traits. Tesser (1968), however, failed to provide support. Further, we occasionally find a recency effect (Anderson and Hubert,

1963) due to the manner of presentation; we find that
primacy can be weakened, especially when the subjects are
warned (Luchins, 1957); and we find that, when the
material is complex, neither primacy nor recency is
noted (Rozenkrantz and Crockett, 1965).

Lastly, how do we "sum" information of this sort?
Again, we can use Asch's change of meaning hypothesis
(also Rokeach and Rothman, 1965, and Warr and Knapper,
1968), i.e. that we slowly, complexly combine traits into
a single image. Or we can take the "statistical" approach:
We can add the independent values of traits (e.g. Fishbein
and Hunter, 1964; Triandis and Fishbein, 1963), or we can
average them (Anderson, 1965; also Anderson and Barrios,
1961; Anderson and Hubert, 1963; Anderson and Norman,
1964). Further, subjects may discount inconsistent
information (so as not to allow it to enter whatever
"equation" may apply at all), as seen in Bugenthal,
Kaswar, and Love (1970), and they may discount redundant
information, as seen in Wyer (1968). What kind of
"statistics" works best may be influenced as well by the
credibility of the source (Rosenbaum and Levin, 1968),
and by the stress of the subject (Schroder, Driver, and
Streufert, 1967). The most reasonable approach, I believe,
is Kennedy's (Kennedy, Koslin, Schroder, Blackman, Ramsey,
and Helm, 1966): how we sum varies from person to person.
Which brings us full circle to Asch.

Intentions

We assign <u>intentions</u> to others, as well as traits, to make sense of their behavior (Heider, 1958). As mentioned before, we do this even when the "others" are physical objects (Heider and Simmell, 1944; Bassili, 1976). The essence of intentions is causal responsibility. First, we tend to see our own behavior as externally caused, and that of others as internally caused (Jones and Nisbett, 1971; Nisbett, Caputo, Legant, and Marecek, 1973). For example, subjects playing the role of learner saw those playing the role of teacher as fairly "free" to reward and punish as they chose; the teachers, on the other hand, saw themselves as being quite restricted (Gurwitz and Panciera, 1975; also Miller, 1975). One theory is that whatever is perceptually "salient" will likely be pointed to as having a dominant causal role. For example, where you sit around two debaters alters your perception of their causal roles: If you sit next to one you see him as less causal than the debator opposite you (Taylor and Fiske, 1975). In some forms of therapy, a videotape of the client frees him to give himself a greater causal role (Storms, 1973; Arkin and Duval, 1975). The inverse is possible as well: Identify or empathize with another and we attribute more causality to the environment (Regan and Totten, 1975).

The more freedom from situation we give the other,

the more information we can derive from observing him
(e.g. Jones, Worchel, Goethals, and Gromet, 1971; Kelley,
1967). When the behavior is seen as unexpected in terms
of expediency (Jones, Davis, and Gergen, 1961), or as not
involving overt rewards (Schopler and Thompson, 1968), or
as antagonistic to an audience (Mills and Jellison, 1967),
again we derive more information and give greater
importance to attributed internal motives.

Interaction

If social interaction consisted of examining photos
or lists of traits, our job would be simple. However,
most impressions are formed in on-going interactions with
real people. We actively explore the target to arrive at
an impression in which we can invest some <u>confidence</u>.
For example, if there are several good reasons for a
behavior, we naturally have less confidence in any one
reason (Kelley, 1972). A generous act, seen as done for
manipulative reasons, is interpreted differently (Tesser,
Gatewood, and Driver, (1968).

The most important way of arriving at confidence is
by observing consistency in the other's behavior: The
more consistent he is, the more confident we are (e.g.
Kelley and Stahelski, 1970). Curiously--or perhaps by the
definition of confidence--the more someone behaves as you
expect him to, the less information he is giving you
(Epstein and Taylor, 1967). <u>Inconsistencies</u> give more

information, e.g. if the target differs from his group (Kelley and Stahelski, 1970), or if his resources don't match his achievement (Kepla and Brickman, 1971), and so on.

Our confidence is also affected by the judgements others present: when they agree with you, you become more confident (Goethals, 1972); if your co-judge arrives at his conclusions in a different manner than you do, you feel even greater confidence (Goethals, 1972); and if your co-judge has great prestige, well! your judgement is surely a good one (Kelley, 1967).

We also take into consideration the other's perception of us, and he takes into account, in generating the behaviors with which we form impressions of him, what he thinks you think of him (Cooley's "looking glass self" and Mead's "generalized other"). Our perceptions of others can function as self-fulfilling prophecies (Merton, 1957), e.g. children labelled "high potential" tend to live up to that label (Rosenthal and Jacabson, 1968). Our perceptions of others' perceptions of us can change our lives: Teenage girls who thought men disapproved of displays of intelligence in women were less likely to be committed to careers (Matthews and Tiedeman, 1964). These "metaperceptions" can become like a mirrored room, and successful long-term interaction generally requires some congruence of perceptions (e.g. Laing, Phillipson, and Lee, 1966; Helm, Fromme, Murphy, and Scott, 1974).

The Perceiver

Of course, the perceiver does not enter into his impression-generating interactions empty of content: He has biases, he has a personality of his own, and he has done it all before. First, a few of his biases: We tend to be kinder to ourselves than to others (e.g. Hakmiller, 1966, and all the studies on attributions of motives to others mentioned above); We seek to present a good image of ourselves (Goffman, 1967); We tend to avoid unpleasantness in any event (e.g. Blumberg, 1972); We have a general bias toward positivity (Bruner and Tagiuri, 1954; Sears and Whitney, 1973; Regan and Totten, 1975; Taylor and Koivumaki, 1976); We tend to believe in a "just world" and attribute accordingly (Lerner, 1965). We tend to attribute success to our own efforts and failure to the situation (Johnson, Feigenbaum, and Welby, 1964; Streufert and Streufert, 1969; Cialdini, Braver, and Lewis, 1974; Lugenbuhl and Crowe, 1975; Nicholls, 1975; Riemer, 1975; Stevens and Jones, 1976), a tendency which increases with ego involvement (Miller, 1975), and decreases with distance from others (e.g. Fontaine, 1975; Stephan, 1975; Snyder, Stephan, and Rosenfeld, 1976; Taylor and Koivumaki, 1976).

Further, the perceiver has his motives (or "set"-- Jones and DeCharms, 1957). The perceiver's emotions can affect his perceptions of others' emotions (Schiffenbauer,

1974). Prejudice in the perceiver can change perceptions a great deal, including his confidence in his judgements (e.g. Dorfman, Keeve, and Saslow, 1971). Different people (we come to this once again) have available to them and use different sets of traits, motives, etc., either because of differing personalities or differing sociocultural backgrounds (e.g. Sechrest, 1962; Sechrest and Jackson, 1961). A relatively complex childhood environment tends to provide one with a greater number of terms with which to describe people (Sechrest and Jackson, 1961), and so on. Males tend to describe people in terms of abilities (Beach and Wertheimer, 1961), roles, and status, while females tend to devote more attention to "inner" traits (Sarbin, 1954). Neurotics show more variety in their descriptions of others (Rabin, 1962). Interestingly--and very significantly--one subject's descriptions of two targets tend to be more similar than two subjects' descriptions of a single target (Richardson, Dornbusch, and Hastorf, 1961; Gross, 1961). Please see Shrauger and Altrocchi (1964) and Shrauger (1967) for reviews.

Areas where research has concentrated regarding personality effects on person perception are authoritarianism and cognitive complexity. Authoritarians tend to see others as more similar to themselves (i.e. more authoritarian, e.g. Kates, 1959), use more extreme evaluation (e.g. Warr and Sims, 1956), are more concerned

with and impressed by status (e.g. Jones, 1954; Wilkins
and DeCharms, 1962), are harder on strangers (DeSoto,
Kuethe, and Wunderlich, 1960), are more certain of their
impressions (Steiner and Johnson, 1963), and so on.
"Complexity"--though agreed upon as itself complex and not
a "true" generalized trait (Bieri, 1955; Vannoy, 1965;
Miller, 1969), does appear to influence attribution as we
might expect: Greater awareness of negative and positive
attributes in a target (Crockett, 1965), greater ability
to integrate conflicting information (Nidorf and Crockett,
1965; Mayo and Crockett, 1964), greater discrimination
among traits, greater interest regarding others' inner
states, and greater awareness of the uncertainty of the
whole process (all in Leventhal and Singer, 1964), are
found in subjects with greater complexity.

Development

The earlier studies (and many recent ones as well)
concerning person perception in children dwell on what
judgements are made. By four or so, we have a pretty
clear-cut conception of mom as devoted to child-care and
housekeeping (at least in 1954--Mott, 1954). Children
see father as "stronger" (Kagan, 1961) and "instrumental"
(Dahlem, 1970), mother as "nicer" (Kagan and Lemkin, 1960)
and "expressive" (Dahlem, 1970), and father as "more
powerful" than mother (Emmerich, 1961). Various
disturbances have interesting effects on perceptions of

parents: Schizophrenic boys see mom as dominant;
Neurotic boys see her as very nurturant; boys with
"behavior disorders" see dad as very punitive (all Rabkin
1964; see also Vogel and Lauterbach, 1963, and Kagan,
1958). All these studies have a common fault, however:
They are overly prestructured for the child.

The earliest free response study of children's
person perception is Watt's (1944): The descriptions he
collected appear to progress through a series of stages
with increasing differentiation (in terms of range of
differences perceived) and integration (complexity
perceived). Younger children (six and seven years old)
were more concerned with appearances, limited evaluation
to "nice-not nice," and were "univalent" (i.e. organized
around a positive or negative "tone").

Richardson, Dornbusch, and Hastorf (1961) analyzed
the contents of free responses to line drawings of
handicapped and non-handicapped children using 69 "first
order categories" (e.g. age, religion, etc.) and a number
of more abstract "second order categories" (e.g.
evaluation, morality), using children varying as to sex,
race, handicap, and rural or urban home. When two
children described two targets, they found a 38% overlap
in categories; when two describe the same target, a 45%
overlap; and when one describes two targets, a 57% overlap.
They talk more about and feel more positively towards high
status targets; low status children use more aggressive

statements; handicapped children use less categories concerning involvement with peers, but more concerning involvement with adults. Similar results were reported by Dornbusch, Hastorf, Richardson, Muzzy, and Vreeland (1965).

Yarrow and Campbell (1963) looked at children forming impressions of other, real children (male and female, black and white, ages eight through thirteen), who shared cabins with them. Early in their acquaintance, the children gave broad evaluations, usually univalent. Over time, they talked more about interactions. Older children gave more complex, better organized descriptions. Active, friendly children gave the most complex descriptions.

Livesley and Bromley (1967) found that younger children use more physical characteristics and specific habits and actions; girls use more "personality" terms; and all children use more "personality" terms in describing peers. McHenry (1971) found similar results. Scarlett, Press, and Crockett (1971) found a rough progression from statements such as "we play together" through "he hits me" and "he hits people all the time" to "he is kind." Brierley (1966), using Kelly's (1955) Role Construct Repertory Test, adopted for children, found a developmental progression away from appearance and toward personality constructs, as did Little (1968).

Concerning children's developing abilities to organize information, Bromley (1968) found an increasing

use of qualifiers and organizing or explanatory
propositions. Gollin (1954, 1958) found that, when
presented with conflicting information, older children
(and adults) made greater efforts at finding underlying
motives to resolve the conflict, girls moreso than boys,
and upper class moreso than lower class (consistent with
Yarrow and Campbell, 1963, described above).

The most expansive effort concerning the development
of person perception to date is Livesley and Bromley's
Person Perception in Childhood and Adolescence (1973).
As this study provides both the methods and the
hypotheses for the study following in chapter IV,
discussion will be reserved for later.

Summary

What we attribute depends on what is there--the
person, the situation, our own attitudes at the time, and
so on; it depends on our "socialization"--the tools with
which we make the attempt at understanding our fellow man,
including what we've been told, the words our language
provides, the metaphors that come to mind, and so on;
it depends on our experience--how well certain
attributions work for us in our never-ending battle
against overwhelming surprises; and it depends on our
empathic understanding of others through examination of
our own past or potential thoughts and feelings in
comparable situations. So person perception changes

with changes in persons and places and times. What remains throughout is something Bartlett called "an effort after meaning."

CHAPTER V

THE STUDY

Rather than attempt to test the theory of alienation presented in the first chapter--a task well beyond limitations of time, energy, and perhaps ability--the following study seeks to explore the possible relations between expressed alienation and the perception of personality as revealed by descriptions of self and others. It is the secondary purpose of this study to explore the possible extention of a fairly complex semantic analysis technique (Livesley and Bromley, 1973) beyond the developmental issues to which it was originally addressed.

What follows includes (1) a discussion of the Livesley and Bromley experiment, with a brief review of semantic analysis generally, (2) a discussion of Dean's (1961) alienation test and its relations with other variables, and (3) the study proper with a discussion of results and the implications for further investigations.

It is expected that strongly alienated people, lacking both empathic closeness and Machiavellian skills, and facing others whose external behaviors belie underlying processes, look at others in concrete, more

77

child-like terms, rather than in the more abstract terms
involving attributions of thoughts, emotions, or
motivations they have learned not to presume to
understand in others. First, let us examine more
specifically what is meant by "child-like."

<div align="center">Person Perception in Childhood
and Adolescence</div>

Livesley and Bromley's (1973) study of person
perception in children and adolescents used a total of
320 schoolchildren, half boys, half girls, ranging in age
from 7:4 to 15:9, and selected from several schools so as
to include a large range of social strata, intelligence,
and so on. The researchers asked them to describe eight
others, categorized as male/female, peer/elder, and liked/
disliked (the target to be selected by the child himself),
and themselves. Each description was dissected into
statements, a statement defined as "one element or idea
referring directly or indirectly to the stimulus person,
or to some other person since some of the descriptions
contained statements which did not refer to the stimulus
person" (p. 98). The use of this unit of analysis was
justified by interjudge reliability correlations ranging
from +0.89 to +0.98.

The first dependent variable examined by analysis of
variance was fluency. Significant differences ($p < 0.01$)
were discovered for age, with younger children using fewer

statements, including significant linear and quadratic trends (both $p < 0.01$). Girls used more statements than boys ($p < 0.01$) and there was a significant sex by age interaction ($p < 0.01$). Intelligence was not significant, but age by intelligence and sex by intelligence interactions were ($p < 0.01$ and $p < 0.05$ respectively). Within subjects, more statements were used to describe males, children, and liked persons (all at $p < 0.01$). Sex of subject by sex of stimulus person and sex of subject by age of stimulus person by like/dislike were significant interactions ($p < 0.05$).

The second analysis consisted of a broad categorization into central versus peripheral statements. Central statements refer to inner, psychological qualities, such as personality traits, general habits, motives, needs, values, attitudes, and orientations. Peripheral statements, on the other hand, refer to external, concrete qualities of a person and his surroundings, such as appearance, identity, actual incidents, possessions, likes and dislikes, social roles, kinship and friends. Using 989 different kinds of statements, independent sorting resulted in interjudge agreement ranging from 94.2 to 98.3 percent. The researchers hypothesized that there would be an increased use of central statements by older children, girls, and more intelligent children, and, within subjects, when the sex of the target was that of the subject, with children

targets, and with liked targets. The hypotheses all held,
with $p < 0.01$. Within subjects results included a number
of additional, quite complex, significant interactions.

The third analysis involved placing the statements
into 33 content categories:

I.	Objective information	1. 2.	Appearance General information and identity
		3.	Routine habits and activities
		4.	Actual incidents
		5.	Possessions
II.	Contemporary and historical circumstances	6. 7.	Life history Contemporary social circumstances
		8.	Physical condition
III.	Personal characteristics and behavioural consistencies	9. 10.	General personality attributes Specific behavioural consistencies
		11.	Motivation and arousal
		12.	Orientation
		13.	Expressive behaviours
IV.	Aptitudes and achievements	14.	Intellectual aptitudes and abilities
		15.	Achievements and skills
V.	Interests and preferences	16.	Preferences and aversions
		17.	Interests and hobbies
VI.	Attitudes and beliefs	18.	Beliefs, attitudes, and values
		19.	Stimulus person's opinions and attitudes towards himself
VII.	Evaluations	20.	Evaluations
VIII.	Social factors	21.	Social roles
		22.	Reputation
		23.	Friendships and playmates
		24.	Effects upon, and relations with,

others
25. Other people's behaviour towards the stimulus person
26. Relations with the opposite sex

IX. Subject-other relations
27. Mutual interaction
28. Subject's opinion of, and behaviour towards, the stimulus person

X. Comparisons against standards
29. Comparison with self
30. Comparison with others

XI. Family and kinship
31. Family and kinship

XII. Illustration, corroboration, and explanation
32. Collateral facts and ideas

XIII. Residue
33. Irrelevant and unclassifiable facts and ideas

(Livesley and Bromley, 1973, p. 135).

These categories were arrived at as follows:

> The statements were put onto cards, each card containing several statements of the same sort. The cards were then sorted in an attempt to establish an exhaustive and exclusive system which would be psychologically meaningful and statistically manageable. Nine-hundred and eighty-nine different kinds of statements were identified and thirty-three different categories were required in order to catalogue them (Livesley and Bromley, 1973, p. 123).

The interjudge agreement on placing statements into these categories ranged from 84.3% to 92.4% and there was 81.8% agreement when the interval between codings was two years. The results are summarized as follows (Livesley and Bromley, 1973, described on pages 133 to 146 and 230 to 236):

Categories showing a decrease with age:

2. General information and identity;

3. Routine habits and activities;

5. Possessions;

31. Family and kinship;

33. Irrelevant and unclassifiable facts and ideas.

Categories showing an increase with age:

9. General personality attributes;

10. Specific behavioural consistencies;

18. Beliefs, attitudes and values;

19. Stimulus person's attitudes towards himself;

22. Reputation;

24. Effects upon, and relations with, others;

25. Other people's behaviours towards the stimulus person;

26. Relations with the opposite sex;

28. Subject's opinion of, and behaviour towards the stimulus person;

30. Comparison with others;

32. Collateral facts and ideas.

Categories showing a curvilinear relationship:

7. Contemporary social circumstances;

13. Expressive behaviours;

16. Preferences and aversions;

20. Evaluations.

Categories used more by girls than by boys:

19. Stimulus person's opinions and attitudes towards himself;

20. Evaluations.

Categories showing an increase with intelligence:

9. General personality attributes.

Categories showing a decrease with intelligence:

1. Appearance;

31. Family and kinship.

Within subjects:

Used more for male targets:

17. Interests and hobbies;

21. Social roles.

Used more for female targets:

31. Family and kinship.

Used more for adult targets:

2. General information and identity;

4. Actual incidents;

5. Possessions;

21. Social roles;

31. Family and kinship.

Used more for child targets:

14. Intellectual aptitudes and abilities;

15. Achievements and skills;

16. Preferences and aversions;

20. Evaluations;

23. Friendships and playmates;

26. Relations with the opposite sex;

29. Comparison with self.

Used more for liked targets:

9. General personality attributes;

14. Intellectual aptitudes and abilities;

15. Achievements and skills;

16. Preferences and aversions;

17. Interests and hobbies;

21. Social roles;

27. Mutual interactions;

29. Comparison with self.

Used more for disliked targets:

1. Appearance;

4. Actual incidents;

10. Specific behavioural consistencies;

19. Stimulus person's opinions of, and attitudes towards, himself;

24. Effects upon, and relations with, others;

28. Subject's opinion of, and behaviour towards, the stimulus person;

32. Collateral facts and ideas.

Regarding self-descriptions:

Categories showing a decrease with age:

1. Appearance;

2. General information and identity;

5. Possessions;

23. Friendships and playmates;

31. Family and kinship.

Categories showing an increase with age:

9. General personality attributes;

10. Specific behavioural consistencies;

12. Orientation;

17. Interests and hobbies;

18. Beliefs, attitudes and values;

19. Attitudes towards self;

26. Relations with the opposite sex;

30. Comparisons with others;

32. Collateral facts and ideas.

Categories showing a curvilinear relationship:

13. Expressive behaviour;

20. Evaluations.

Used more by boys:

17. Interests and hobbies.

Used more by girls:

26. Relations with the opposite sex;

31. Family and kinship.

Increased with intelligence:

9. General personality attributes;

12. Orientation;

13. Expressive behaviour.

Decrease with intelligence:

1. Appearance;

2. Identity;

23. Friendship and playmates;

26. Relations with the opposite sex.

Further analysis involved the use of qualifying and organizing terms (see Table II, following section): The

use of everything but modal qualifiers increased significantly with age ($p < 0.001$); use of categories i ($p < 0.001$), iv ($p < 0.05$), v ($p < 0.001$), vi ($p < 0.01$), and vii ($p < 0.02$) increased with intelligence; only category v (exclusion) was more used by girls than boys ($p < 0.01$).

Finally (among other interesting excursions less germane to the problem at hand), Livesley and Bromley investigated the use of trait terms, and found a general increase in number and variety with age, along with other results consistent with expectations.

These studies, then, provide the methods and the hypotheses for the present study.

Semantic Analysis

Subjects have rarely been provided with relatively unstructured situations and allowed to select the information they think relevant, or to respond in their usual manner. Such a "naturalistic" approach may seem to run counter to current attitudes and methods in psychology, but, in the absence of developed theories about the way we perceive and understand others, it is an obvious approach and a legitimate one from a philosophy of science point of view. The use of fairly natural and unstructured situations minimizes the risk of our being misled by false assumptions or experimental artifacts, and it allows us to identify the key variables which can be studied subsequently under more clearly controlled conditions (Livesley and Bromley, 1973, p. 67).

So do Livesley and Bromley summarize their reasoning regarding the use of semantic analysis of freely written descriptions of personality. Beyond a general increase in

the use of content analysis techniques (as documented, for example, by Holsti, 1968), the "discovery" by psychologists of componential analysis (derived from Goodenough, 1956, and Lounsbury, 1956) as well as parallel developments in semantics (Lamb, 1964, and Leech, 1969), has led to very broad semantic analysis techniques, used in areas as varied as interpersonal behavior (Melbin, 1972), dream interpretation (Foulkes, 1978), personality descriptions, and psychological case studies (Bromley, 1977).

It is a very short step from an analysis technique such as that used by Livesley and Bromley (1973) to a full semantic analysis technique of potentially universal application. Taking as one's unit (for the purposes at hand) to be the proposition (as used by Leech, 1974), we may proceed to classify, according to our needs, those propositions which include as an argument the event or set of events under consideration. We must take care that our classification system include all (significant) possibilities involving those events, including down-graded and embedded propositions other than those used to define the event. If the propositions are or could be linked into a narrative, those linkages, whether explicit or understood, should be categorized inasmuch as they are likely to be significant.

In the following investigation, we shall follow Livesley and Bromley rather closely inasmuch as they are providing us with comparative data. The propositions

which they call statements are those which contain as an argument the specified target person. They are categorized by the nature of the propositional and any other argument the proposition contains (Table I). Further, certain propositions which contain propositions such as those just mentioned as arguments are classified in terms of what Livesley and Bromley call qualifying and organizing terms (Table II).

The preceding brings interjudge agreement to 100% regarding units of analysis and, to the degree that the categories are clearly defined in terms of semantic components, regarding categorization as well.

Dean's Alienation Scale

Dean (1961) constructed his scale of alienation by submitting 139 statements gleaned from the literature, conversation, and simple reflection, to seven judges-- social science professionals--who had been provided with page-long descriptions of the three aspects of alienation in which Dean was interested: Powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation. (Please refer to Chapter III for similar descriptions.) Five of the seven judges had to agree on an item for it to be included. When the process was completed, he was left with the 24 items presented in the appendix.

Dean (1961) found the split-test reliabilities to be .78 for powerlessness, .73 for normlessness, .84 for social

TABLE I

CONTENT ANALYSIS CATEGORIES

1.	Appearance	(PHYS)* (1. Appearance)** References to external qualities, that is, physical build, facial appearance, clothing, and so on, including approvals, "He is tall," "She is pretty," "He has blue eyes," "He has fair hair."
2.	Identity	(IDEN) (2. General information and identity) The person's name, age, sex, nationality, religion, residence, school, and physical environment, for example, "He lives at. . . ," "He is a Catholic," "He goes to our school," "She will be 10 years old on Wednesday."
3.	Health	(HLTH) (8. Physical condition) Health, physical fitness and strength, for example, "He is strong," "He is often ill," "He has a bad leg."
4.	Roles	(SORO) (21. Social Roles) Group and organizational membership, occupational role, for example, "He is a teacher," "She is a member of the tennis club," "He is a cub."
5.	Past	(LIFE) (6. Life history) Historical circumstances, childhood experiences, background, origin, for example, "He was brought up wrong," "He comes from Leeds," "He was not well educated."
6.	Prospects	(PROS) ("Any aspect of the person's future existence"--Bromley, 1977, p. 132)
7.	Possessions	(MATP) (5. Possessions) The person's property and possessions, for example, "He has a pet rabbit," "He owns a car," "He has a new bicycle."

TABLE I (Continued)

---

8. Traits

(GENT) (9. General personality attributes) Personality traits and temperament, for example, "friendly," "conceited," "selfish," "kind," "moody," "bad tempered," "gentle," "changeable."

9. Habitual acts

(SPET) (10. Specific behavioural consistencies) General habits, characteristic reactions to others of a specific nature, reaction to blame, stress, failure, and so on, for example, "grumbles," "can't take a joke," "shouts," "plays nice," "groans a lot."

10. Specific acts

(INCS) (4. Actual incidents) Statements about specific actions, things done and said, events the other person has been involved in or the places he has visited, for example, "He went to France for his holidays," "He painted his house last week," "She told me that she dislikes a woman who talks behind people's backs."

11. Routine acts

(ROUT) (3. Routine habits and activities) Daily and weekly routine, for example, "He goes to work at 8 o'clock," "She goes skating every Thursday," "He gets up at 6 o'clock and makes the fire."

12. Mannerisms

(EXPR) (13. Expressive behaviour) Specific personal habits and mannerisms, characteristic gait, speech characteristics, for example, "He twitches his moustache," "Walks funny," "He has a funny voice," "She speaks with a squeaky voice."

TABLE I (Continued)

13. He-may

(SITU) (7. Contemporary social circumstances) Contemporary constraints and opportunities in his environment, pressures exerted on him, for example, "His father won't let him play out," "His parents are very rich," "His mother won't let him climb trees," "He always has lots of money to spend."

14. Hobbies

$(OBJE_1)$ (17. Interests and hobbies) General interests and hobbies, including play activities, for example, "His hobby is collecting stamps," "He enjoys walks in the country," "He is very interested in ships."

15. He-likes

$(OBJE_2)$ (16. Preferences and aversions) Likes and dislikes (both persons and things), for example, "He likes sweets," "He likes watching television," "He is very fond of ice cream."

16. Intellect

$(ABAT_1)$ (14. Intellectual aptitudes and abilities) Mental skills and intellectual capacity, scholastic achievements and failures, for example, "intelligent," "clever," "good at sums."

17. He-can

$(ABAT_2)$ (15. Achievements and skills) Physical skills, successes, failures, disabilities, for example, "He is a good footballer," "She is good at cooking," "She wins a lot of house points."

TABLE I (Continued)

18.	He-wants	(MOTA) (11. Motivation and arousal) Aspirations, ambitions, wants, needs, goal directedness of behaviour, motivation in tasks undertaken, for example, "His ambition is to get into grammar school," "He wants to go in the army."
19.	He-feels	(ORFE) (12. Orientation) Expectations, wishes, fears, self-reproaches; how the person sees the situation; how he feels things are going; feelings of hope, anxiety, neglect; for example, "She is always crying because she is fat," "She does not like war and gets very upset when anyone mentions it," "He is only of average ability but that does not worry him."
20.	Beliefs	(PRIN) (18. Beliefs, attitudes, and values) Standards, values, and ideals that the person accepts and conforms to, for example, "She is very religious," "He does not believe in war."
21.	Evaluation	(EVAL) (20. Evaluations) The subject's evaluations of the stimulus person. Social desirability or undesirability of behaviour, manners, outright evaluations, including abusive statements, for example, "good," "nice," "nasty," "horrible," "rude," "cheeky," "polite," "clean," "dirty."
22.	Reputation	(O-SP) (22. Reputation) What people in general think of the person, for example, "He is popular," "Other people like him."

TABLE I (Continued)

23.	Others-him	(X-SP) (25. Other people's behaviour towards the stimulus person) Other people's behaviour towards the person described, for example, "Karen dislikes her," "Cathy said she did not like her," "My brother says he is not too bad as a friend."
24.	He-himself	(SELF) (19. Stimulus person's opinions and attitudes towards himself) The person's evaluation and opinion of himself, for example "She thinks she is very beautiful," "He thinks he is better than everyone else," "She thinks she is a hard knock."
25.	I-him	(S-SP) (28. Subject's opinion of, and behaviour towards, the stimulus person) General pronouncements about the person, for example, "I like him," "He is my best friend."
26.	We	(SP+S) (27. Mutual interaction) Interactions between the subject and the stimulus person; the things they do or have done together, length of acquaintanceship, frequency of interaction, for example, "I see her at the weekend," "We play together after school," "He knows our family well," "I have always known him."
27.	He-others	(SP-O) (24. Effect upon, and relations with, others) The consequences and effects the person's behaviour has upon other people and the consequences for himself, for example, "He makes us miss our playtime," "At parties he just mopes around with a face like a 'wet Echo' and puts a big black cloud over everybody," "She makes everyone feel happy."

TABLE I (Continued)

28. He-me

(SP-S) ("Statements in the category Stimulus Person's Response to the Subject . . . include statements about things said or done by the stimulus person which are directed towards the 'subject' . . . ."--Bromley, 1977, p. 150)

29. Friends

(FRIL) (23. Friendships and playmates) The person's friends, acquaintances, and playmates, including details of the number of friends he has, for example, "He plays with. . . ," "Her best friend is. . . ," "He has lots of friends."

30. Family

(FAMK) (31. Family and kinship) The person's family and relations, the number of children he has, descriptions of a relative, for example, "He has three children," "His son is called Peter," "His wife is horrible," "She has three brothers."

31. Lovers

(26. Relations with the opposite sex) Attitudes towards and relations with the opposite sex, for example, "Her boyfriend is. . . ," "He is not interested in girls," "He is very sexy."

32. He:me

(SPvS) (29. Comparison with self) Comparisons between the person and the subject, for example, "He is smaller than me," "He is not as clever as me."

33. He:others

(SPvO) (30. Comparison with others) Comparisons between the person and other people or an ideal, for example, "He is the tallest in the class," "He is more clever than his sister."

TABLE I (Continued)

---

34. Collateral

(COLL$_1$) (32. Collateral facts and ideas) Specific statements in support of a previous assertion, illustrations of personal qualities, explanations of behaviour, for example, "(She is quite lonely) because her daughter is now in London and she is alone," "(She treats her best friend very badly) when she has a party and doesn't invite her," "(If he sees something he likes he takes it) for example, if he feels like a drink he would take a bottle of milk from anyone's front door and think nothing of it."

35. Miscellaneous

(COLL$_2$) (33. Irrelevant and unclassifiable facts and ideas) Irrelevant information--usually about someone unrelated to the other--or statements which cannot be placed in any other category.

---

*Abbreviation used in Bromley (1977) for an identical (or nearly so) category.

**Number and title used in Livesley and Bromley (1973), followed by a description quoted from pages 123 through 126, unless otherwise noted.

TABLE II

QUALIFICATION AND ORGANIZATION CATEGORIES*

A. Qualifying terms
    i.   Modal Qualification indicates the probability of
        a particular quality, or its intensity if it
        occurs. These terms say something about the
        likelihood of occurance, frequency, intensity,
        and duration of personal characteristics, for
        example, "very," "mostly," "sometimes,"
        "usually," "always," "can be," "scarcely ever,"
        "quite," "often," and various combinations of
        these.
    ii. Obscurity of Impression indicates that the
        writer is not too sure of the impression he has
        formed, and finds it difficult to decide whether
        or not the person possesses a given quality, for
        example, "seems to be," "sort of," "I suppose."

B. Organizing terms
Note: Quasi-causal explanations are statements which
attempt to explain why a person possesses a particular
characteristic, either in terms of the other qualities
he possesses, or because of the circumstances he is in.
This category divides into two subcategories:
   iii. The explicit use of "because," for example, "He
        is . . . because . . . ."
    iv. The implicit use of "because," as in: (a) the
        interdependency of psychological processes and
        qualities, for example, "He is nervous and this
        makes him shy at times," "He is only kind if he
        is in a good temper;" (b) the effects of
        circumstances on psychological processes, for
        example, "He is cheerful considering the
        difficulties he is in," "He is quiet when in
        company."
    v. Exclusion of the Usual Trait or Situational
        Implication. This is indicated by a statement
        which, in effect, instructs the reader (or
        listener) not to make the usual inferences from
        a particular quality the stimulus person is said
        to possess. The effect is to modify the
        operation of the implicit theory of trait
        implications held by the reader (or listener),
        for example, "She is always being kind, but she
        is nosy," "She is very nice but keeps breaking
        friends with me," "She is quite modern although
        sensible," "He is very good at work but very
        slow."

TABLE II (Continued)

---

    vi.   <u>Specificity</u> of <u>Trait Expression</u>. Trait names are highly generalized terms for describing behaviour and behavioural tendencies. When applied to a particular individual, however, additional information may have to be provided so as to specify in greater detail <u>how</u> the trait is expressed by that person, for example, "She does not always argue, if she does, she does not get aggressive," "She is greedy because she never shares things although others offer her things." Note, in this last example that the term "because" is used to make an "evidential" rather than "causal" statement.

    vii.   Distinction between: <u>Qualities</u> <u>which</u> <u>are</u> <u>Real</u> <u>rather</u> <u>than</u> <u>Apparent</u>, <u>Actual</u> <u>rather</u> <u>than</u> <u>Possible</u>, <u>or</u> <u>Past</u> <u>rather</u> <u>than</u> <u>Present</u>, for example, "Although she professes to be your friend, when you are ill she doesn't visit you," "He is not really. . . ," "She used to be. . . , now she is. . . ."

    viii.   <u>Metaphor</u>, <u>Simile</u>, <u>and</u> <u>Analogy</u>. These are statements which might be assimilated to category vi above, since they are rarely used, for example, "He flares up easily," "He's a pig."

C. Miscellaneous

    ix.   <u>Miscellaneous</u> items are those which do not fall clearly into one or the other of the above categories of organizing and qualifying terms.

The mnemonics used in this study are as follows:
    i.   Qualification;
    ii.   Obscurity;
  iii.   Because;
    iv.   Conditional;
    v.   But;
    vi.   Specific;
    vii.   Really;
    viii.   Metaphor.
The only change in interpretation involves the relegation to iii (because) of the first variety of iv, with the reservation to iv (conditional) of the second variety. Miscellaneous (ix) was not used because of lack of clarity.

isolation, and .78 for the test as a whole.
Intercorrelations of the subscales were .67 between
powerlessness and normlessness, .54 between powerlessness
and social isolation, and .41 between normlessness and
social isolation.   Correlations of subscales and the test
as a whole were .90 for powerlessness, .80 for
normlessness, and .75 for social isolation.   Knapp (1976)
found the intercorrelations to be .50 between
powerlessness and normlessness, .51 between powerlessness
and social isolation, and .37 between normlessness and
social isolation.

Test-retest reliability of the items were measured
by Dodder (1969) and by Hensley and Hensley (1975).   The
latter used college students as subjects, so the
reliabilities are presented in Table III.   Both of these
studies performed a factor analysis on the scale.   Dodder,
using Iowa housewives as subjects, found eight subscales.
All eight factors loaded on one second order factor,
which lead Dodder to suggest that Dean was measuring
alienation, although not in the manner he hypothesized.
It is for this reason that the present study uses the
scale as a unit, without presenting subscale hypotheses
or data.

Hensley and Hensley (1975) have, unfortunately, less
kind things to say.   Factor analysis also revealed eight
factors.   However, the three subscales do not appear to
correspond to the actual responses.   The eight factors

TABLE III

TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY OF ITEMS
(SEVEN-WEEK PERIOD)

Subscale	Item	Reliability
Social Isolation		.651
1.	Sometimes I feel all alone in the world	.549
3.	I don't get invited out by friends...	.387
5.	Most people today seldom feel lonely	.275
8.	Real friends are as easy as ever to find	.612
11.	You can always find friends...	.256
14.	The world in which we live...	.482
17.	There are few dependable ties...	.556
22.	People are just naturally friendly...	.507
24.	I don't get to visit friends...	.377
Powerlessness		.741
2.	I worry about the future...	.628
6.	Sometimes I have the feeling...	.441
9.	It is frightening to be responsible...	.577
13.	There is little or nothing I can do...	.490
15.	There are so many decisions to be made...	.606
18.	There is little chance for promotion...	.729
20.	We're so regimented today...	.370
21.	We are just so many cogs...	.549
23.	The future looks very dismal	.517
Normlessness		.644
4.	The end often justifies the means	.496
7.	People's ideas change so much...	.555
10.	Everything is relative...	.478
12.	I often wonder...	.594
16.	The only thing you can be sure of...	.510
19.	With so many religions around...	.539
Total Scale		.769

Source: Hensley and Hensley (1975), p. 558.

account for only one-third of the variance, with the rest unaccounted for. Second order factoring suggests that the scale remains multidimensional. Finally, the results were not isomorphic to Dodder's--i.e. the test measures different things with different samples. Hensley and Hensley were appalled that all but one study coming after Dodder's results failed to mention those results. They cite specifically Bonjean and Grimes (1970), Burbach and Thompson (1973), Dubey (1971a and 1971b), Schulze (1971), and Photiadis and Schweiker (1971). They do not mention, however, that these studies found their hypotheses generally supported, regarding bureaucracy, race, race and mobility, commitment, and marginal businessmen, respectively. The study that did mention Dodder (Bean, Bonjean, and Burton, 1973) also found their hypotheses supported (see the section on ecological validity, below).

A detailed analysis of Dean's scale and others was performed by Knapp (1976). From seven scales (see below for details), he derived ten factors, which he attempted to name:

1. Authoritarian concern for status;
2. Future uncertainty;
3. Tendency to discriminate;
4. Powerlessness;
5. Normlessness;
6. Distrust in people;
7. Perceived purposelessness;

8. Authoritarianism;

9. Inevitability of war;

10. Social isolation.

Intercorrelations among the oblique factor scores are presented in Table IV. All three of Dean's subscales loaded significantly on "future uncertainty." Social isolation also loaded significantly on "distrust in people" and "social isolation." See Table V for details.

Relation to other measures

In the original study, Dean (1961) found his normlessness subscale correlating with Srole's anomia scale (1956) at .31. F-scale authoritarianism (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford, 1950) correlated with powerlessness at .37 ($p < .05$), with normlessness at .33 ($p < .05$), with social isolation at .23 ($p < .01$), and with alienation as a whole at .26 ($p < .01$). Dean suggested that the significant but low orders of correlation indicate an association of the two variables without identity.

Returning to Knapp's (1976) analysis, we may examine Table VI, presenting the correlations between the subscales of Neal and Rettig's (1963, 1967) alienation scale, Streuning and Richardson's (1965) scales, anomia (Srole, 1956), authoritarianism (Adorno et al., 1950), status concern (Kaufman, 1957), the tendency to discriminate (Knapp, 1971), and Dean's (1961) subscales.

TABLE IV

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG THE OBLIQUE FACTOR SCORES

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	-.04	-.04	-.10	-.10	.06	.13	.31	-.14	-.04
2		.03	.31	.13	.25	.23	-.14	.06	-.11
3			.07	.11	.09	-.06	.03	.06	.02
4.				.14	.20	.19	-.15	.24	-.17
5					.07	-.02	-.01	.01	.06
6						.12	-.02	.05	-.10
7							.00	.06	-.01
8								-.11	-.01
9									.00

Source: Knapp (1976), p. 205.

TABLE V

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE FACTOR SCORES
AND INDIVIDUAL SUBSCALE SCORES

Subscale	Factor									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Power1.										
oblique	.06	-.76	-.08	-.55	-.18	-.18	-.36	.23	-.17	.19
orthog.	.03	-.72	-.06	-.32	-.22	-.23	-.06	.09	-.18	.14
Norm1.										
oblique	.04	-.67	-.04	-.33	-.34	-.26	-.27	-.19	-.01	.16
orthog.	.06	-.60	.03	-.17	-.36	-.22	.06	-.31	.03	.13
Soc. Isol.										
oblique	-.14	-.62	-.05	-.31	.09	-.46	-.13	.01	-.22	.46
orthog.	-.15	-.43	-.05	-.12	-.08	-.59	-.07	-.05	-.12	.36

Source: Knapp (1976), p. 210.

TABLE VI

SUBSCALE CORRELATIONS

Subscales	Dean's Scale		
	Powerlessness	Normlessness	Soc. isolation
Anomia (Srole)	.57	.45	.48
Authoritarianism (F-scale)	.31	.09	.07
Normlessness (Neal & Rettig)	.37	.35	.22
Powerlessness (Neal & Rettig)	.42	.25	.23
Social isloation (Neal & Rettig)	.56	.45	@
Meaninglessness (Neal & Rettig)	.61	@	.44
Status concern	.07	.07	-.10
Tendency to discriminate	.09	.00	-.08
Alienation by rejection	.65	.53	.49
Authoritarianism	.11	-.03	-.08
Perceived purposelessness	.32	.22	.34

Source: Condensed from Knapp (1976), p. 198.

Note: All values greater than or equal to .12 are significant at p less than .01. All values greater than or equal to .09 are significant at p less than .05. Correlations not recorded due to item overlap are indicated by @.

Ecological validity

Do we find alienation as measured by Dean's scale where we might expect it? With some reservations, yes. To begin, we might expect various manifestations of "certainty" and "uncertainty" related to alienation. Using only the normlessness subscale to test a hypothesis suggested by Durkheim, Dean and Reeves (1962) found highly significant differences between Catholic and Protestant women: With sex, age, and educational levels held constant, the means were 3.77 for Catholics and 8.63 for Protestants, with a standard deviation of 3.50 and 3.26 respectively. Noting socioeconomic discrepancies between the samples, Dean suggests that his earlier research (and common sense) indicates that the difference would have been even greater had this variable been controlled. Dean and Lewis (1978) found significant correlation between alienation and emotional maturity: For men, the correlations with emotional maturity were -.368 for powerlessness, -.304 for normlessness, and -.208 for social isolation; for women, the correlations were -.493 for powerlessness, -.301 for normlessness, and -.318 for social isolation. When we examine the transition in adolescence from one stage of moral development to the next, however, we do not find a "moral disequilibrium" in terms of self-concept, happiness, anxiety, personal integration, or alienation (Wonderly and Kupfersmid, 1978).

Next, we might expect certain relations between alienation and various concepts of freedom. In a fascinating study, Hillery, Dudley, and Morrow (1977) found the correlations shown in Table VII. Disciplined freedom (the "freedom from passions" sought after, perhaps, by monks) was significantly inversely related to alienation and its components. Conditional freedom (not being obliged to do what others want you to do) was significantly directly related to alienation, suggesting that detachment from others is freedom from others. Ego freedom ("I can . . .") was least related to alienation in any direction. Most strongly related was perceived deprivation of freedom, as one might expect.

We might further expect alienation to be related to "escape from reality," in the form of alcoholism or drug use. Calicchia and Barresi (1975) found alcoholics, expecially males, significantly more alienated in Dean's terms than non-alcoholics. Of greatest significance was the social isolation subscale. Alienation was directly related to the length of time as an alcoholic, and inversely related to the length of time in treatment for alcoholism. Paton, Kessler, and Knadel (1977) found drug use also related to alienation. The relation of drug use to normlessness was as high as its relation to depressed mood. The social isolation effect, however, disappeared when depressive mood was partialled out.

In contrast to this last point, suicide, the "ultimate

TABLE VII

FREEDOM-ALIENATION CORRELATIONS

Scales	Ego freedom	Conditional freedom	Disciplined freedom	Perceived deprivation
Cohesion	-.11*	-.43*	.37*	-.30*
Alienation	.08	.19*	-.28*	.32*
Normlessness	.15*	.17*	-.17*	.24*
Powerlessness	.00	.13*	-.22*	.30*
Social isolation	.12*	.20*	-.25*	.31*

*p $<$ .05

Source: Hillery, Dudley, and Morrow (1977), p. 692,

escape," was found highly related to the social isolation subscale, used by Wenz (1979) to measure loneliness. He found significant relations between seasons, loneliness, "future loneliness" as measured by a semantic differential, and suicide attempts. In another study, Wenz (1978) adapted Dean's normlessness scale to measure family anomie, and found the highest normlessness among low economic status attempted suicides, and the lowest among high economic status non-suicides. Normlessness and powerlessness correlated in the controls, and correlated very highly in low economic status suicidal teenagers and their families.

Regarding such background factors as economic status, Dean provides us with the earliest data (1961) using his test. As can be seen in Table VIII, significant albeit low order correlations occur for alienation and occupational, educational, income, age, and community differences. Nightingale and Toulouse (1978), looking at cultural differences between French- and English-speaking Canadians in the work place, found alienation (measured with a modified version of Dean's scale) to be highly correlated with (1) socio-demographic characteristics of the individual, (2) the quality and nature of interpersonal relations, and (3) organizational structures, as expected. Bean, Bonjean, and Burton (1973), looking at intergenerational occupational mobility, found an inverse relationship between alienation, as measured by Dean's

TABLE VIII

BACKGROUND FACTORS-ALIENATION CORRELATIONS

	Occu-pation	Edu-cation	Income	Age	Commu-nity
Powerlessness	-.20**	-.22**	-.26**	.14**	-.10*
Normlessness	-.21**	-.18**	-.14**	.13**	-.10*
Soc. isolation	-.07	-.11*	-.13**	-.03	-.06
Alienation	-.19**	-.21**	-.23**	.12**	-.10*

*p ∠ .05

**p ∠ .01

Source: Dean (1961), p. 755.

test, and the occupational status at origin, a significant
inverse relation with occupational status at destination,
plus a significant "over-riding" effect of the status at
destination.

Three studies using Dean's test deserve mention for
their unusual topics. Burbach and Thompson (1973),
mentioned earlier as finding significant alienation
differences among whites, blacks, and Puerto Ricans, also
found no differences, across racial groups or within them,
between college drop-outs and "persisters." The
researchers themselves point out that intellectually-
oriented alienated people would probably rather stay in
college than enter the work force. A study by Brattesani
and Silverthorne (1978) found significant positive
correlation between Dean's scale and the negative affect
and isolation scales of a "Menstrual Distress
Questionnaire." Finally, Greenburg (1973) found that
homosexual males were significantly more alienated than
heterosexual males, and Catholic homosexuals even more so.
Alienation and self esteem varied inversely in relation to
other variables, but no correlations between the two were
provided. Complex interactions were found for oral versus
anal preferences, which need not be mentioned.

To summarize, Dean's alienation scale must be
acknowledged to be a rough measure of alienation, but a
measure none-the-less. Analysis, especially of validity,
is made difficult by the fact that the great majority of

alienation researchers create their own tests for their individual purposes. Other than this, the choice is really among three tests: Sroles (1956), which is the most used but the least effective; Neal and Rettig's (1963), which is relatively effective but almost unused; and Dean's (1961) which falls between these two in effectiveness and use. Pending further research, Dean's test appears to be the best bet.

Hypotheses

The broad expectation is that, as a person is more alienated, his descriptions (and, presumably, understanding) of others increasingly resembles the descriptions made by children. Fluency, as measured by the number of statements per description, should decrease with alienation. Further, the types of statements made should be the mirror image of the developmental trend discovered by Livesley and Bromley (1973). We should expect the following regarding the content categories defined in Table I:

Increasing as alienation increases:

    2. Identity;

    7. Possessions;

    11. Routine acts;

    30. Family;

    35. Miscellaneous.

Decreasing as alienation increases:

    8. Traits;

    9. Habitual acts;

  24. He-himself;

  20. Beliefs;

  22. Reputation;

  23. Others-him;

  25. I-him;

  27. He-others;

  31. Lovers;

  33. He:others;

  34. Collateral.

Regarding differences in the target of one's description:

Used more in reference to elders:

    2. Identity;

    4. Role;

    7. Possessions;

  10. Specific acts;

  30. Family.

Used more in reference to peers:

  15. He-likes;

  16. Intellect;

  17. He-can;

  21. Evaluations;

  29. Friends;

  31. Lovers;

  32. He:me.

Used more in reference to liked targets:

    4.   Roles;

    8.   Traits;

  14.   Hobbies;

  15.   He-likes;

  16.   Intellect;

  17.   He-can;

  26.   We;

  32.   He:me.

Used more in reference to disliked targets:

    1.   Appearance;

    9.   Habitual acts;

  10.   Specific acts;

  24.   He-himself;

  25.   I-him;

  27.   He-others;

  34.   Collateral.

Although these within-subject expectations are not particularly germane to the issues at hand, they are included in order to confirm Livesley and Bromley (1973) in regards to adults, and secondly because an interaction effect is to be expected wherein the effect of alienation is most strongly seen in disliked elders and least strongly in liked peers.

Regarding self descriptions, I expect there to be little or no difference between alienated and non-alienated individuals, since I am proposing that the

alienated have _learned_ to be unsure of their understanding
of others, and not of themselves, with whom they should be
just as familiar as any adult. There is a possible
exception in the extreme form of alienation where the
individual refuses to assume understanding of his own
actions as well.

It is also expected that alienated individuals would
offer less in the way of qualification or organization
(see Table II) in describing others, although I expect no
difference in simple qualification (e.g. "very," "usually,"
"quite," etc.) and, again, no difference between the
alienated and non-alienated in qualification or
organization of _self_ descriptions.

Method

Subjects were 100 students enrolled in several
sections of the introductory psychology course at the
Oklahoma State University.

The independent variable consisted of scores on
Dean's test of alienation (Dean, 1961--see appendix)
given by assistants three to seven days earlier than that
which follows, with no indication of a relationship, in
the classes from which volunteers would be drawn. The
scores of the people who volunteered for the second
phase were rank ordered and divided into quartiles.
The effects of "volunteerism" are unavoidable here, other
than by a sincere effort to get all to participate with an

offer of two extra-credit points and free cookies.

To arrive at dependent variables, volunteers were
presented with booklets of six pages each. The first
page consisted of the following instructions, somewhat
adapted from Livesley and Bromley (1973):

> Please write your name at the top of this page.
> There are five pages following this one, each
> with a small description at the top. Look at
> the description and think of someone you know
> who fits it. Write the name or initials of
> that person next to the small description. I
> want you to describe the person as carefully
> as you can. I don't want you to tell me about
> their size, the color of their hair or eyes,
> or the kind of clothes they wear. Instead, I
> want you to describe what sort of person they
> are. I want you to tell me what you think
> about them and what they are like. I would
> appreciate it if you would write at <u>least</u> 50
> words about each person, but if possible not
> more than a page. Please relax and take your
> time. Thank you very much for your help.

The "small descriptions" on the following pages (randomly
arranged) were as follows:

a. A person I know fairly well, whom I <u>like</u>
   and who is <u>older</u> than me.

b. A person I know fairly well, whom I <u>like</u>
   and who is about the <u>same</u> age as me.

c. A person I know fairly well, whom I <u>dislike</u>
   and who is <u>older</u> than me.

d. A person I know fairly well, whom I <u>dislike</u>
   and who is about the <u>same</u> age as me.

e. Myself.

The resulting descriptions were then divided into
statements as defined in the previous section: Any "string
of utterances" which, at the <u>semantic</u> level, consist of a
propositional with one or more arguments, one of which is

the target person.

"Fluency" was measured in terms of the number of statements per description. An analysis of variance was performed to examine the effects of alienation quartiles (between subjects) and the within subjects effects of like/dislike and peer/elder.

The "varieties of statements" analysis of the descriptions of others begins by assigning each statement to a single content category, described in Table I. The scores in each category are expressed as the frequency of statements used in the four descriptions. The frequencies were dichotomized at the median and the resulting contingency tables examined by means of a chi-square test. For within-subject variables, a Friedman two-way analysis of variance by ranks method was used with the frequency of statements in each category (see Siegel, 1956).

The "varieties of statements" analysis of the self descriptions proceeds the same way, using chi-squares. Note that the categories 25 (I-him), 26 (We), 28 (Me-him), and 32 (He:me) are irrelevant to self description, and that others must be adjusted (e.g. "He-himself" may be read as "I-myself," and so on).

The "qualifying and organizing terms" analysis of descriptions of others begins by assigning all relevant statements to an appropriate category, described in Table II. The scores are expressed as frequencies, and

analysis proceeds as for the "varieties of statements" analysis.   The same applies with the self descriptions.

Results

There is an embarrassing simplicity to the statistical results of this study: With little exception, the hypotheses failed to find support. Strictly speaking, the nonparametric techniques and the often very low frequencies disallow paying serious attention to probabilities less than .01 (if that). However, for the purpose of eking out possibilities, I have noted significances at the .1 and .05 levels as well.

Regarding fluency, the sole significant effect was that of the liked versus disliked target. Simply put, people (regardless, unfortunately, of their alienation scores) talk more about people they like than people they dislike. (See Table IX.) Fluency means are presented in Table X.

Turning to the central portion of the study, the use of "specific acts" was found to increase with alienation quartiles at the .01 level; "He-me" and "family" had a curvilinear relationship to alienation, with the low and high quartiles using these categories more, at the .05 level; the use of "beliefs" decreased with increased alienation at the .1 level; and "intellect" peaked in the low-mid quartile, also at the .1 level. Compare these results to those expected: "Family" was expected to

TABLE IX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE - FLUENCY

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Ss	8414.500	99		
A	133.320	3	44.440	0.515
Ss w/in grps.	8281.180	96	86.262	
Within Ss	3679.500	300		
B	141.610	1	141.610	10.713*
AB	53.950	3	17.983	1.360
B x Ss w/in grps.	1268.940	96	13.218	
C	10.890	1	10.890	0.775
AC	27.390	3	9.130	0.650
C x Ss w/in grps.	1349.220	98	14.054	
BC	4.000	1	4.000	0.471
ABC	8.200	3	2.733	0.322
BC x Ss w/in grps.	815.300	96	8.493	
TOTAL	12094.000	399		

*p $<$ .001

A = Alienation quartiles

B = Liked/disliked target

C = Peer/elder target

TABLE X

FLUENCY MEANS

Targets	Alienation quartiles				All Subjects
	High	High Mid	Low Mid	Low	
Liked-elder	12.88	12.60	13.44	11.60	12.630
Liked-peer	13.48	13.40	12.88	12.88	13.160
Disliked-elder	12.76	11.12	11.80	10.88	11.640
Disliked-peer	13.64	11.08	11.28	11.08	11.770
Liked	13.18	13.00	13.16	12.24	12.895
Disliked	13.20	11.10	11.54	10.98	11.705
Elder	12.82	11.86	12.62	11.24	12.135
Peer	13.56	12.24	12.08	11.98	12.465
All Targets	13.19	12.05	12.35	11.61	12.300

increase with increased alienation; "Beliefs" was indeed
expected to decrease with increased alienation, making
this our sole confirmed expectation regarding the content
categories; and the others had been expected to be
relatively stable across alienation quartiles. (See
Table XI.)

Next, obscurity and the organizing terms were
expected to increase with alienation. No evidence of
this was found. (See Table XII.)

Regarding self descriptions, no differences were
expected and, indeed, almost no differences were found.
However, without the expected differences in the
descriptions of others, these results have little meaning.
It must be noted that the use of "collateral" statements
decreased with increased alienation at the .1 level, and
"beliefs" showed a trend in the same direction as in the
descriptions of others, decreasing with increased
alienation. (See Table XIII.)

The qualification and organization categories in
self descriptions showed significance at the .05 level for
use of "because," with greatest use by the low alienation
quartile and least by the high. (See Table XIV.)

The alienation scores had a range of 54, with the
median at 70.

Discussion

The proper interpretation of these results is somewhat

TABLE XI

FREQUENCY OF EACH CONTENT CATEGORY
FOR ALL TARGETS AT EACH
ALIENATION QUARTILE
WITH CHI-SQUARES

Category	Low	Low Mid	High Mid	High	Chi-Squares
1. Appearance	2	8	6	14	5.0000
2. Identity	8	25	14	25	3.1526
3. Health	1	2	0	0	3.7801
4. Roles	12	16	11	25	0.8151
5. Past	8	7	9	6	3.9627
6. Prospects	4	1	3	3	1.0870
7. Possessions	3	8	4	6	0.9967
8. Traits	204	218	267	208	1.7207
9. Habitual acts	118	170	122	118	4.3232
10. Specific acts	14	15	21	55	12.0000***
11. Routine acts	6	8	3	17	6.4497*
12. Mannerisms	1	2	0	1	2.0833
13. He may	4	0	3	6	4.0000
14. Hobbies	3	4	1	3	2.3199
15. He likes	26	34	21	28	1.4051
16. Intellect	12	35	26	32	7.1629*
17. He can	9	17	9	6	2.2869
18. He wants	31	23	23	20	0.4416
19. He feels	30	23	24	34	0.6410
20. Beliefs	20	17	11	9	6.7323*
21. Evaluation	64	71	81	76	3.0012
22. Reputation	16	14	8	11	2.4762
23. Others-him	20	22	29	29	4.9220
24. He-himself	47	70	54	38	3.1199
25. I-him	101	57	97	141	5.3096
26. We	34	11	35	49	5.3333
27. He-others	200	211	171	145	2.0934
28. He-me	52	15	24	63	9.4400**
29. Friends	18	10	14	19	1.1349
30. Family	29	18	17	38	7.8788**
31. Lovers	9	22	14	18	3.2258
32. He:me	16	9	21	16	1.1868
33. He:others	10	9	4	6	3.0303
34. Collateral	20	30	34	41	3.4722
35. Miscellaneous	12	7	8	10	1.5245

*p < .1
**p < .05
***p < .01

TABLE XII

FREQUENCY OF QUALIFICATION AND
ORGANIZATION CATEGORIES FOR
ALL TARGETS AT EACH
ALIENATION QUARTILE
WITH CHI-SQUARES

Category		Low	Low Mid	High Mid	High	Chi-Squares
i.	Qualification	328	353	389	347	4.2817
ii.	Obscurity	31	25	19	20	1.6234
iii.	Because	61	33	60	73	5.4487
iv.	Conditional	103	96	114	108	3.4312
v.	But	56	68	86	78	2.0474
vi.	Specific	48	45	51	58	2.0474
vii.	Really	12	19	26	19	0.9615
viii.	Metaphor	10	28	12	11	2.5934

TABLE XIII

FREQUENCY OF EACH CONTENT CATEGORY
FOR SELF DESCRIPTIONS AT EACH
ALIENATION QUARTILE
WITH CHI-SQUARES

Category	Low	Low Mid	High Mid	High	Chi-Squares
1. Appearance	1	5	1	2	3.2609
2. Identity	1	4	1	3	2.1739
3. Health	0	2	0	0	6.1224
4. Roles	2	2	1	4	1.0870
5. Past	5	3	1	14	3.6545
6. Prospects	4	4	2	7	1.6611
7. Possessions	2	4	3	0	2.9186
8. Traits	69	74	96	75	1.6026
9. Habitual acts	40	30	34	31	3.4312
10. Specific acts	7	7	8	7	0.5000
11. Routine acts	6	5	0	5	4.0000
12. Mannerisms	0	0	0	0	0.0000
13. He may	1	1	0	0	2.0408
14. Hobbies	1	3	4	2	0.4608
15. He likes	36	46	34	53	4.0000
16. Intellect	5	5	8	10	2.5641
17. He can	5	4	1	11	3.0946
18. He wants	20	22	31	25	2.2436
19. He feels	27	24	29	33	0.3205
20. Beliefs	27	19	6	8	6.2500
21. Evaluation	10	17	15	13	1.5280
22. Reputation	5	3	4	4	0.3322
23. Others-him	23	14	20	15	2.3333
24. He-himself	31	19	29	25	2.3333
25. (irrelevant)					
26. (irrelevant)					
27. He-others	44	64	61	55	3.0000
28. (irrelevant)					
29. Friends	10	6	11	14	1.3113
30. Family	3	8	9	16	2.9810
31. Lovers	3	8	4	5	1.9135
32. (irrelevant)					
33. He:others	9	5	5	6	0.5000
34. Collateral	21	10	11	9	7.3084*
35. Miscellaneous	0	6	2	7	5.7778

*p $<$ .1

TABLE XIV

FREQUENCY OF QUALIFICATION AND
ORGANIZATION CATEGORIES FOR
SELF DESCRIPTIONS AT EACH
ALIENATION QUARTILE
WITH CHI-SQUARES

Category		Low	Low Mid	High Mid	High	Chi-Squares
i.	Qualification	128	139	117	137	3.0108
ii.	Obscurity	7	6	11	8	3.8052
iii.	Because	35	18	27	12	8.5346*
iv.	Conditional	35	42	48	40	1.4141
v.	But	43	41	39	41	1.7262
vi.	Specific	30	25	17	18	2.3609
vii.	Really	4	2	0	2	3.5461
viii.	Metaphor	2	1	1	2	0.6316

*$p < .05$

problematic. Fortunately, despite the negative results, the act of doing this study has taught me a great deal, some of which I would like to convey to you here.

First and foremost, the links between concepts and observables were far too tenuous. To begin, look at the alienation test once more. I found, as I went back over the "raw" data, that a number of people with cheery attitudes about themselves saw the world as being in dire straits. A few others saw the world as getting along just fine, but very much without them. There were the usual tendencies on the part of some to answer in extreme terms (it's an awful time for bringing a child into this world, but friends are more abundant than ever), and possibly other tendencies to "uncertainty." One may well wonder if an "uncertain" (counting 3) wouldn't be more indicative of alienation than an "agree strongly" (counting 5). Further--in keeping with my argument that alienation is an awareness of reality--there appeared to be a "strangeness" about the descriptions on both ends of the alienation scale. For example, a number of people scoring very low on alienation referred to themselves as recently "born again" Christians. Several of these also referred to bad childhoods, recent ill fortune, personal troubles, and the like, that were resolved by their religious experiences. Some of the highly alienated recounted similar troubles, but of course without the conversion. The styles of their descriptions (use of categories) are

more similar to each others' than to those firmly
entrenched in the middle of the distribution. Speculative
explanations for this are easy to come up with: It takes
time for them to change their way of thinking about
others; their conversions are shallow affairs which merely
mask their alienation; conversion is itself a manifestation
of alienation; and so on. Returning to the alienation
test, the problem may simply be that it is _obvious_ what the
test is after. A born-again Christian may wish to
demonstrate his new-found trust in the Lord in his
answers, as might a fresh recruit to the radical left wish
to demonstrate his fashionable alienation from the
establishment.

These problems may not have been quite as severe had
the range of scores been greater. As it stands, however,
my experience with this test leads me to suggest we
proceed in two directions: (1) Develop a test that
quietly and unobtrusively taps those _feelings_ associated
with alienation, in terms of "sometimes I feel . . ." or
". . . is very frustrating to me," rather than "politicians
are crooks" (as they may well be); (2) Develop a second
test that (rather like Srole's) puts the questions on the
line, without a five-point-scale or misty interworld, "I
have no power," "Norms are merely conventions," maybe even
"life is essentially meaningless." I don't mean to suggest
that these then form two dimensions of alienation, but
rather that they tap two forms of adaptation (and yes,

there are likely more than two) to the alienating
situation, forms which in Dean's test and others are
confused with each other, with "normality," and even with
"extremely well adjusted."

Next, I would like to discuss the semantic analysis.
First off, let me convey my personal feelings about the
descriptions. Apparently, when people realize that what
they are doing relates to psychology, they pour their
hearts out. I found it very, very difficult to dissect
people's feelings, aspirations, personal histories, and
so on, and put the pieces into the rather arbitrary and
very cold indeed categories of "content." Being fairly
alienated myself, I was warmed by the realization that
the great majority of people--at least of the ones I met
via this study--are good people. Even those people whose
descriptions might lead one to form a negative opinion of
their characters expressed what appears to be sincere
desires to be good. Although it is said that the road to
hell is paved with good intentions, that road must
certainly be broad and high. But these observations are,
of course, unscientific, and my alienation returned quickly
as I entered into statistical manipulations of my objective
data.

To return to the concrete, I found that, despite the
apparent generality of the categories, it must be that
they are better suited to the developmental questions for
which they were originally designed. Mind you, the

extension of the technique beyond those questions was not
my idea--Bromley's book (1977) specifically advocates its
use as a means of dealing with large amounts of "quasi-
juridical" (i.e. case study) data of any sort. As I used
the technique, however, I became increasingly dismayed
by its ability to eradicate differences important to
alienation: When "I like football" is classified with
"I like solitaire," "I go through lovers like I go through
potato chips" with "My wife and I have a satisfying sex
life," "I expect to complete medical school" with "I hope
I have a job next year," or "I am shy" with "I am easy-
going," one begins to wonder at the amounts of information
that are lost.

It appears to me now that the type of universal
semantic analysis I had been looking for--one wherein
the subject "defines" the categories of analysis--may not
be possible. Livesley and Bromley's technique, of course,
involved categories pre-established, albeit using material
relevant to the studies to follow, by expert judges. But
the breadth of the categories led me to believe that it
would begin to approach the ideal. However, with this
experience and further thought, it now appears to me that,
if the subject defines the categories of content by the
categories he uses, the researcher must essentially
relate each semantic "gestalt" with every other--a feat
approximated only by one individual's understanding of
another. In simpler terms, the closest thing we have to

a universal semantic analysis is an expert's carefully thought-out impressions of another after years of interaction (shades of Freud, perhaps?). Although it pains me to admit it, the best procedure, when it comes to experimenting with texts, verbal or written, is probably to categorize the content into relatively broad categories, in the manner of the techniques developed by McClelland or Secord. Again, the analysis used by Livesley and Bromley is perfectly alright--when used for its intended purpose.

Another problem, tied more to my hypotheses that to the technique, concerns the relation between the manner in which people perceive people and the manner in which they describe them. How much, for example, does the child's "child-like" description depend on his lack of verbal skill and understanding of the meanings of words, and how much depends on a real difference in cognitive organization? Notice (isn't hindsight a wonderful sense?) that in Livesley and Bromley's study (1973), fluency was greater in girls--acknowledged to be verbally more fluent at an earlier age--yet is unrelated to intelligence, which one might expect to make a difference when it comes to actual cognitive complexity in interpersonal understanding! Regarding the present study, does one express one's distrust of or ignorance of others' inner processes by changing the way one talks about others? A mute may see the sunrise but not describe it; a blindman may describe it but not see it. Less poetically, we may describe

others as moody, changeable, untrustworth, unpredictable, and other indicators of our lack of understanding of their inner workings, just as easily as we describe them as friendly, gentle, sincere, and so on--all "traits," all "category 8."

Again with the benefit of hindsight, I believe I made a poor choice of targets: As I never expected to have subjects so thoroughly alienated as to have no relationships with others, I should hardly have expected that the more alienated subjects would not have a few trusted friends or family members to draw on for the "liked" targets. And inasmuch as much of the descriptions of "disliked" others consists of one's own reactions to those others, as well as the possibility that even the very "unalienated" might dislike someone precisely because their surface behaviors belie underlying motives, I should not have expected these targets to draw out the desired differences either. Perhaps a "generalized other" target would have better served the purpose.

The within-subjects analysis of variance by ranks to examine the effects of target on each category was not performed for a number of reasons. Foremost, the preponderance of zeros, ties, and even non-use of categories by individual subjects, together render the statistics essentially meaningless. Next, in addition to being subject to the criticism just mentioned, Livesley and Bromley (1973) apparently used the statistical

technique mentioned incorrectly, using proportions in place of ranks, leading me to seriously question their results--and hence the predictions made in this study-- concerning target effects. Finally, the irrelevance of simple target effects to the main mypotheses and the incalculability of target-by-alienation interactions make the omission less than serious. I might add that the one category in which I could see differences in usage with different targets--evaluation--is one which is biased by definition, or more precisely by the examples Bromley (1977) gave for its use: There was far more "evaluation" of disliked targets than of liked targets because "cocky," for example, was to be considered an evaluative term, whereas "friendly," for another example, was to be considered a trait. The reasoning behind the differentiation is fine, and the reliability good; but the bias remains none-the-less.

The list of reasons why a study failed to produce the sought after results can, of course, go on forever. The fact of the matter is, however, that this study failed rather dramatically. I, personally, learned a great deal from it. But in regards to this particular design addressing this particular problem, permit me to paraphrase a phrase very familiar to psychology: Further research is not indicated.

I hardly mean to imply, however, that the concept of alienation, the interpretation of it developed in

Chapter II, its possible relationship to person perception, or the fruitfulness of semantic analysis have been put to task. The failings of this study have, by their very nature, spared these things for the time being. I hope that I may have something to do with demonstrating their alue in the coming years. In the meantime, having failed in an instrumental society, it is apparent that my myths and natural associations will sustain me.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., and
Sanford, R. N. The authoritarian personality.
New York: Harper, 1950.

Aiken, M. and Hage, J. Organizational alienation: A
comparative analysis. American Sociological Review,
1966, 31, 497-507.

Allport, G. and Cantril, H. Judging personality from the
voice. Journal of Social Psychology, 1934, 5, 37-55.

Anderson, N. H. Averaging versus adding as a stimulus-
combination rule in impression formation. Journal
of Experimental Psychology, 1965, 70, 394-400.

Anderson, N. H. and Barrios, A. A. Primacy effects in
personality impression formation. Journal of
Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 346-350.

Anderson, N. H. and Hubert, S. Effects of concommitant
recall on order effects in personality impression
formation. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal
Behavior, 1963, 2, 379-391.

Anderson, N. H. and Norman, A. Order effects in impression
formation in four classes of stimuli. Journal of
Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 69, 467-471.

Anisfeld, M., Bogo, N., and Lambert, W. Evaluation
reactions to accented English speech. Journal of
Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 65, 223-231.

Argyle, M. and McHenry, R. Do spectacles really affect
judgements of intelligence? British Journal of
Social and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 10, 27-29.

Aristotle. The politics of Aristotle (B. Jowett, Trans.).
New York: P. F. Collier and Son, 1900.

Arkin, R. M. and Duval, S. Focus of attention and causal
attributions of actors and observers. Journal of
Experimental Social Psychology, 1975, 11, 427-438.

Aronowitz, S. False promises: The shaping of American
    working class consciousness. New York: McGraw Hill,
    1973.

Asch, S. E. Forming impressions of personality. Journal
    of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1946, 41, 258-290.

Asch, S. E. Social Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.:
    Prentice Hall, 1952.

Baer, D. J. Trait judgements of military pilots from
    photographs. Journal of Psychology, 1964, 58, 257-
    260.

Bailyn, L. Career and family orientations of husbands
    and wives in relation to marital happiness. Human
    Relations, 1970, 23, 97-113.

Barakat, H. Alienation: A process of encounter between
    utopia and reality. British Journal of Sociology,
    1969, 20, 1-10.

Bass, B. M. Organizational Psychology. Boston: Allyn
    and Bacon, 1965.

Bass, B. M. and Barret, G. V. Man, work, and
    organizations. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

Bassili, J. N. Temporal and spatial contingencies in the
    perception of social events. Journal of Personality
    and Social Psychology, 1976, 33, 680-685.

Beach, L. and Wertheimer, H. A free response approach to
    the study of person cognition. Journal of Abnormal
    and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 367-374.

Bean, F. D., Bonjean, C. M., and Burton, M. G.
    Intergenerational occupational mobility and
    alienation. Social Forces, 1973, 52, 62-73.

Bell, D. and Held, V. The community revolution. Public
    Interest, 1969, 16, 142-177.

Benedict, R. Patterns of culture. Boston: Houghton
    Mifflin, 1934.

Berman, J. S. and Kenny, D. A. Correlational bias in
    observer ratings. Journal of Personality and Social
    Psychology, 1976, 34, 263-273.

Berscheid, E., Dion, K., Walster, E., and Walster, G. Physical attratctiveness and dating choice: A test of the matching hypothesis. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1971, 7, 173-189.

Bickford, H. L. and Neal, A. G. Alienation and social learning: A study of students in a vocational training center. Sociology of Education, 1969, 42, 141-153.

Bieri, J. Cognitive complexity-simplicity and predictive behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 263-268.

Blauner, R. Work satisfaction and industrial trends in modern society. In Galenson, W. and Lipset, S. M. (Eds.), Labor and trade unionism: An interdisciplinary reader. New York: Wiley, 1960.

Blauner, R. Alienation and freedom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Blood, R. O. and Wolfe, D. M. Husbands and wives: The dynamics of modern living. New York: Free Press, 1960.

Blumberg, H. H. Communication of interpersonal evaluations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 23, 157-162.

Blumberg, P. Industrial democracy: The sociology of participation. London: Constable, 1968.

Bonjean, C. M. and Grimes, M. D. Bureaucracy and alienation: A dimensional approach. Social Forces, 1970, 48, 365-373.

Bradburn, N. M. The structure of psychological well-being. Chicago: Aldine, 1969.

Brattesani, K. and Silverthorne, C. P. Social psychological factors of menstrual distress. Journal of Social Psychology, 1978, 106, 139-140.

Bray, D. W., Campbell, R. J., and Grant, D. L. Formative years in business: A long-term A. T. & T. study of managerial lives. New York: Wiley, 1974.

Brierley, D. W. Children's use of personality constructs. Bulletin of British Psychological Society, 1966, 19, 72.

Britton, J. H. and Britton, J. O. Personality changes in aging: A longitudinal study of community residents. New York: Springer, 1972.

Bromley, D. B. The social psychology of reputation. Bulletin of British Psychological Society, 1966, 19, 73.

Bromley, D. B. Conceptual analysis in the study of personality and adjustment. Bulletin of British Psychological Society, 1968, 21, 155-160.

Bromley, D. B. Personality description in ordinary language. London: Wiley, 1977.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Two worlds of childhood: U.S. and U.S.S.R. New York: Russell Sage, 1970.

Bruner, J. S. and Tagiuri, R. The perception of people. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Boeree, C. G. Glass beads: Towards an alternative approach to the science of social psychology. Unpublished thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1979.

Bugenthal, D. Kaswan, J., and Love, L. Perception of contradictory meanings conveyed by verbal and non-verbal channels. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 16, 647-655.

Bullough, B. L. Social-psychological barriers to housing desegregation. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969.

Burbach, H. and Thompson, M. A. A note on alienation, race, and college attrition. Psychological Reports, 1973, 33, 273-274.

Calicchia, J. P. and Barresi, R. M. Alcoholism and alienation. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1975, 31, 770-775.

Campbell, A. White attitudes toward black people. Ann Arbor: Institute of Social Research, 1971.

Caplan, N. The new ghetto man: A review of recent empirical studies. Journal of Social Issues, 1970, 26, 59-73.

Chiriboga, D. A. and Lowenthal, M. F. Psychological adaptation in later life: A dual model. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, San Francisco, 1974.

Cialdini, R. B., Braver, S. L., and Lewis, S. K. Attributional bias and the easily persuaded other. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 30, 631-637.

Clark, J. P. Measuring alienation within a social system. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 849-852.

Clifford, M. and Walster, E. The effect of physical attractiveness on teacher expectation. Sociology of Education, 1973, 46, 248.

Cohen, D. This day's child in school. Childhood Education, 1974, 51, 8-15.

Cohen, J. Some statistical issues in psychological research. In B. B. Wolman (Ed.), Handbook of clinical psychology. New York: McGraw Hill, 1965.

Converse, P. E. Changes in the American electorate. In A. Campbell and P. E. Converse (Eds.), The human meaning of social change. New York: Russell Sage, 1972.

Cotgrove, S. Alienation and automation. British Journal of Sociology, 1972, 23, 437-451.

Crain, R. L. and Weisman, C. S. Discrimination, personality, and achievement. New York: Seminar, 1973.

Crockett, W. H. Cognitive complexity and impression formation. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), Progress in experimental personality research Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.

Cronbach, L. Processes affecting scores on "understanding of others" and "assumed similarity." Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 177-193.

Cummings, T. G. and Manring, S. L. The relationship between worker alienation and work-related behavior. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1977, 10, 167-179.

Dahlem, W. "Young Americans'" reported perception of their parents. Journal of Psychology, 1970, 74, 187-194.

Davenport, W., Brooker, G., and Munro, N. Factors in social perception: Seating position. _Perceptual and Motor Skills_, 1971, _33_, 747-752.

Davis, W. L. and Phares, E. J. Internal-external control as a determinant of information seeking in a social influence situation. _Journal of Personality_, 1967, _35_, 547-561.

Dean, D. G. Alienation and political apathy. _Social Forces_, 1960, _38_, 185-189.

Dean, D. G. Alienation: Its meaning and measurement. _American Sociological Review_, 1961, _26_, 753-768.

Dean, D. G. and Lewis, A. K. Alienation and emotional maturity: A preliminary investigation. _Psychological Reports_, 1978, _42_, 1006.

Dean, D. G. and Reeves, J. A. Anomie: A comparison of a Catholic and Protestant sample. _Sociometry_, 1962, _25_, 209-212.

DeCharms, R. _Personal Causation_. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Deutsch, K. W. Mechanism, teleology, and mind: The theory of communications and some problems in philosophy and social science. In R. W. Marks (Ed.), _Space, time, and the new mathematics_. New York: Bantam, 1964.

DeSoto, C., Kuethe, J. L., and Wunderlich, R. Social perception of high and low authoritarians. _Journal of Social Psychology_, 1960, _52_, 149-155.

Dion, K. Physical attractiveness and evaluations of children's transgressions. _Journal of Personality and Social Psychology_, 1972, _24_, 207-213.

Dion, K. and Berscheid, E. _Physical attractiveness and social perception of peers in preschool children_. Mimeographed research report available from the authors, 1972.

Dion, K., Berscheid, E., and Walster, E. What is beautiful is good. _Journal of Personality and Social Psychology_, 1972, _24_, 285-290.

Dillon, S. V. and Grout, J. A. Schools and alienation. _Elementary School Journal_, 1976, _76_, 481-489.

Dodder, R. A. A factor analysis of Dean's alienation
    scale. Social Forces, 1969, 48, 252-255.

Dorfman, D. D., Keeve, S., and Saslow, C. Ethnic
    identification: A signal detection analysis.
    Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971,
    18, 373-379.

Dornbusch, S. M., Hastorf, A. H., Richardson, S. A.,
    Muzzy, R. E., and Vreeland, R. S. The perceiver and
    the perceived: Their relative influence on the
    categories of interpersonal cognition. Journal of
    Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 434-440.

Dubey, S. N. Powerlessness and mobility orientations
    among disadvantaged blacks. Public Opinion
    Quarterly, 1971, 35, 183-188. (a)

Dubey, S. N. Powerlessness and the adaptive responses
    of disadvantaged blacks: A pilot study. Human
    Organization, 1971, 30, 144-157. (b)

Dubin, R. Industrial workers' worlds: A study of the
    central life interests of industrial workers.
    Social Problems, 1956, 3, 131-142.

Duncan, O. D., Schuman, H., and Duncan, B. Social change
    in a metropolitan community. New York: Russell
    Sage, 1973.

Ekman, P. Body position, facial expression, and verbal
    behavior during interviews. Journal of Abnormal
    and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 295-301.

Ekman, P. and Friesen, W. Nonverbal leakage and clues to
    deception. Psychiatry, 1969, 32, 88-106.

Ekman, P. and Friesen, W. Detecting deception from
    body or face. Journal of Personality and Social
    Psychology, 1974, 29, 288-298.

Ekman, P., Friesen, W., and Ellsworth, P. Emotion in the
    human face: Guidelines for research and an
    integration of findings. New York: Pergamon Press,
    1972

Ekman, P., Friesen, W., and Scherer, K. Body movements
    and voice pitch in deceptive interaction.
    Semiotica, 1976, 2, 73-79.

Ellsworth, P. and Carlsmith, J. Effects of eye contact and verbal content on affecting responses to a dyadic interaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 15-20.

Ellsworth, P. and Carlsmith, J. Eye contact and gaze aversion in an aggressive encounter. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 28, 280-292.

Ellsworth, P., Carlsmith, J., and Henson, A. The stare as a stimulus to flight in human subjects: A series of field experiments. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 21, 302-311.

Emmerich, W. Family role concepts of children ages six to ten. Child Development, 1961, 32, 609-624.

Engels, F. The origin of family, private property, and the state. Chicago: International Publishers, 1902.

Engen, T. and Levy, N. Constant-sum judgements of facial expressions. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1956, 51, 396-398.

Engen, T., Levy, N., and Schlosberg, H. A new series of facial expressions. American Psychologist, 1957, 12, 264-266.

Epstein S. and Taylor, S. Instigation to aggression as a function of degree of defeat and perceived aggressive intent of the opponent. Journal of Personality, 1967, 35, 265-289.

Erbe, W. Social involvement and political activity: A replication and elaboration. American Sociological Review, 1964, 29, 198-215.

Farris, G. F. A predictive study of turnover. Personnel Psychology, 1971, 24, 311-328.

Fay, P. J. and Middleton, W. C. Judgements of stranger personality types from voice as transmitted over a public address system. Character and Personality, 1936, 8, 144-155.

Fay, P. J. and Middleton, W. C. The ability to judge sociability from voice as transmitted over a public address system. Character and Personality, 1941, 13, 303-309.

Feagin, J. R., Tilly, C., and Williams, C. W.
Subsidizing the poor: A Boston housing experiment.
Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1972.

Fein, M. The myth of job enrichment. The Humanist,
1973, 33, 30-32.

Feldman, N. S., Higgins, E. T., Karlovac, M., and Ruble,
D. N. Use of consensus information in causal
attributions as a function of temporal presentation
and availability of direct information. Journal
of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34,
694-698.

Felipe, N. and Sommer, R. Invasions of personal space.
Social Problems, 1966, 14, 206-214.

Feuer, L. What is alienation? The career of a concept.
In M. Stein and A. Vidich (Eds.), Sociology on
Trail. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1963.

Finifter, A. W. Dimensions of political alienation.
American Political Science Review, 1970, 64, 389-410.

Fishbein, M. and Hunter, R. Summation versus balance in
attitude organization and change. Journal of
Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 69, 505-510.

Fischer, C. S. On urban alienation and anomie:
Powerlessness and social isolation. American
Sociological Review, 1973, 38, 311-326.

Fisher, G. H. and Cox, R. L. Development and initial
application of the facial attribution differential.
Bulletin of the British Psychological Society, 1971,
24, 259.

Fontaine, G. Causal attribution in simulated versus real
situations: When are people logical, when are they
not? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,
1975, 32, 1021-1029.

Ford, R. N. Job enrichment lessons from A. T. & T.
Harvard Business Review, 1973, 51, 96-106.

Form, W. H. Technological and social behavior of workers
in four countries: A sociotechnical perspective.
American Sociological Review. 1972, 37, 727-738.

Form, W. H. Auto workers and their machines: A study of
work, factory, and job satisfaction in four
countries. Social Forces, 1973, 52, 1-15.

Forward, J. R. and Williams, J. R. Internal-external
    control and black militancy. Journal of Social
    Issues, 1970, 27, 75-92.

Foulkes, D. A grammar of dreams. New York: Basic Books,
    1978.

Fried, M. The world of the urban working class.
    Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Frijda, N. Recognition of emotion. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.),
    Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol. 4.
    New York: Academic Press, 1969.

Fullan, M. Industrial technology and worker integration
    in the organization. American Sociological Review,
    1970, 35, 1028-1039.

Gales, K. E. The campus revolution. British Journal of
    Sociology, 1966, 17, 1-19.

Gamson, W. A. Power and discontent. Homewood, Ill.:
    Dorsey Press, 1968.

Gannon, M. J. and Hendrickson, D. H. Career orientation
    and job satisfaction among working wives. Journal
    of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 339-340.

Geyer, R. F. and Schweitzer, D. R. Theories of alienation:
    Critical perspectives in philosophy and the social
    sciences. Leiden: Marinus Nijhoff, 1976.

Gibbins, K. Communication aspects of women's clothes and
    their relation to fashion ability. British
    Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 8,
    301-312.

Gillis, J. S. and Jessor, R. Effects of brief
    psychotherapy on belief in internal control: An
    exploratory study. Psychotherapy, 1970, 7, 135-137.

Goethals, G. Consensus and modality in the attribution
    process: The role of similarity and information.
    Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972,
    21, 84-92.

Goffman, E. Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face
    behavior. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Goldthorpe, J. H., Lockwood, D., Bechhofer, F., and Platt,
    J. The affluent worker: Industrial attitudes and
    behavior. London: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Gollin, E. S. Forming impressions of personality.
     Journal of Personality, 1954, 23, 65-76.

Gollin, E. S. Organizational characteristics of social
     judgement: A developmental investigation. Journal
     of Personality, 1958, 26, 139-154.

Goodenough, W. H. Componential analysis and the study of
     meaning. Language, 1956, 32, 195-216.

Gore, P. and Rotter, J. B. A personality correlate of
     social action. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31,
     58-64.

Gorman, B. S. An observation of altered locus of control
     following political disappointment. Psychological
     Reports, 1968, 23, 1094.

Granovetter, M. S. The strength of weak ties. American
     Journal of Sociology, 1973, 78, 1360-1379.

Greenberg, J. S. A study of self-esteem and alienation
     of male homosexuals. Journal of Psychology, 1973,
     83, 137-143.

Greer, S. The emerging city: Myth and reality. New York:
     Free Press, 1962.

Gross, C. F. Intrajudge consistency in ratings of
     heterogeneous persons. Journal of Abnormal and
     Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 605-610.

Gurin, G., Veroff, J., and Feld, S. Americans view their
     mental health. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Gurwitz, S. B. and Panciera, L. Attributions of freedom
     by actors and observers. Journal of Personality and
     Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 531-539.

Hahn, D. K. Why don't workers want to be promoted?
     Paper presented at the annual A.P.A. convention,
     Chicago, 1975.

Haire, M. Role-perceptions in labor-management relations:
     An experimental approach. Industrial and Labor
     Relations Review, 1955, 8, 204-216.

Haire, M. and Grunes, W. Perceptual defenses: Processes
     protecting an organized perception of another
     personality. Human Relations, 1950, 3, 403-412.

Hajda, J. Alienation and integration of student intellectuals. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 758-777.

Hakmiller, K. Threat as a determinant of downward comparison. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology Supplement, 1966, 1, 27-31.

Hall, E. T. A system for the notation of proxemic behavior. American Anthropologist, 1963, 65, 1003-1026.

Hall, E. T. Silent assumptions in social communication. Disorders of Communication, 1964, 42, 41-55.

Hall, E. T. Hidden Dimension. London: Bodley Head, 1969.

Hall, E. T. Beyond Culture. Garden City, N. Y.: Anchor Books, 1977.

Hall, D. T. and Mansfield, R. Organizational and individual response to external stress. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1971, 16, 533-547.

Hall, D. T. and Mansfield, R. Relationships of age and seniority with career variables of engineers and scientists. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 201-210.

Hall, D. T. and Nougaim, K. E. An examination of Maslow's need hierarchy in an organizational setting. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1968, 3, 12-35.

Hamilton, D. L. and Zanna, M. P. Context effects in impression formation: Changes in connotative meaning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 649-654.

Harris, L. What America thinks of itself. Newsweek, December 10, 1973, 40-48.

Harris, L. and associates. The myth and reality of aging in America. Washington, D. C.: National Council on the Aging, 1975.

Hegel, G. W. F. Philosophy of right (T. M. Knox, Trans.). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942.

Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Heider, F. and Simmel, M. An experimental study of apparent behavior. *American Journal of Psychology*, 1944, 57, 243-258.

Helm, B., Fromme, D. K., Murphy, P., and Scott, W. C. *Interaction perceptions in a double-bind conflict setting*. Unpublished manuscript, Oklahoma State University, 1974.

Hensley, D. R. and Hensley, D. R. Factor structure of Dean's alienation scale among college students. *Psychological Reports*, 1975, 37, 555-561.

Herzberg, F. *Work and the nature of man*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1966.

Hicks, M. W. and Platt, M. Marital happiness and stability: A review of the research in the sixties. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1970, 32, 553-574.

Hillery, G. A., Dudley, C. J., and Morrow, P. C. Toward a sociology of freedom. *Social Forces*, 1977, 55, 685-700.

Hjelmslev, L. *Prolegomena to a theory of language* (F. J. Whitfield, Trans.). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. (Originally published, 1943.)

Hochreich, D. J. and Rotter, J. B. Have college students become less trusting? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1970, 15, 211-214.

Holian, J. Alienation and social awareness among college students. *Sociological Quarterly*, 1972, 13, 114-125.

Holsti, O. R. Content analysis. In L. Cardner and E. Aronson, *Handbook of social psychology*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Horton, J. and Thompson, W. Powerlessness and political negativism: A study of defeated local referendums. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1962, 67, 485-493.

House, J. S. and Mason, W. M. *Political alienation in America: 1952-1968*. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York, 1974.

Howell, R. and Jorgenson, E. Accuracy of judging emotional behavior in a natural setting: A replication. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1970, 81, 269-270.

Hunnius, G., Garson, G. P., and Case, J. (Eds.). Worker
    control: A reader in labor and social change.
    New York: Random, 1973.

Inglehart, R. The silent revolution in Europe:
    Intergenerational change in post-industrial societies.
    American Political Science Review, 1971, 65, 991-
    1017.

Israel, J. Alienation: From Marx to modern sociology.
    Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Jessor, R., Graves, T., Hanson, R. C., and Jessor, S. L.
    Society, personality, and deviant behavior.
    New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.

Johnson, F. Alienation: Concept, term, and meanings.
    New York: Seminar Press, 1973.

Johnson, H. M. Sociology: A systematic introduction.
    New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1960.

Johnson, T. J., Feigenbaum, R., and Weiby, M. Some
    determinants and consequences of the teacher's
    perception of causation. Journal of Educational
    Psychology, 1964, 55, 237-246.

Jones, A. P., James, L. R., and Bruni, J. R. Perceived
    leadership behavior and employee confidence in the
    leader as moderated by job involvement. Journal
    of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 146-149.

Jones, E. E. Authoritarianism as a determination of
    first impression formation. Journal of Personality,
    1954, 23, 106-127.

Jones, E. E. and Nisbett, R. E. The actor and the
    observer: Divergent perceptions of the causes of
    behavior. In Attribution: Perceiving the causes of
    behavior. Morristown, N. J.: General Learning
    Press, 1972.

Jones, E. E., Davis, K., and Gergen, K. Role playing
    variations and their informational value for person
    perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,
    1961, 63, 302-310.

Jones, E. E. and deCharms, R. Changes in social perception
    as a function of the personal relevance of behavior.
    Sociometry, 1957, 20, 75-85.

Jones, E. E., Worchel, S., Goethals, G., and Grumet, J. Prior expectancy and behavioral extremity as determinants of attitude attribution. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 1971, 7, 59-80.

Jones, S. and Shrauger, J. Reputation and self evaluation as determinants of attractiveness. *Sociometry*, 1970, 33, 276-286.

Jones, W. Interaction effects of students, drugs, and alienation. *Journal of Drug Education*, 1977-1978, 7, 271-278.

Josephson, E. and Josephson, M. R. Alienation: Contemporary sociological approaches. In Johnson, F. (Ed.), *Alienation: Concept, term, and meanings*. New York: Seminar Press, 1973.

Kagan, J. Socialization of aggression and the perception of parents in fantasy. *Child Development*, 1958, 29, 311-320.

Kagan, J. Child's symbolic conceptualization of parents. *Child Development*, 1961, 32, 625-626.

Kagan, J. and Lemkin, J. The child's differential perception of parental attitudes. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1963, 61, 440-447.

Kahn, M. Nonverbal communication as a factor in marital satisfaction. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1970, 30, 4794.

Kahneman, D. and Tversky, A. On the psychology of prediction. *Psychological Review*, 1973, 80, 237-251.

Kanungo, R. N. The concepts of alienation and involvement revisited. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1979, 86, 119-138.

Kaplan, M. F. Context effects in impression formation: The weighted average versus the meaning-change formulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1971, 19, 92-99.

Karaz, V. and Perlman, D. Attribution at the wire: Consistency and outcome finish strong. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 1975, 11, 470-477.

Kasarda, J. D. and Janowitz, M. Community attachment in mass society. *American Sociological Review*, 1974, 39, 328-339.

Kates, S. L. First impression formation and authoritarianism. Human Relations, 1959, 12, 277-286.

Kaufman, W. C. Status, authoritarianism, and anti-Semitism. American Journal of Sociology, 1957, 62, 379-382.

Keasey, C. and Tomlinson-Keasey, C. Petition signing in a naturalistic setting. Journal of Social Psychology, 1973, 89, 313-314.

Kelley, H. The warm-cold variable in first impressions of persons. Journal of Personality, 1950, 18, 431-439.

Kelley, H. Attribution theory in social psychology. In D. Levine (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1967, 15, 192-238.

Kelley, H. Attribution in social interaction. In Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior. Morristown, N. J.: General Learning Press, 1972.

Kelley, H. and Stahelski, A. The influence of intention from moves in the prisoners dilemma game. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1970, 6, 401-419.

Kelly, G. A. The psychology of personal constructs. New York: W. W. Norton, 1955.

Keniston, K. The uncommitted: Alienated youth in American society. New York: Dell, 1965.

Keniston, K. The sources of student dissent. Journal of Social Interests, 1967, 23, 108-137.

Keniston, K. Young radicals. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1968.

Kennedy, J., Koslin, B., schroder, H., Blackman, S., Ramsey, J., and Helm, C. Cognitive patterning of complex stimuli: A symposium. Journal of General Psychology, 1966, 74, 25-49.

Kepka, E. and Brickman, P. Consistency versus discrepancy as clues in the attribution of intelligence and motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 20, 223-229.

Kirby, D. A counter-culture explanation of student activism. Social Problems, 1971, 19, 203-216.

Kirk, R. E. Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral sciences. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1968.

Kirsch, B. A. and Lengermann, J. J. An empirical test of Robert Blauner's ideas on alienation in work as applied to different type jobs in a white-collar setting. Sociology and Social Research, 1972, 56, 180-194.

Klinger, E. Meaning and void: Inner experience and the incentives in people's lives. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977.

Knapp, R. J. A factor analytic study of alienation, anomia, and authoritarianism and their relationship to the tendency to discriminate. Unpublished Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1971.

Knapp, R. J. Authoritarianism, alienation, and related variables: A correlational and factor analytic study. Psychological Bulletin, 1976, 83, 194-212.

Kohn, M. L. and Schooler, C. Occupational experience and occupational functioning: An assessment of reciprocal effects. American Sociological Review, 1973, 38, 97-118.

Kolaja, J. A Yugoslav workers' council. Human Organization, 1961, 20, 27-31.

Kornhauser, A. Mental health of the industrial worker. New York: Wiley, 1965.

Korte, C. and Milgram, S. Acquaintance networks between racial groups: Application of the small world method. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 15, 101-108.

Kozel, N. Perception of emotion, race of expressor, sex of perceiver, and mode of presentation. Proceedings of the 77th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1969, 4, 39-40.

Kozel, N. and Gitter, A. Perception of emotion: Differences in mode of presentation, sex of perceiver, and role of expressor (Technical Report #18). Boston: Boston University, 1968.

Kramer, E. Judgement of personal characteristics and emotions from nonverbal properties of speech. _Psychological Bulletin_, 1963, _60_, 408-420.

Krauss, R. M., Geller, V., and Olson, C. _Modalities and cues in the detection of deception._ Paper presented at A.P.A. meeting, Washington, D.C., Sept., 1976.

Kretschmer, E. _Physique and character._ London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1936.

Laing, R., Phillipson, H., and Lee, A. _Interpersonal perception: A theory and a method of research._ New York: Springer, 1966.

Lalljee, M. G. Cited by M. Argyle, _Research project on non-verbal communication._ Final Report to Social Science Research Council, for period October 1, 1967 to September 30, 1971.

Lamb, S. M. The sememic approach to structural semantics. In A. K. Romney and R. G. D'Andrade (Eds.), _Transcultural studies in cognition._ A special publication of _American Anthropologist_, 1964, _66_, part 2.

Lamb, S. M. _Outline of stratificational grammar._ Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press, 1966.

Landis, C. The interpretation of facial expression in emotion. _Journal of General Psychology_, 1929, _2_, 59-72.

Latane, B. and Darley, J. M. Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. _Journal of Personality and Social Psychology_, 1968, _10_, 215-221.

Laumann, E. O. _Bonds of pluralism: The form and substance of urban social networks._ New York: Wiley, 1973.

Lawler, E. E., Hackman, J, R,, and Kaufman, S. Effects of job redesign: A field experiment. _Journal of Applied Social Psychology_, 1973, _3_, 49-62.

Lawler, E. E. and Hall, D. T. Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. _Journal of Applied Psychology_, 1970, _54_, 305-312.

Le Compte, W. and Rosenfeld, H. Effects of minimal eye contact in the instruction period on impressions of the experimenter. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1971, 7, 211-220.

Leech, G. N. Towards a semantic description of English. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1969.

Leech, G. N. Semantics. Baltimore: Penguin, 1974.

Lefcourt, H. M., Lewis, L., and Silverman, I. W. Internal versus external control of reinforcement and attention in a decision-making task. Journal of Personality, 1968, 36, 663-682.

Lefcourt, H. M. and Wine, J. Internal versus external control of reinforcement and the development of of attention in experimental situations. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 1969, 1, 167-181.

Lerner, M. J. The effect of responsibility and choice on a partner's attractiveness following failure. Journal of Personality, 1965, 33, 178-187.

Leventhal, H. and Singer, D. Cognitive complexity, impression formation, and impression change. Journal of Personality, 1964, 32, 210-226.

Levin, M. The alienated voter. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1960.

Levinger, G. Marital closeness and dissolution: An integrative review. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1965, 27, 19-28.

Liazos, A. School, alienation, and delinquency. Crime and Delinquency, 1978, 24, 355-370.

Little, B. R. Age of sex differences in the use of psychological, role, and physicalistic constructs. Bulletin of the British Psychological Society, 1968, 21, 34.

Livesley, W. J. and Bromley, D. B. Studies in the developmental psychology of person perception. Bulletin of the British Psychological Society, 1967, 20, 21.

Livesley, W. J. and Bromley, D. B. Person perception in childhood and adolescence. London: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.

Lodahl, T. M. Patterns of job attitudes in two assembly technologies. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1964, 8, 482-519.

Lodahl, T. M. and Kejner, M. The definitions and measurement of job envolvement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1965, 49, 24-33.

Lombardo, J. P. and Fantasia, S. C. Internality-externality, alienation, and generalized expectancies for academic achievement, independence, and love and affection from others. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1978, 133, 139-140.

Long, S. Academic attachment: Predicting students' attachment to the university. Research in Higher Education, 1976, 5, 233-241.

Long, S. Academic disaffectation and the university student. Educational Studies, 1977, 3, 67-79.

Long, S. Political alienation: Reality and reactance. Journal of Social Psychology, 1978, 104, 115-121.

Lounsbury, F. G. A semantic analysis of Pawnee kinship usage. Language, 1956, 32, 158-194.

Lowry, R. The functions of alienation in leadership. Sociology and Social Research, 1962, 46, 426-435.

Luchins, A. Primacy-recency in impression formation. In C. Hovland, W. Mandell, E. Campbell, T. Brock, A. Luchins, A. Cohen, W. McGuire, I. Janis, R. Feierabend, and N. Anderson (Eds.), The order of presentation in persuasion. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957. (a)

Luchins, A. Experimental attempts to minimize the impact of first impressions. In C. Hovland, W. Mandell, E. Campbell, T. Brock, A. Luchins, A. Cohen, W. McGuire, I. Janis, R. Feierabend, and N. Anderson (Eds.), The order of presentation in persuasion. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957. (b)

Luginbuhl, J. E. R. and Crowe, D. H. Causal attributions for success and failure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 86-93.

Lutterman, K. G. and Middleton, R. Authoritarianism, anomia, and prejudice. Social Forces, 1970, 48, 485-492.

Lyons, S. R. The political socialization of ghetto children: Efficacy and cynicism. Journal of Politics, 1970, 32, 288-304.

Lystad, M. H. Social alienation: A review of current literature. Sociological Quarterly, 1972, 13, 90-113.

Macarov, D. Incentives to work. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

MacArthur, L. A. Luck is alive and well in New Haven. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 16, 316-318.

MacIver, R. M. The ramparts we guard. New York: Macmillan, 1950.

Mackey, J. and Ahlgren, A. Dimensions of adolescent alienation. Applied Psychological Measurement, 1977, 1, 219-232.

Maimon, Z. The inner-city impact. Urban Affairs Quarterly, 1970, 8, 233-248.

Manley, J. C. Report of the fifth East-West Philosophers' Conference. Honolulu: Department of Philosophy, University of Hawaii, 1969.

Mannheim, B. A. A comparative study of work centrality, job rewards, and satisfactions. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 1975, 2, 79-102.

Manz, W. and Lueck, H. Influence of wearing glasses on personality ratings: Cross-cultural validation of an old experiment. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1968, 27, 704.

Marascuilo, L. A. and McSweeney, M. Nonparametric and distribution-free methods for the social sciences. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1977.

Martel, M. U. Age-sex roles in American magazine fiction (1890-1955). In B. L. Neugarten (Ed.), Middle age and aging: A reader in social psychology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Marx, K. Karl Marx: Early writings (T. B. Bottomore, Ed. and Trans.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Maslow, A. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

Matthews, E. and Tiedeman, D. Attitudes toward career and marriage in the development of life styles of young women. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 375-384.

Mayo, C. and Crockett, W. H. Cognitive complexity and primacy-recency effects in impression formation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 335-338.

McArthur, L. A. The how and what of why: Some determinants and consequences of causal attribution. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 22, 171-193.

McArthur, L. A. The lesser influence of consensus than distinctiveness information on causal attributions: A test of the person-thing hypothesis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 33, 733-742.

McClosky, H. and Schaar, J. Psychological dimensions of anomy. American Sociological Review, 1965, 30, 14-40.

McDill, E. and Ridley, J. Status, anomia, political alienation, and political participation. American Journal of Sociology, 1962, 68, 205-213.

McHenry, R. Cited by M. Argyle. Project on non-verbal communication, Final report to Social Science Research Council, for the period from October 1, 1967 to September 30, 1971.

McKeachie, W. J. Lipstick as a determiner of first impressions of personality. Journal of Social Psychology, 1952, 36, 241-244.

McWilliams, W. C. The idea of fraternity in America. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

Mehrabian, A. Orientation behaviors and nonverbal attitude communication. Journal of Communication, 1967, 17, 324-332.

Mehrabian, A. Inference of attitude from the posture, orientation, and distance of a communicator. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 296-308.

Mehrabian, A. and Friar, J. Encoding of attitude by a seated communicator via posture and position cues. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 330-336.

Melbin, M. Alone and with others: A grammar of interpersonal behavior. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Mensch, I. M. and Wishner, J. Asch on "Forming impressions of personality": Further evidence. Journal of Personality, 1947, 16, 188-191.

Merton, R. K. Social theory and social structure. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957.

Middleton, R. Alienation, race, and education. American Sociological Review, 1963, 28, 973-977.

Milgram, S. The small-world problem. Psychology Today, 1967, 1, 61-67.

Milgram, S. The experience of living in cities. Science, 1970, 167, 1461-1468.

Miller, A. G. Amount of information and stimulus valence as determinants of cognitive complexity. Journal of Personality, 1969, 37, 141-157.

Miller, A. G. Actor and observer perceptions of the learning of a task. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1975, 11, 95-111.

Miller, G. A. Professionals in bureaucracy: Alienation among industrial scientists and engineers. American Sociological Review, 1967, 32, 755-768.

Mills, J. and Jellison, J. Effect on opinion change of how desirable the communication is to the audience the communicator addressed. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 6, 98-101.

Mills, R. Young outsiders: A study of alternative communities. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.

Mizruchi, E. H. Success and opportunity: A study of anomie. New York: Free Press, 1964.

Morse, N. C. and Weiss, R. S. The function and meaning of work and the job. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 191-198.

Mott, S. N. Concept of mother--a study of four- and five-year-old children. Child Development, 1954, 25, 99-106.

Muller, H. J. The children of Frankenstein: A primer on modern technology and human values. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970.

Munn, N. The effect of knowledge of the situation upon judgement of emotion from facial expressions. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1940, 35, 324-338.

Neal, A. G. and Groat, H. T. Alienation correlates of Catholic fertility. American Journal of Sociology, 1970, 76, 460-473.

Neal, A. G. and Groat, H. T. Social class correlates of stability and change in levels of alienation: A longitudinal study. Sociological Quarterly, 1975, 16, 548.

Neal, A. G. and Rettig, S. Dimensions of alienation among manual workers and non-manual workers. American Sociological Review, 1963, 28, 599-608.

Neal, A. G. and Rettig, S. On the multidimensionality of alienation. American Sociological Review, 1967, 32, 54-64.

Neisser, U. Cognition and reality: Principles and implications of cognitive psychology. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1976.

Nelson, E. N. Women's work: Household alienation. Humbolt Journal of Social Relations, 1977, 5, 90-117.

Nelson, J. I. Anomie: Comparisons between the old and the new middle class. American Journal of Sociology, 1968, 74, 184-192.

Nettler, G. A measure of alienation. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 670-677.

Nicholls, J. G. Causal attributions and other achievement-related cognitions: Effects of task outcome attainment value, and sex. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 379-389.

Nidorf, H. J. and Crockett, W. H. Cognitive complexity and the integration of conflicting information in written impressions. Journal of Social Psychology, 1965, 69, 98-101.

Nightingale, D. V. and Toulouse, J. M. Alienation in the workplace: A comparative study in French- and English-Canadian organizations. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 1978, 10, 271-282.

Nisbett, R. E. and Borgida, E. Attribution and the psychology of prediction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 932-943.

Nisbett, R. E., Caputo, C., Legant, P., and Marecek, J. Behavior as seen by the actor and as seen by the observer. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 27, 154-164.

Nisbett, R. E., Borgida, E., Crandall, R., and Reed, H. Popular induction: Information is not necessarily informative. In J. S. Carroll and J. W. Payne (Eds.), Cognition and social behavior. Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1976.

Olsen, M. E. Two categories of political alienation. Social Forces, 1969, 47, 288-299.

Orden, S. R. and Bradburn, N. M. Working wives and marriage happiness. American Journal of Sociology, 1969, 74, 392-407.

Orlofsky, J. L., Marcia, J. E., and Lesser, I. M. Ego identity status and the intimacy versus isolation crisis of young adulthood. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 27, 211-219.

Osako, M. Technology and social structure in a Japanese automobile factory. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 1977, 4, 397-426.

Osgood, C. E. Dimensionality of the semantic space for communication via facial expressions. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 1966, 7, 1-30.

Paige, J. M. Political orientation and riot participation. American Sociological Review, 1971, 36, 810-820.

Pappenheim, F. The alienation of modern man. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1959.

Parsons, T. The social system. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1951.

Patchen, M. Some questionnaire measures of employee motivation and morale. _Institute for Social Research Monograph_, 1965, _41_, 1-70.

Paton, S., Kessler, R., and Kandel, D. Depressive mood and adolescent drug use: A longitudinal analysis. _Journal of Genetic Psychology_, 1977, _131_, 267-289.

Paul, W. J., Robertson, K. B., and Herzberg, F. Job enrichment pays off. _Harvard Business Review_, 1969, _47_, 61-78.

Pawley, M. _The private future: Causes and consequences of community collapse in the west._ New York: Random House, 1974.

Pear, T. H. _Personality, appearance, and speech._ London: Allen and Unwin, 1957.

Pearlin, L. I. Alienation from work: A study of nursing personnel. _American Sociological Review_, 1962, _27_, 314-326.

Pelz, D. C. and Schuman, S. H. _Drinking, hostility, and alienation in driving of young men._ Paper presented at the third annual alcoholism conference of the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, Washington, D. C., 1977.

Phares, E. J. Differential utilization of information as a function of internal-external control. _Journal of Personality_, 1968, _36_, 649-662.

Philliber, W. W. Patterns of alienation in inner city ghettos. _Human Relations_, 1977, _30_, 303-310.

Phillis, J. Children's judgements of personality on the basis of voice quality. _Developmental Psychology_, 1970, _3_, 411.

Photiadis, J. D. and Schwecker, W. F. Corrollaries of alienation: The marginal businessman. _Rural Sociology_, 1971, _36_, 20-30.

Polansky, N. A., Borgman, R. D., and de Saix, C. _Roots of futility._ San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Porter, L. W. and Steers, R. M. Organization, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. _Psychological Bulletin_, 1973, _80_, 151-176.

Portes, A.   Political primitivism, differential
    socialization, and lower-class leftist radicalism.
    American Sociological Review, 1971, 36, 820-835.

Pravetz, M. J.   Alienation and social structure: An
    empirical investigation.   South African Journal of
    Psychology, 1976, 6, 18-32.

Putney, S. and Middleton, R.   Ethical relativism and
    anomia.   American Journal of Sociology, 1962, 67,
    430-438.

Rabin, H. M.   Perception of others by adjusted and
    maladjusted subjects as reflected in measures of
    perceptual space.   Journal of Social Psychology,
    1962, 56, 149-158.

Rabinowitz, S. and Hall, D. T.   Organizational research on
    job involvement.   Psychological Bulletin, 1977, 84,
    265-288.

Rabkin, L. Y.   The disturbed child's perception of his
    pranks.   Journal of Individual Psychology, 1964, 20,
    172-178.

Rahav, G.   Juvenile delinquency as minority crime.
    Adolescence, 1977, 12, 471-476.

Ransford, H. E.   Isolation, powerlessness, and violence.
    American Journal of Sociology, 1968, 73, 581-591.

Redfield, R.   The folk culture of the Yucatan.   Chicago:
    University of Chicago Press, 1941.

Redfield, R.   The folk society.   American Journal of
    Sociology, 1947, 52, 294.

Regan, D. T. and Totten, J.   Empathy and attribution:
    Turning observers in actors.   Journal of Personality
    and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 850-856.

Regin, D.   Sources of cultural estrangement.   The Hague:
    Mouton, 1969.

Richardson, S. A., Dornbusch, S. M., and Hastorf, A. H.
    Children's categories of interpersonal perception.
    Final report for the National Institute of Mental
    Health, Grant 7-2480, June, 1961.

Riemer, B. S.   Influence of causal beliefs on affect and expectancy. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 31, 1163-1167.

Rokeach, M. and Rothman, G.   The principle of belief congruence and the congruity principle as models of cognitive interaction. Psychological Review, 1965, 72, 128-142.

Rosenbaum, M. and Levin, I.   Impression formation as a function of the relative amounts of information presented by high and low credibility sources. Psychonomic Science, 1968, 12, 349-350.   (a)

Rosenbaum, M. and Levin, I.   Impression formation as a function of source credibility and order of presentation of contradictory information. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 167-174.   (b)

Rosenbaum, M. and Levin, I.   Impression formation as a function of source credibility and the polarity of information. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 12, 34-37.

Rosenberg, M.   Misanthropy and political ideology. American Sociological Review, 1956, 21, 690-695.

Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L.   Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.

Rosow, I.   Social integration of the aged.   New York: Free Press, 1967.

Rotter, J. B.   Generalized expectancies for interpersonal trust. American Psychologist, 1971, 26, 443-451.

Rozenkrantz, P. and Crockett, W.   Some factors influencing the assimilation of disparate information in impression formation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 397-402.

Ruble, D. N. and Feldman, N. S.   Order of consensus, distinctiveness, and consistency information and causal attribution. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 930-937.

Runyon, K. E. Some interactions between personality and management styles. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 288-294.

Saleh, S. D. and Hosek, J. Job involvement: Concepts and measurements. Academy of Management Journal, 1976, 19, 213-224.

Samuels, M. R. Judgements of faces. Character and Personality, 1939, 8, 18-27.

Sarbin, T. R. Role theory. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Scarlett, H. H., Press, A. N., and Crockett, W. H. Children's descriptions of peers: A Wernerian development. Child Development, 1971, 42, 439-453.

Schacht, R. Alienation. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1970.

Scherer, D. Attribution of personality from voice: A cross-cultural study on interpersonal perception. Proceedings of the 79th Annual Convention of the A.P.A., 1971, 6, 351-352.

Schiffenbauer, A. Effect of observer's emotional state on judgements of the emotional state of others. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 30, 31-35.

Schlosberg, H. Three dimensions of emotion. Psychological Review, 1954, 61, 81-88.

Schneider, D. J. Implicit personality theory: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 79, 294-309.

Schopler, J. and Thompson, V. Role of attribution processes in mediating amount of reciprocity for a favor. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 243-250.

Schroder, H., Driver, M., and Streufert, S. Human information processing: Individuals and groups functioning in complex social situations. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967.

Schubert, D. S. and Wagner, M. E. A subcultural change of M.M.P.I. norms in the 1960's due to adolescent role confusion and glamorization of alienation. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1975, 84, 406-411.

Schulze, R. An exploration of alienation and committment among Indian college students. International Journal of Contemporary Sociology, 1971, 8, 141-159.

Schwyhart, W. R. and Smith, P. C. Factors in the job involvement of middle managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1972, 56, 227-233.

Scott, M. B. The social sources of alienation. In I. Horowitz (Ed.), The new sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Sears, D. O. and Whitney, R. E. Political persuasion. Morristown, N. J.: General Learning Press, 1973.

Sechrest, L. Biographical similarity and similarity in personal construction. Unpublished manuscript, 1962. Cited by L. Sechrest. The psychology of personal constructs: George Kelly. In N. M. Wepman and R. W. Heine (Eds.), Concepts of personality. London: Methuen, 1964.

Sechrest, L. and Jackson, D. N. Social intelligence and accuracy of interpersonal predictions. Journal of Personality, 1961, 29, 167-182.

Secord, P. F. Facial features and inference processes in interpersonal perception. In R. Tagiuri and L. Petrullo (Eds.), Person perception and interpersonal behavior. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958.

Secord, P. F., Dukes, W. F., and Bevan, W. Personalities in faces: I. An experiment in social perceiving. Genetic Psychology Monogaphs, 1954, 49, 231-279.

Secord, P. F. and Muthard, J. E. Personalities in faces: IV. A descriptive analysis of the perception of women's faces and the identification of some physiognomic determinants. Journal of Psychology, 1955, 39, 269-278.

Secord, P. F., Stritch, T. H., and Johnson, L. The role of metaphorical generalization and congruency in the perception of facial characteristics. Journal of Social Psychology, 1960, 52, 329-337.

Seeman, M. On the meaning of alienation. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 783-791.

Seeman, M.   On the personal consequences of alienation in work. American Sociological Review, 1967, 32, 273-285.

Seeman, M.   The alienation hypothesis. Psychiatry and Social Science Review, 1969, 3, 1-6.

Seeman, M.   Alienation studies. Annual Review of Sociology, 1975, 1, 91-123.

Seeman, M.   Empirical alienation studies: An overview. In R. F. Geyer and D. R. Schweitzer (Eds.), Theories of alienation: Critical perspectives in philosophy and the social sciences. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 1976.

Seeman, M., Bishop, J. W., and Grigsby, J. E.   Community and control in a metropolitan setting. In P. Orleans and R. Ellis (Eds.), Race, change, and urban society. Los Angeles: Sage, 1971.

Sheldon, W. H.   The varieties of human physique. New York: Harper, 1940.

Sheldon, W. H.   The varieties of temperament. New York: Harper, 1942.

Shepard, J. M.   Functional specialization and work attitudes. Industrial Relations, 1969, 8, 185-194.

Shepard, J. M.   Automation and alienation: A study of office and factory workers. Cambridge, Mass: M. I. T. Press, 1971.

Shepard, J. M.   Technology, division of labor, and alienation. Pacific Sociological Review, 1973, 16, 61-88.

Shepard, J. M.   Technology, alienation, and job satisfaction. Annual Review of Sociology, 1977, 3, 1-21.

Sheppard, H. L. and Herrick, N. Q.   Where have all the robots gone: Worker dissatisfaction in the 70's. New York: Free Press, 1972.

Shrauger, S.   Cognitive differentiation and the impression formation process. Journal of Personality, 1967, 35, 402-414.

Shrauger, S. and Altrocchi, J. The personality of the perceiver as a factor in person perception. Psychological Bulletin, 1964, 62, 289-308.

Siegel, L. Industrial psychology. Homewood, Ill: Irwin, 1969.

Siegel, A. L. and Ruh, R. A. Job involvement, participation in decision making, personal background, and job behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1973, 9, 318-327.

Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw Hill, 1956.

Smith, P. C. and Cranny, C. J. Psychology of men at work. Annual Review of Psychology, 1968, 19, 467-496.

Smith, R. E. Changes in locus of control as a function of life crisis resolution. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1970, 75, 328-332.

Snyder, M. L., Stephan, W. G., and Rosenfeld, D. Egotism and attribution. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 10, 585-600.

Solomon, F., Walker, W. J., O'Connor, G. J., and Fishman, J. R. Civil rights activity and reduction in crime among Negroes. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1965, 12, 227-236.

Sommer, R. Personal space: The behavioral basis of design. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Sorokin, P. A. Social and cultural dynamics: A study of change in major systems of art, truth, ethics, law, and social relationships. New York: American Book Company, 1937-1941.

Srole, L. Social integration and certain corollaries: An exploratory study. American Sociological Review, 1956, 21, 709-716.

Steiner, I. D. and Johnson, H. H. Authoritarianism and "tolerance of trait inconsistency." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 388-391.

Stephan, W. G. Actor versus observer: Attributions to behavior with positive or negative outcomes and empathy for the other role. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1975, 11, 205-214.

Stevens, L. and Jones, E. E. Defensive attribution and the Kelley cube. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 809-820.

Stone, G. P. Appearance and the self. In A. M. Rose (Ed.), Human behavior and social processes. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1962.

Storms, M. D. Videotape and the attribution process: Reversing actors' and observers' points of view. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 27, 165-175.

Strauss, G. Job satisfaction, motivation, and job redesign. In Strauss, G., Miles, R. E., Snow, C. C., and Tannenbaum, A. S. (Eds), Organizational behavior: Research and issues. Madison, Wisc.: Industrial Research Associates, 1974.

Streufert, S. and Streufert, S. C. Effects of conceptual structure, failure, and success on attribution of causality and interpersonal attitudes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 11, 138-147.

Streuning, E. L. and Richardson, A. H. A factor analytic exploration of the alienation, anomia, and authoritarianism domain. American Sociological Review, 1965, 30, 768-776.

Strickland, B. R. The prediction of social action from a dimension of internal-external control. Journal of Social Psychology, 1965, 66, 353-358.

Stromberg, R. N. 1910: An essay in psychohistory. Psychoanalytic Review, 1976, 63, 235-248.

Susman, G. I. Process design, automation, and worker alienation. Industrial Relations, 1972, 11, 34-45. (a)

Susman, G. I. Automation, alienation, and work group autonomy. Human Relations, 1972, 25, 171-180. (b)

Sussman, M. B. Family, kinship, and bureaucracy. In A. Campbell and D. E. Converse (Eds.), The meaning of social change. New York: Russell Sage, 1972.

Tagiuri, R. Movement as a cue in person perception. In
     H. P. David and J. C. Brengelman (Eds.),
     Perspectives in personality research. London:
     Crosby Lockwood and Son, 1960.

Tagiuri, R. Person perception. In G. Linzey and
     E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology.
     Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Tankard, J. Effects of eye position on person perception.
     Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1970, 31, 883-893.

Taylor, H. C. Social agreement in personality traits
     judged from speech. Journal of Social Psychology,
     1934, 5, 244-248.

Taylor, J. C. The quality of work life: An annotated
     bibliography, 1957-1972. Los Angeles: Graduate
     School of Management, 1973.

Taylor, S. E. and Fiske, S. T. Point of view and
     perceptions of causality. Journal of Personality
     and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 439-445.

Taylor, S. E. and Koivumaki, J. H. The perception of
     self and others: Acquaintanceship, affect, and
     actor-observer differences. Journal of Personality
     and Social Psychology, 1976, 33, 403-408.

Terkel, S. Working: People talk about what they do all
     day long and how they feel about what they do.
     New York: Pantheon, 1974.

Tesser, A. Differential weighting and directed meaning
     as explanation of primacy in impression formation.
     Psychonomic Science, 1968, 11, 299-300.

Tesser, A., Gatewood, R., and Driver, M. Some determinants
     of gratitude. Journal of Personality and Social
     Psychology, 1968, 9, 233-236.

Thayer, S. and Schiff, W. Stimulus factors in observer
     judgement of social interaction: Facial expression
     and motion pattern. American Journal of Psychology,
     1969, 82, 73-85.

Thompson, W. and Horton, J. Political alienation as a
     force in political action. Social Forces, 1960,
     190-195.

Thornton, G. R. The effect upon judgements of personality
    traits of varying a single factor in a photograph.
    Journal of Social Psychology, 1943, 18, 127-148.

Thornton, G. R. The effects of wearing glasses upon
    judgements of personality traits of persons seen
    briefly. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1944, 28,
    203-207.

Toennies, F. Thomas Hobbes: Leben und Lehre. Stuttgart:
    F. Frommann Verlag, 1925.

Toennies, F. Community and Society (C. P. Loomis, Trans.).
    East Lansing: Michigan University Press, 1957.
    (Originally published 1912.)

Touraine, A. The May movement: Protest and reform.
    New York: Random House, 1971.

Touraine, A. The academic system in American society.
    New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Travers, J. and Milgram, S. An exploratory study of the
    small world problem. Sociometry, 1969, 32, 425-443.

Triandis, H. C. and Fishbein, M. Cognitive interaction in
    person perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social
    Psychology, 1963, 67, 446-453.

Triandis, H. C. and Lambert, W. W. A restatement and
    test of Schlosberg's theory of emotion with two
    kinds of subjects from Greece. Journal of Abnormal
    and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 321-328.

Tudor, B. A specification of relationships between job
    complexity and powerlessness. American Sociological
    Review, 1972, 37, 596-604.

Tunstall, J. Old and alone. New York: Humanities, 1967.

Turnbull, C. M. The mountain people. New York: Simon
    and Schuster, 1972.

United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
    Summary reports: New Jersey graduated work incentive
    experiment. Washington, D. C.: Department of Health,
    Education, and Welfare, 1973.

United States Department of Labor. Job satisfaction: Is
    there a trend? Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government
    Printing Office, 1974.

Vamplew, C. Automated process operators: Work attitudes and behavior. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 1973, *11*, 415-430.

Vales, P. A. Socio-cultural alienation and heroin addiction. *Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, 1973, *17*, 441-453.

Vannoy, J. S. Generality of cognitive complexity-simplicity as a personality construct. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1965, *2*, 385-396.

Veness, T. and Brierley, D. W. Forming impressions of personality. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 1963, *2*, 11-19.

Vogel, W. and Lauterbach, C. G. Relationships between normal and disturbed sons' percepts of their parents' behavior and personality attributes of the parents and sons. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 1963, *19*, 52-56.

Vonnegut, K., Jr. *Wampeters, foma, and granfalloons*. New York: Dell, 1974. (Originally, address to the National Institute of Arts and Letters, 1971.)

Vreeland, R. Is it true what they say about Harvard boys? *Psychology Today*. 1972, *5*, 65-68.

Vroom, V. *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Wagoner, C. P. Police alienation: Some sources and implications. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 1976, *4*, 389-403.

Walster, E., Aronson, V., Abrahams, D., and Rottmann, L. Importance of physical attractiveness in dating behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1966, *4*, 508-516.

Walton, R. How to counter alienation in the plant. *Harvard Business Review*, 1972, *50*, 70-81.

Warr, P. B. and Knapper, C. The relative importance of verbal and visual information in direct person perception. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 1966, *5*, 118-127. (b)

Warr, P. B. and Knapper, C. The role of expectancy and communication content in indirect person perception. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 1966, *5*, 244-253. (b)

Warr, P. B. and Knapper, C. The perception of people and events. New York: Wiley, 1968.

Warr, P. B. and Sims, A. A study of cojudgement processes. Journal of Personality, 1965, 33, 598-604.

Watts, A. F. The language and mental development of children. London: Harrap and Company, 1944.

Weber, M. The theory of social and economic organization. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Weissenberg, P. and Gruenfeld, L. W. Relationship between job satisfaction and job involvement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52, 469-473.

Wells, G. L. and Havey, J. H. Do people use consensus information in making causal attributions? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1977, 35, 279-293.

Wenz, F. V. Economic status, family anomie, and adolescent suicide potential. Journal of Psychology, 1978, 98, 45-47.

Wenz, F. V. Seasonal suicide attempts and forms of loneliness. Adolescence, 1979, 14, 387-391.

Wilkins, E. J. and DeCharms, R. Authoritarianism and the response to power cues. Journal of Personality, 1962, 30, 439-457.

Wilson, R. A. Anomie in the ghetto: A study of neighborhood type, race, and anomie. American Journal of Sociology, 1971, 77, 66-88.

Wishner, J. Reanalysis of "impressions of personality." Psychological Review, 1960, 67, 96-112.

Wonderly, D. M. and Kupfersmid, J. H. A test of the cognitive-developmental hypotheses in moral development. Journal of Psychology, 1978, 100, 297-304.

Wyer, R. The effects of information redundancy on evaluation of social stimuli. Psychonomic Science, 1968, 13, 245-246.

Yankelovich, D. The changing values on campus: Political and personal attitudes of today's college students. New York: Washington Square, 1972.

Yarrow, M. R. and Campbell, J. D. Person perception in
     children. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1963, 9, 57-72.

Yinger, J. M. Anomie, alienation, and political behavior.
     In J. N. Knutson (Ed.), Handbook of political
     psychology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Yoder, S. A. Alienation as a way of life. Perspectives
     in Psychiatric Care, 1977, 15, 66-71.

APPENDIX

DEAN'S (1961) ALIENATION SCALE

1. Sometimes I feel all alone in the world.

2. I worry about the future facing today's children.

3. I don't get invited out by friends as often as I'd really like.

4. The end often justifies the means.

5. Most people today seldom feel lonely.

6. Sometimes I have the feeling that other people are using me.

7. People's ideas change so much that I wonder if we'll ever have anything to depend on.

8. Real friends are as easy as ever to find.

9. It is frightening to be responsible for the development of a small child.

10. Everything is relative, and there just aren't any definite rules to live by.

11. You can always find friends if you show yourself friendly.

12. I often wonder what the meaning of life really is.

13. There is little or nothing I can do to prevent a major "shooting" war.

14. The world in which we live is basically a friendly place.

15. There are so many decisions that have to be made that sometimes I could just "blow up."

16. The only thing you can be sure of today is that you can be sure of nothing.

17. There are few dependable ties between people anymore.

18. There is little chance for a promotion on a job unless you get a break.

19. With so many religions around, one doesn't really know which to believe.

20. We're so regimented today that there's not much room for choice even in personal matters.

21. We are just so many cogs in the machinery of life.

22. People are just naturally friendly and helpful.

23. The future looks very dismal.

24. I don't get to visit friends as often as I'd really like.

Notes: a. Items 5, 8, 11, 14, and 22 are reversed, and must be scored accordingly.
b. Items 2, 6, 9, 13, 15, 18, 20, 21, and 23 refer to "powerlessness."
c. Items 4, 7, 10, 12, 16, and 19 refer to "normlessness."
d. Items 1, 3, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 22, and 24 refer to "social isolation."

2

VITA

Cornelis George Boeree

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: ALIENATION AND THE PERCEPTION OF PERSONALITY

Major field: Psychology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Badhoevedorp, the Netherlands, January 15, 1952, the son of Cornelis George Boeree and Eberdina van Olffen Boeree; married Judith Marion Kovarik, April 8, 1972; daughter, Jennifer Marie Boeree, born May 24, 1975.

Education: Graduated from Southside Senior High School, Rockville Centre, New York, in June, 1969; received Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology from Pennsylvania State University in March, 1974; received Master of Science degree in Psychology from Oklahoma State University in July, 1979; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Psychology at Oklahoma State University in July, 1980.

Professional Experience: Graduate research, teaching, and administrative assistant, Department of Psychology, Oklahoma State University, 1976-80; instructor, Extension Service, Oklahoma State University, 1980; reader, Department of Correspondence Study, Oklahoma State University, 1976-80.

Memberships: Society for Personality and Social Psychology; Society for the Study of Symbolic Interactionism; Southwestern Psychological Association; Phi Kappa Phi.