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INTRODUCTION

The concept of alienation has emerged as one of the major themes of modern sociology. Essentially, this concept has been employed to describe one of the great negative influences upon society and the human condition resulting from the political, social, and technological revolutions of the past two centuries (Nisbet, 1966). Both the disaffection of youth and the lack of hope which sometimes manifests itself in individuals at later stages of the life cycle may be viewed as the outcomes of problems in psychosocial development or of conflicts with either the stated or implicit values of society.

Most social critics and observers view the negative aspect of technological and social progress in terms of increasing isolation of the individual from his fellowmen. As Neff (1968) indicated, the huge, impersonal city, an aggregate of strangers, has replaced the closely knit farming village; the semipatriarchial feudal estate has been replaced by the modern factory, in which the only binding factor between worker and employer is financial; increasing secularism and the decline of absolute moral and ethical values have held sway over a personal God and omnipresent religion.

The personal sense of security engendered by the
presence of several close ties and slowly changing values in the pre-industrial or folk society has undoubtedly been diluted as the industrial revolution and its strong push for technological progress continued. With a value orientation based on increasing individualism for technological advancement, one might expect interpersonal relationships to become more instrumental than expressive, more secondary than primary. The worker then becomes a cog in the factory machinery and his work seems meaningless to him; the communicant experiences his religion as "irrelevant"; members of families go their separate ways; the meaning of clan membership and kinship is less attractive; and even the traditional idea of marriage is changed - "companionship" is emphasized over "family".

Although most of the literature and research in the last two decades have focused mainly on the disenchantment of adolescents and young adults with society, the condition of alienation is clearly recognized as cutting across all segments of society. The social and political thinkers of the nineteenth century viewed alienation as a process or end result emerging from different social and technological factors. These factors have a differential impact on the various groups in society; to a large extent this differential impact accounts for the variability in goal and value orientations and the alienated status of such groups in the society at large.
Alienation, in whatever form it presents itself, may be viewed as a type of attempt at coping. As the individual develops and grows, he is confronted with situations which may be ambiguous or conflicting and which can be resolved only in the light of his subjective self and other-perceptions. The imposition of a subjective grid upon external events and solutions to them help maintain the integration of self that is vital to normal functioning within a particular system of values.

It becomes rather hopeful, then, that the concept of alienation, as presented here, may provide a social-psychological understanding of the individual. This hopefulness is based upon the fact that alienation and the alienation process are best understood in the light of (1) the external or social conditions impinging upon the individual at a given period of time, and (2) the internal-developmental aspects of the individual, especially as related to values and expectancies regarding them.

Statement of the Problem

It is the purpose of the present study to provide information relative to the alienation process in terms of the discrepancy between values an individual caters to and the expectancies he has regarding those values. In order to delineate the merits of this type of study, a number of propositions have been offered and assumptions
made which should clarify its principal objectives.

1) At the present time, in all the social sciences, increasing reference is being made to the concept of alienation as a factor in interpersonal relationships and community functioning. As such, the concept should be more amenable to sharp empirical definition and treatment.

2) Traditional sociological approaches have viewed alienation as one of the natural outcomes of several global events - industrialization, urbanization, secularization, etc. - but have generally been short on explaining specifically how it develops in the individual. Research directed at discovering the mediational link between external events and alienated attitudes are greatly desirable.

3) In times of rapid social change, adults may become unsure as to the validity and desirability of existing values as standards to guide the raising of their youth. On the other hand, youth cannot be expected to accept readily and passively the values espoused by society and adults. At times, inconsistencies between the teachers of values may force the adolescent to be rebellious or passive in order to avoid violating the norms of his teachers. All of these elements need to be understood further, since they create conflicts for, and between, the transmitters as well as the receivers of values.

4) In the sociological arena, few writers have attempted a linkage between expectation and value. It appears that
while the past two centuries of technological and social progress have created many "needs" and aspirations for man, it has, in some instances, also created conditions not conducive to the realization or attainment of such needs and aspirations. Expectancies were fairly well "set" for the individual in the pre-industrial days. The artisan's son knew what his vocation in life was going to be. Today, however, the stated value may be that one can become whatever he wishes, although the steps may be frequently blocked or realistically unattainable.

5) One of the corollaries of alienation is hope. Since one's motivation to pursue his values is partly a function of the subjective probability (or expectancy) of realizing those values, and partly a function of their subjective importance, it can be reasonably expected that high expectancies regarding highly desirable values or goals will lead to a sense of satisfaction or positive affect in the individual. On the other hand, low expectancies regarding highly desirable values or goals are expected to lead to the experience of conflict, frustration, or anxiety within the individual. Theoretically, then, those high on a value as well as expectancy (HH), those low on a value, but high on expectancy (LH), and those low on value as well as expectancy (LL), should produce the least value-expectancy discrepancy and therefore manifest the least alienation. However, those high on a value but low on expectancy (HL)
should produce the largest value-expectancy discrepancy, and therefore manifest the most alienation. The above propositions, if found to be correct, could explain why all members of specific groups in one society are not alienated and do not manifest the same levels of conflict within the society at large.

6) In the traditional sociological approach to alienation, not much emphasis has been placed on the mental health or internal conflict consequences of the individual's alienated status. In a recent study, Jackson (1968) has theorized that alienation may or may not result in internal conflict. According to her formulation, there should be a difference in personality and behavior between an individual who endorses alienated statements but is satisfied about his endorsement, and an individual who endorses alienated statements but is dissatisfied with his endorsement. Thus, the variable of self-satisfaction-dissatisfaction lends additional meaning to the concept of alienation and the psychological consequences of such a status.

**Historical Background**

Alienation as one of the traditional themes of sociology is increasingly being studied within and across all disciplines concerned with the human condition. The stage has now been set for social scientists to come to grips with this problem as they realize that present ecological and environmental conditions are not tending
in the direction of minimizing social and interpersonal conflicts. Despite the plethora of theoretical statements and studies on the topic of alienation, there is a great need for clarifying its meaning and for making assumptions and hypotheses concerning the concept more subject to verification. Seeman (1959), in an excellent article, has attempted to accomplish these aims and provides the basic theoretical foundation for this study.

The central approach taken by alienation theorists of the nineteenth century was that industrialization and the factory system had made work increasingly meaningless to the individuals who were required to perform it (Neff, 1968). The phrase "alienation of work" was derived from the writings of Karl Marx who viewed the factory system in terms of its deadening consequences for society. In Marx's view, work was not losing its meaning because of technology itself but because of the property relations inherent in a capitalist system. Thus, the separation of the worker from ownership either of the means of production or the end product itself defines work alienation in the Hegelian and Marxist sense (Marcuse, 1941).

The concept of alienation as a type of identity crisis forced on the individual by various societal developments is also inherent in the writings of De Tocqueville (1835-40), Weber (1930), Durkheim (1947, 1951), and Simmel (1950). Unlike Marx,
De Tocqueville saw work losing its positive meaning, not because of the property relations aspects of capitalism, but because of the economic specialization and division of labor inherent in the factory system. He wrote:

> When a worker is unceasingly and exclusively engaged in the fabrication of one thing, he ultimately does his work with singular dexterity; but at the same time he loses the general faculty of applying his mind to the direction of his work. He every day becomes more adroit and less industrious; so that it may be said of him that in proportion as the workman improves, the man is degraded. What can be expected of a man who has spent twenty years of his life in making the heads for pins? ... In proportion as the principle of labor is more extensively applied, the workman becomes more weak, more narrow-minded, and more dependent. (De Tocqueville, Vol. II, p. 158 ff.)

According to De Tocqueville, then, the individual's work becomes meaningless to him, because the advance of industrialization precludes the expression of creative artisanship - the worker no longer has full control over the entire process of production.

Although the Marxist view of alienation has had a strong impact, its obvious polemic ingredients have precluded its widespread acceptance except by adherents of Marxist philosophy. Most non-Marxist writers follow the theme set by De Tocqueville. For example, Weber (1930) felt that the main problems of modern society were related to the growing secularization and bureaucratization of all aspects of life. Thus, we find in Weber's work a definition of alienation different from the Marxist notion of...
powerlessness, or meaninglessness as connected to the industrial and capitalist system. Gerth and Mills (1946) view Weber's refinement of the notion of powerlessness in the following light:

Marx's emphasis upon the wage worker as being 'separated' from the means of production becomes, in Weber's perspective, merely one special case of a universal trend. The modern soldier is equally 'separated' from the means of violence; the scientist from the means of enquiry, and the civil servant from the means of administration (p. 50).

Another meaning of alienation, that of normlessness or valuelessness, is evident in Durkheim's concept of anomie. Durkheim (in DeGrazia, 1948) saw industrialization and increasing urbanization as factors tearing away the traditional means by which the person establishes his self-identity. To Durkheim, anomie or lack of identity, in its extreme form, led the individual to crime, various socially deviant behaviors, and even suicide. In attempting to capture Durkheim's definition of anomie, DeGrazia (1948) has indicated:

The specific words and phrases in French that Durkheim repeatedly used - un perpétuel état de mécontentement, tourments, déceptions répétées, inutilité, désorientée, inquiétude douloureuse, malaise, stérilité, intolérable, désenchantement, douloureux - help us create the composite picture of anomie as it affects the individual. It becomes apparent that anomie as Durkheim conceived it in the subjective sense had three characteristics: a painful uneasiness or anxiety, a feeling of separation from group standards, a feeling of
pointlessness or that no certain goals exist.

Sociological anomie has been defined in terms of the environmental conditions which increase the probability of deviation from norms. An anomic environmental condition, according to Merton, is "a breakdown in the cultural structure, occurring particularly when there is an acute disjunction between the cultural norms and goals and the socially structured capacities of members of the group to act in accord with them" (Merton, 1957, p. 162). Anomic environmental conditions are likely to lead to belief in chance, fate, or luck; such conditions also tend to foster poor learning, deviant norms, and deviant behavior.

Psychological stress, as well as tendencies toward deviant behavior, are considered more likely to be characteristic of those who internalize or value highly the success-goals of society but who have little opportunity or expectancy of attaining them. The psychological counterpart to social anomie is found in Rotter's concept of internal versus external (I-E) locus of control (Rotter, 1966; Lefcourt, 1966). This construct has stemmed essentially from Rotter's social learning theory (Rotter, 1954), in which the concepts of value-expectancy and reinforcement are of central importance.

The I-E construct refers to the degree to which
the individual perceives reinforcements as stemming from his own actions or sees them as proceeding from forces external to him - chance, fate, luck, or powerful others in his life. Research with this measure of "generalized expectancy" (Rotter, 1966) has found that Internals (I's) are persons who see their own behavior determining their lives and what happens to them; they are more interested in personally meaningful and potentially useful aspects of the environment (Seeman, 1963; Seeman and Evans, 1962), more committed to action for social change (Gore and Rotter, 1963), and more involved in situations they see as demanding use of their skills rather than depending on chance factors (Rotter and Mulry, 1965). Externals (E's) have been found to manifest the opposite characteristics. Seeman (1959) has considered the alienated status of Externals as a position of powerlessness with respect to socio-political conditions.

It appears that the concepts of internality-externality and powerlessness can be related to the attitude of "mastery" that Strodtbeck(1958) found to be a function of religion, national, and social-class orientations existing within the family. In the literature, the concepts of competence (White, 1959), need for achievement (McClelland, 1961; McClelland, Atkinson, Clark and Lowell, 1953), inner- versus outer-directedness (Riesman, 1950), and field dependency-independency (Witkin
et al., 1954) have often been viewed as related to the concept of alienation both in terms of their antecedents and their behavioral manifestations.

There are a number of other conceptions of alienation of man in the modern world. Although these views are not always parallel to each other, it is worthwhile to incorporate them into any discussion of the concept. Fromm (1941), in considering the effect of capitalism as a socio-economic system on human personality, concluded that the need for relatedness to others, and the need for freedom or autonomy are stifled in such a system. Concerning the need for relatedness "the need to avoid aloneness," Fromm felt that absence of a tie to values, symbols, patterns - a moral aloneness - was as intolerable as physical aloneness. Furthermore, physical aloneness, existing simultaneously with moral aloneness is viewed as unbearable - a state "which man most dreads." The need for freedom is seen as a need to be free from instinctual and other restraints preventing individuation or the "growth of self-strength".

In his various writings Fromm (1941, 1947, 1955), like Freud (1930), in his Civilization and Its Discontents, painted a rather bleak picture of what was in store for man as society advanced. In Freud's view, man must increasingly be called upon to give up instinctual gratification for the cause of group or societal progress.
Thus, the society which has the best balance between the gratification of instinctual needs and the amount of "freedom" the individual must sacrifice as a member of society, will engender the least conflict. Fromm's (1941) view is that all of human history has been beset by conflict because:

Each step in the direction of growing individuation threatened people with new insecurities. Primary bonds once severed, cannot be mended ......

However, if the economic, social and political conditions on which the whole process of human individuation depends do not offer a basis for the realization of individuality ..., while at the same time people have lost those ties which gave them security, this lag makes freedom an unbearable burden ....

Powerful tendencies arise to escape from this kind of freedom into submission or some kind of relationship to man and the world which promises relief from uncertainty, even if it deprives the individual of his freedom (pp. 36-37).

Basically, then, both Freud and Fromm specify for man a high degree of relatedness to others as well as freedom from restraints which prevents individuation. Where there is individuation at the expense of relatedness, attempts will be made to regain relatedness by a surrender of freedom to group goals. This formula is quite applicable toward understanding alienated groups in our society.

In his book, The Unexpected Universe, Eiseley (1969) echoes thoughts similar to those of Freud and Fromm. In his commentary on the history of man, he notices that in man's religious and philosophical writings the need for
psychological balance and peace have usually been in conflict with his technological advances. In this sense, the story of modern science "is a story at once of tremendous achievement, loneliness, and terror." Taking note of the restlessness of today's atmosphere, the violence on campuses and in the streets, the abandonment of the conceptual tools and values of the past, and the individual's self-confinement to the unsettled present, Eiseley offers the following analysis:

Their world, therefore, becomes increasingly the violent, unpredictable world of the first men simply because, in losing faith in the past, one is inevitably forsaking all that enables man to be a planning animal. For man's story in brief, is essentially that of a creature who has abandoned instinct and replaced it with cultural tradition and the hard-won increments of contemplative thought. The lessons of the past have been found to be a reasonably secure instruction for proceeding against the unknown future (pp. 6-7).

Although Eiseley's view of the behaviors of certain elements of our society may be essentially correct, it is not entirely fitting when applied to individuals who have values different from the dominant ones in society but who work within the established framework to achieve change. The radical activist must be distinguished from the active reformer.

The view that man has become estranged from himself, a situation in which his actions and their consequences control him (Fromm, 1955), finds a parallel in Erikson's
view of the effects of industrial growth on youth.

Erikson (1950) saw the consequence of the industrial revolution, world-wide communication, standardization, centralization, and mechanization in the following light:

What inner equilibrium these cultures had to offer is now endangered on a gigantic scale. As the fear of loss of identity dominates much of our irrational motivation, it calls upon the whole arsenal of fear, which is left in each individual from the mere fact of his childhood. In this emergency masses of people become ready to seek salvation in some reactionary pseudo-identity (p. 368).

For Erikson, the state of identity diffusion (Erikson, 1955) with its negative undertones - work paralysis, bisexual diffusion, authority diffusion, ideological diffusion, sense of time diffusion, identity consciousness, and negative identity - can be alleviated in all of its aspects, if the social structure provides complementary institutions toward this end. For example, he states:

Ideological movements of a great variety give an answer to all of these problems such as giving time perspective to the individual by interpreting what he is doing and what his society is doing in a particular way so that, at least for a while, he will know where he is and where he is going; by giving him a self-certainty, in regard to what he is, permitting him a certain amount of role experimentation,... by permitting him occupational choices that he can experiment with until he can choose a final one (p. 153).
Erikson considered the various negative aspects of identity-diffusion as possible forms of extreme pathology, more frequently of a transitory nature and usually one of adolescent imagery. However, one might assume that the presence of these aspects in post-adolescents essentially represents a pathological condition that is more than transitory in nature.

It appears that the sociological concept of alienation can be considered as having implications for personality functioning, if one approaches it from the Eriksonian view that it reflects some sort of identity crisis. Rogers (1951) sees the emotionally ill person as being unable to accept himself "as he is". Horney (1950) views problems in identity formation in terms of the discrepancy between real and ideal self; Fromm (1955) sees it as a moving away from the original real self to the conventional pseudo-self.

Following from Durkheim's description of the anomic individual, and comparing this description with that of psychologically unstable persons, it has been assumed that the alienated person might subjectively experience more loneliness, depression, feelings of rejection, worthlessness, and hostility than the non-alienated. Fromm (1955) contends that the alienated person views himself "as an impoverished 'thing' dependent on powers outside of himself". Several studies have attempted to establish a

The expectation that alienation is associated with maladjustment or conflict has essentially stemmed from those theories which stress the role of conflicting norms or values as etiological factors in both alienation and psychopathology. Horney (1949) has viewed the neurotic personality in these terms; most alienation theorists agree that displacement of the old values by the new has been a major factor in alienation (Weber, 1946; Merton, 1957; Simmel, 1956; Durkheim, 1948).

There are a number of writers who believe that alienation does not necessarily involve maladjustment, feelings of despair, unrelatedness, or a negative world view. Nettler (1957) has stated that a large number of creative artists and scientists are alienated. He has pointed out that the concepts of alienation and anomie should not always be equated with personal disorganization or emotional illness. In an attempt to draw a distinction between two "levels" of adjustment, Viereck (1956) states that an individual who is alienated in terms of the established social order may be termed "unadjusted", and must be distinguished from the "maladjusted, the psychiatric, the grandstand non-conformer, and the never adjusted".
A distinction is being drawn here between the normless or anomic individual and the individual who rejects the values of society but is committed to a definite value system. The latter condition may shed some light on Nettler's statement that many creative artists and intellectuals are alienated. The "unadjusted" person is dissatisfied, not with himself, but with existing external conditions; he is socially estranged, but psychologically stable due to the absence of internal conflict.

The Measurement of Alienation

Writing almost two decades ago, Nisbet concluded:

At the present time, in all the social sciences, the various synonyms of alienation have a foremost place in studies of human relations. Investigations of the 'unattached', the 'marginal', the 'obsessive', the 'normless', and the 'isolated' individual all testify to the central place occupied by the hypothesis of alienation in contemporary social science (p. 15).

Perhaps implicit in Nisbet's conclusion is a plea to clarify the various meanings of alienation so that the concept can be more amenable to scientific analysis.

Although a number of encouraging attempts have been made to clarify the theoretical as well as the methodological issues regarding alienation, Feuer (1963) has rendered a pessimistic judgment in his view of alienation as "...a fixed set of dimensions because it is as multipotential as the varieties of human experiences."
Attempts at measuring alienation have had a relatively short history. Nettler (1957) viewed alienation in terms of estrangement from society and its cultural manifestations. Thus, rejection of mass media, of mass production, of adherence to the dictates of mass society were viewed as elements of alienation.

Srole (1956) developed an anomie scale based on questions constructed in opinion poll format. The items were designed to tap the respondent's perception of his own interpersonal situation which would produce a picture of his level of social functioning. The Srole scale has been criticized by Putney and Middleton (1962) regarding the claim of its face validity as a measure of the theoretical components of anomie. They point out:

...the manifest content of the items is more clearly a measure of cynicism with regard to people and pessimism with regard to social conditions and events.

A number of authors have been critical of the Srole scale for a variety of reasons. Seeman (1959) felt that it refers to individual experience and that it carried perhaps too much of an adjustment component. Dean (1961) stated that Srole's conception of anomie has a meaning different from his and other authors (Keedy and Vincent, 1958; Bell, 1957). Meier and Bell (1959) concluded that the Srole items measured despair, discouragement, or utter hopelessness. This condition is akin to complete apathy in which the individual is paralyzed in his belief that
his hopes and aspirations cannot be realized. To see alienation strictly in these terms is to deny the validity of the views of Nettler (1957) and Viereck (1956) that alienation is not necessarily correlated with inaction, passivity, or psychological disequilibrium.

That alienation does not express itself in only one class of behavioral response is the theme of writers such as Pappenheim (1959) and Levin (1960) in regard to political alienation, Goodman (1960) in reference to the "Beat" generation, and Keniston (1965, 1967, 1968) in reference to students, intellectuals, and radicals.

Dean (1956) has reported on his measure of alienation with the three dimensions he attributed to the concept - powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation. The latter dimension deals with the individual's friendship status and does not capture the essential meanings of isolation - value uniqueness or normlessness - which Nisbet (1953) pointed to when he spoke of the "unattached" or "isolated".

A perusal of the literature on alienation in terms of the ways in which it has been conceptualized and measured reveals that Roberts and Rokeach (1956), Dean (1961), Seeman (1959), Elmore (1962), DeGrazia (1948), and several social critics and political thinkers have taken account of one or more of the following variants of alienation: powerlessness, purposelessness, meaninglessness, normless-
ness, cultural estrangement, social estrangement, isolation, work alienation, conformity, prejudice, conventionality, lack of trust, self-estrangement, etc.

The Value-Conflict Aspect of Alienation

Reference has already been made to the fact that most alienation theorists consider conflicting or ambiguous values as the root cause of alienation. That such conflicts or ambiguities in values are produced by changes that occur too rapidly in the social, political, and technological spheres is a major contention of alienation theorists. It is in this light that Allport (1968) argued for the teaching of values in schools in order to prepare today's youth for life in the immediate future.

MacIver (1950) viewed alienation as the loss of a value system that gave direction or meaning to people's lives. He saw the amassing of things, money and power seeking as compensation for a feeling of emptiness and lack of purpose rather than for their positive ends. The lack of a real leisure orientation in our society has also caused some people to pursue phantoms and engage in controversial causes in order to lend meaning to their lives. There are others who feel so rejected that they experience social alienation in the form of a persecution complex.

Writing on the effects of a monetary self-value orientation or a money culture on man, both Fromm (1955) and Simmel (1956) predict an intrinsic loss of self-worth
and changes in personality in the direction of indifference and lack of affect. Hershey (1966) viewed college youth's contempt of modern values as resulting from the ambiguity and relativity of these values. Flacks (1968) has recently pointed out that there is an identifiable tradition of humanism in families whose youth are engaged in movements against the dominant values of society. The occupations of the parents of activists have been found to be "almost entirely within the vocational and professional fields involved in helping relationships with people". Flacks maintains that there is intra- as well as inter-generational value conflict in our society. Regarding the intergenerational conflict, he has stated.

If there is a generational conflict in activist families, it is over the issue of optimism. Although the parents, for the most part, are not themselves activists - nor were they when they were younger - they are people engaged in careers and personal ways of life which they thought could be personally fulfilling and at the same time could make positive contributions to the larger society. Their children find it impossible to accept this optimism over the usefulness of personal occupations .... and the optimism over the potential of government for dealing effectively with social problems (p. 5).

Thus, even where there is an essential match in values from one generation to the next, the modes and expectations of realizing them are often different, perhaps as the result of subjectively experienced external events.

Although the value-conflict approach to alienation
is widely accepted in the various social sciences, the link between these two variables has been expressed too broadly to be tested empirically. Why and how do values contribute to alienation? To answer the how aspect of the question, it is necessary to define what is meant by "value".

Stein and Cloward (1958) stated that values determine the choices that men make, and the ends they live by. To these authors, values have to do with what is considered good and what is evil, what is right and wrong, success and failure, what is relevant and irrelevant, desirable or undesirable, beautiful and ugly, important and unimportant. Values, whether they are related to economics, religion, ethics, politics, or aesthetics, essentially exist as they are in the human mind and manifest themselves in human behavior.

Williams (1951) has recognized values as "things in which people are interested - things people want, desire to be or become, feel as obligatory, worship, enjoy". He conceptualized values as ways in which the person organizes his behavior, as meaningful, affectively charged guides for human action. He has summarized four aspects of values as follows:

(1) They have a conceptual element - they are more than pure sensations, emotions, reflexes, or so-called needs. Values are abstractions drawn from the flux of the individual's immediate
experience. (2) They are affectively charged: they represent actual or potential emotional mobilization. (3) Values are not the concrete goals of action, but rather the criteria by which goals are chosen. (4) Values are important, not "trivial" or of slight concern.

Allport's concise definition of values as "meanings perceived as related to self" essentially sums up the psychological and sociological definitions of values. Values are construed as existing in a hierarchy or on a continuum rather than in all-or-none fashion. The societal arrangement of values may or may not correspond to the individual's. Assuming a value-conflict theory of alienation the extent of the discrepancy between these two arrangements determines the level of conflict in the society.

A few writers, especially in the area of anthropology (Lee, 1948; Kluckhohn, 1951), have stressed the necessity of giving up the strongly entrenched "needs" approach to human motivation and behavior. These authors believe that it is value, not a series of needs, which forms the basis for human behavior. The advantage gained in substituting the notion of value for that of needs, is, according to Lee, that "we are no longer troubled with the difficulty of trying to assess a totality in terms of an aggregate, since value is total and is to be found in a total situation". Kluckhohn (1951) pointed out the necessity of a systematic ordering of cultural value orientations as an aid in understanding single as well as total "value
orientation profiles" of entire societies or parts of them. Clyde Kluckhohn (1951) defined value orientation as:

...a generalized and organized conception, influencing behavior, of nature, of man's place in it, of man's relation to man, and of the desirable and undesirable as they may relate to man-environment and interhuman relations (p. 409).

From what has been said about values and their importance to the individual, it can at least be assumed that anything running counter to them will generally produce a strong affective response. If one's value system causes him to attend church every Sunday or to avoid excessive drinking of alcohol, most situations preventing the expression or realization of these values will be avoided. Furthermore, the individual may experience shame and guilt if he does not act in accord with his values. This conceptualization of what happens to the individual when he is blocked or impeded in the attainment or expression of his values fits closely the value-conflict conception of alienation. In this situation, competing values place various stresses on the individual which cause him to withdraw or to be rebellious and defiant, in short, to express his conflict in the form of unacceptable behaviors and in alienated attitudes and feelings.

The generally assumed position that values represent the greatest source of control over human behavior (Thibaut and Kelley, 1959) must be tempered somewhat by the low correlations found between expressed moral standards
and actual behavior in certain situational contexts (e.g., Hartshorne and May, 1928). Aronfreed (1969) has hypothesized that inconsistencies between the findings of these studies "may be partially attributable to complex motivational linkages between values and behavior". These linkages are "differentially activated by variations in the cognitive and affective impact of specific social stimulus situations". Aronfreed suggests that the understanding of the operation of these linkages can be accomplished by experimental analysis of their mediational properties; he does not favor correlation of behavioral and cognitive aspects of internalization.

A Value-Expectancy Discrepancy Approach to Alienation

If one were to hold strictly to a value-conflict theory of alienation in reference to the United States, one should expect alienation to be a far more pervasive problem than it appears to be. If alienation were essentially a response to value-conflict, the majority of our youth, the majority of our ghetto residents, the majority of our intellectuals, the majority of our elderly citizens should be alienated - for all the members of these various groups can find a few dominant values with which they are in daily conflict.

The concept of value-expectancy discrepancy represents a starting point toward clarification of the value-alienation problem. Value-expectancy discrepancy is
defined as the gap between the strength or importance of a value for a person and his subjective expectancy regarding the realization or expression of that value. This construct has its roots in level of aspiration studies (Lewin, Dembo, Festinger, and Sears, 1944), social learning theory regarding goal setting behavior (Rotter, 1954), and in studies of achievement motivation (McClelland et al., 1953; Atkinson, 1964; Atkinson and Feather, 1966). The effects of success or failure on an individual's hopes and expectation for performance on certain tasks, the value of a goal as related to a person's expectancy of success, and the two types of motivation for achievement - fear of failure versus hope for success - have been the areas covered in the respective studies.

Rotter's I-E Scale has been validated as a measure of "generalized expectancy" of a relationship - built up by the individual - between behavior and reinforcement received. The subjective experience of powerlessness has been found to be characteristic of Externals, that is, those who have a low generalized expectancy that they control their reinforcements, especially in the socio-political arena (Seeman, 1959).

In his attempt to define alienation in terms of the five distinct meanings used in the literature, Seeman (1959) has followed the basic ideas of expectancy and value contained in Rotter's work. He has operationalized the five
variants in value-expectancy language as follows:

(1) **Powerlessness**: the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements, he seeks.

(2) **Meaninglessness**: a low expectancy that satisfactory predictions about future outcomes of behavior can be made.

(3) **Normlessness**: a high expectancy that socially approved behaviors are required to achieve given goals.

(4) **Isolation**: assign low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society.

(5) **Self-Estrangement**: the degree of dependence of the given behavior upon anticipated rewards, that is, upon rewards that lie outside the activity itself .... the worker who works merely for his salary.

It appears that each of the variants of alienation have some reference to behaviors, values, or beliefs of the individual. The subject's expectancy level for specific values represents his own subjective structuring of external events and their impact upon him. If alienation is viewed in this way it becomes easy to appreciate the variability in alienation levels within groups that have highly similar life experiences and goals.

The "expectancy" conceptualization of alienation does not deny that there is a conflict component to alienation. However, this conflict is not so much between values as it
Theoretically, then, conflict is greatest where values are highly desirable, but expectancies for realizing them are low (HL). Conversely, conflict would be lowest where the values are not too important to the individual but expectancies are high (LH). Where there is congruence between the subjective desirability of values and the expectancies for them (LL and HH), the level of conflict might be somewhere between those of the HL and LH conditions. The above theoretical position is supported in the work of Stotland (1969) who reviewed the literature on both animal and human studies regarding the concept of "hope".

In defining hope "as a shorthand term for an expectation about goal attainment," Stotland felt he could make the term less subjective and hence more acceptable to psychologists. He also reinforced the idea expressed earlier that the "expectation of attaining a goal is not the same thing, conceptually, as its desirability". Taking an "expectancy" approach to hope, particularly in a therapeutic sense, Stotland has offered seven propositions regarding the loss or creation of hope in the individual. In defining the aim of his theory, he stated:

...hypotheses can be generated about the schemas that an organism develops about its own behavior, about its attainment of goals, about the effects other people have on goal attainment, about the relationship between schemas and anxiety, and so forth (p. 13).
The Acquisition and Changing of Values

Whether or not one views alienation in light of a value-conflict framework, as indeed most alienation theorists see it, or in terms of the value-expectancy discrepancy hypothesis, it is of obvious value to attempt to understand how values develop. In considering the consequents of the formation of values, one must be at least aware of the antecedents and ingredients of formation and change.

There are two basic approaches to the study of the acquisition of values. The first is the cognitive-developmental view represented by Piaget (1948) and Kohlberg (1963a, 1963b, 1964a, 1969). The second is the social-learning or imitation approach represented in the works of Aronfreed (1964), Bandura and Walters (1963) and several other writers, including Whiting and Sears. Although most writers have addressed themselves to moral development only, the basic approach is generally felt to be applicable to the acquisition of other values.

Kohlberg and Piaget view the development of moral judgments as part of the more general process of cognitive development. Several investigators (Boehm, 1962; Durkin, 1959; McRae, 1954) have given partial confirmation to the theoretical positions of Piaget and Kohlberg in their findings that developmental changes in levels of moral
judgment are correlated with age and hence with the development of cognitive structures.

In Piaget's system three phases in the process of internalization of moral rules are recognized. First, the child sees rules as entirely external to himself. Secondly, the child accepts the obligation to conform to rules, even though he does not feel he had a part in creating them. Full interiorization of rules or true autonomy in moral judgment does not occur until the child can express mutual respect, cooperation, and reciprocity. At this stage, the child feels that he has agreed to conform to certain rules for the sake of others and, in return, they have agreed to abide by these rules for his sake. Kohlberg agrees that the child progresses through an invariant sequence of stages which are partly independent of the cultural situation. Based on age-related findings in various replicated studies, Kohlberg (1964) has devised the following scheme for describing value development:

Level I. Premoral Level:

1. Punishment and obedience orientation (conformity to rules to avoid punishment).
2. Naive instrumental hedonism (conformity to rules to obtain rewards and have favors returned).

Level II. Morality of Conventional Role-Conformity:

3. Good-boy morality of maintaining good relations, approval of others (conformity to avoid disapproval and rejection by others).
4. Authority maintaining morality
   (conformity to avoid reprimand
   by legitimate authority and the
   guilt it provokes).

Level III. Morality of Self-Accepted
   Moral Principles:

5. Morality of contract, of individual
   rights, and of democratically accepted
   law.
6. Morality of individual principles
   of conscience (conformity to avoid
   self-condemnation).

In Kohlberg's view (1963) evidence of stage or sequence
is shown not only in the regular age order of dimensions of
moral judgment but also in the patterning within the
individual. For example, if a child is predominantly at
one stage of thought, the remainder of his thinking will
represent neighboring stages. Kohlberg (1963a) has also
stated that higher stages of thinking "involve re-organi-
ization and displacement of lower stages". Higher stages
are not simply added up to lower stages but rather
represent a tendency to avoid using lower stages.

Although social-structural variables are recognized
as playing a part in value acquisition, Kohlberg and
Piaget put much less emphasis on such factors than socio-
logical theorists do. The value of opportunities for role
playing and their positive effects on internalization of
values is recognized especially in Kohlberg's work.

The social-learning theorists emphasize that the
acquisition of values and moral behavior follows the rules
of any other class of behavior. Thus, in understanding
value acquisition and moral behavior, one must simply study the processes underlying learning. Since moral behavior sometimes involves the denial of, or self-punishment for, the immediate gratification of hedonistic needs in consideration of the social group, the processes of learning may be somewhat more difficult to discover.

Aronfreed (1963) has stated that moral behavior can be induced by very specific forms of social experience which are not the product of an invariant sequence of unfolding. According to this approach, social experience can translate itself in many ways into "internal monitors" which the child can use to direct his behavior. In this sense, stage of moral judgment may have very little to do with behavior. Rather, the nature and strength of the affective components in a situation may determine behavior. Other writers (Bandura and Walters, 1963) have stressed the importance of value acquisition through observational learning facilitated by the mass media and imitation of, or identification with, a model. Thus, the role that Bandura and Walters assign to social-structural variables such as social class would differ from Kohlberg's. While the latter sees such variables in terms of the opportunities they provide for role playing, and hence for moral development, the former views them in terms of their effects upon the child regarding the internalization of the value of delaying gratification and resisting temptation.
In considering the problem of intergenerational changes or shifts in values, certain problems are raised regarding cognitive-developmental approaches to the acquisition of values. Since Kohlberg and Piaget seem to account for the development of values only up to the adolescent years, how are changes in values after that period to be accounted for? Furthermore, since social-structural variables are assumed to play such a minimal role in the development of values, how would Kohlberg account for the vast changes in values reported for college students?

Social-learning theorists, in answering the above questions, would refer to both the age of the group and the differential impact of certain social institutions on the individual. The age of the individual determines the "type of learning" he engages in; the college provides a set of learning experiences, models, identificands, etc. which are generally not matched in other social institutions. In college, values may be taught or interpreted in ways that are at variance with those of the rest of the community or society. A major problem for social-learning theorists, however, would be to explain the basic processes whereby previously "internalized" values are displaced.

The previous discussion of alienation and values has made it necessary to define what is meant by values, how they develop, and to attempt to pinpoint how they
affect alienation. Traditionally, sociological and alienation theorists from other disciplines have viewed alienation in terms of rapid shifts in values engendered by the revolutionary nature of political, social, and technological change in the past two centuries. The disparities between the values of the old and new orders have been seen as contributing to man's loss of identity, his increasing sense of powerlessness, and the meaninglessness of his work. It is felt that this theory of alienation is only partially adequate for two reasons. First, it is assumed that alienation may or may not be subjectively experienced as a conflict by the individual. Secondly, it seems that alienation might be more pervasive in this society if it were merely a matter of conflicting values.

An alternate way of conceptualizing the alienation process is proposed in which the concepts of expectancy and values are major variables. The discrepancy between the strength of one's values and the expectancies he has regarding the attainment of these values is seen as the determinant of not only the level of alienation (number of alienated statements endorsed), but also the degree of satisfaction-dissatisfaction (conflict) experienced by the individual in endorsing the alienated statement.
Formally stated, the hypotheses to be examined in this study are as follows:

**Hypothesis 1:** There is a significant difference in objective or world alienation as a function of discrepancy level. Specifically, low discrepancies between values and expectancies lead to more objective or world alienation (alienation-satisfaction) than high discrepancies.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is a significant difference in subjective or self-alienation as a function of discrepancy level. Specifically, high discrepancies between values and expectancies lead to more subjective or self alienation (alienation-dissatisfaction) than low discrepancies.

**Hypothesis 3:** There is a significant difference in overall alienation as a function of discrepancy level. Specifically, high discrepancies between values and expectancies lead to a higher level of alienation than low discrepancies.

**Hypothesis 4:** The relationship between discrepancy level and alienation is a function of the value under consideration.

The above hypotheses regarding alienation have been derived from learning theory and are of significance in this regard; however, since they could also conceivably produce a relatively parsimonious explanation of alienation as a response to external events as individually
perceived, the potential is present for discovering lines of action to counteract this process. Specifically, which values should be stressed for particular segments of the population? How can the desirability of certain values or expectancies regarding them be raised or lowered in order to keep the individual relatively free from conflict and disenchantment?
METHOD

Subjects

The subjects in this study were 411 students, the majority of whom were underclassmen enrolled in an introductory psychology course at The Ohio State University. There were 295 females and 116 males represented in the sample. Females ranged in age from 19 to 38 and males, from 18 to 46. The average age of the former was just over 20 years and of the latter, a little over 21 years.

High and Low discrepancy groups were chosen on the basis of discrepancy scores which fell in the upper and lower tenth percentiles of the distribution. The general discrepancy score for each subject was determined by the following formula: Each expectancy score on the subscales of the expectancy scale was subtracted from the respective score on the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values. These discrepancies were then summed, and the general expectancy subscale score was subtracted from the sum to yield one individual's discrepancy score for all values taken together.

Since subjective expectancy and value strength or desirability were the significant elements considered in the various hypotheses, demographic variables were not
controlled for High and Low discrepancy groups. However, as Table 1 indicates, the ages of individuals in these two groups are fairly comparable.

TABLE 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges for Age and Discrepancy Scores in the Two Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Discrepancy (N=41)</th>
<th>Low Discrepancy (N=41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy Score</td>
<td>213.07</td>
<td>26.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instruments

The instruments used were the Study of Values (Allport, Vernon, Lindzey, 1960), the Alienation Scale constructed by Jackson (1968), and the Opinions and Reactions Survey designed by the writer as a measure of a general expectancy for all values as well as specific expectancies for values measured by the Study of Values.

The Study of Values was first published in 1931, later revised in 1951, and again, in 1960. It purports to measure the relative strength "of six basic interests or motives in personality: the theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious". Although the authors admit certain limitations inherent in such a classification of values and the interdependence of the scores on the six values, the instrument has been widely
used in business, industry, and research (see Manual, Study of Values, Third Edition, 1960). Reliability measures of internal consistency (split-half and item analysis) and stability (test-retest) have yielded very high coefficients. Special norms and external validation for this instrument have also been determined for sex and occupational differences; in almost all cases high and low scores on the values were found to correspond to prior expectation for sex as well as occupation.

Jackson's Alienation Scale was constructed for use in her study of alienation-satisfaction-dissatisfaction as a function of age in older adolescents (Jackson, 1968). For five of the six subscales she developed her items from the Srole scale (Appendix A). The sixth subscale, self-abasement, was added to tap the psychological dimension of self-contempt or self-rejection in certain alienated individuals. Jackson has described the six subscales as follows:

1. **Aloneness**, defined as: isolation, estrangement from society; a distrust of others; feeling apart from society; low reward values given to goals which are valued by one's society; and, a degree of commitment to cultural things.

2. **Powerlessness**, defined as: the inability to direct, control, or regulate one's life; a "fated" outlook; a control from "outside" or that one's own behavior cannot determine the occurrences of outcomes or the reinforcements one seeks.
3. **Meaninglessness**, defined as: lack of purpose or direction in life; no understanding of "what" or "why" of the purpose of life; hedonistic views; unclear as to what to believe, because minimal standards of clarity are not met; a low expectancy that predictions of future events or behavior can be made.

4. **Valuelessness**, defined as: having the expectancy that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve goals; a loss of values, ideals, and norms; possessing a form of cultural estrangement. Included is the dimension of normlessness.

5. **Hopelessness**, defined as: despair, lack of plans; disillusionment; rejection of happiness as a goal; being less than what one might be if circumstances were different; discrepancy between the real and ideal self image; loss of intrinsic pride in work; insecure; given to appearances.

6. **Self Abasement**, defined as: feeling of dislike of self; non-acceptance of self; rejection of self as a person no matter how good the environment or prospects; hopeless as a person, not as a result of one's condition; just "no good"; non-acceptance of self as worthwhile; total self-estrangement.

Based on high inter-judge agreement as to category placement (according to the above definitions), 72 out of a total of 110 original items were chosen and one Srole item not meeting the criteria for inclusion was kept. The Jackson scale thus consists of 73 items in addition to 34 randomly placed positively stated items designed to lessen the negative tone so characteristic of alienated items. The entire scale and the various subscales are presented in Appendix B. Although only the first two
types of responses were analyzed in the present study, four types of response classes were available to the subjects as follows:

1. YES-YES: Endorsement of alienated statement, satisfaction with endorsement.
2. YES-NO: Endorsement of alienated statement, dissatisfaction with endorsement.
3. NO-NO: Non-endorsement of alienated statement, dissatisfaction with non-endorsement.
4. NO-YES: Non-endorsement of alienated statement, satisfaction with non-endorsement.

The Opinions and Reactions Survey

This expectancy scale was developed to tap the extent to which the subject felt he could attain or realize his values, the relative prominence of which were determined by scores on the Study of Values. "Expectancy", in terms of the scale constructed here, was defined as the degree to which the individual perceived certain factors - personal, social, political, institutional, etc., - as helping him or blocking him in the attainment or expression of his values. The assumption was that the more blocks perceived, the lower the expectancies. Conversely, the more aids perceived, the higher the expectancies.

Items were constructed in line with the various interests or motives expressed in the Study of Values.
While several items had direct relevance to a specific value, others were seen as potentially affecting the realization of one or more values. On this basis a "general expectancy" category was formed. A total of 100 items were originally submitted to 14 judges for category placement. The judges consisted of six advanced Roman Catholic seminarians, four advanced graduate students in psychology, three professional social workers with graduate degrees, and one college senior majoring in education. The criteria for judgment of an item as to value-expectancy category were as follows:

1. **Theoretical:** a factor which affects the realization or expression of values related to the pursuit of truth through intellectual or scientific means.

2. **Economic:** a factor which affects the realization or expression of values related to money, and the usefulness or practicality of things.

3. **Aesthetic:** a factor which affects the realization or expression of values related to interests in beauty, art, etc.

4. **Social:** a factor which affects the realization or expression of values related to helping people.

5. **Political:** a factor which affects the realization or expression of values related to the use of power, influence over people, etc.

6. **Religious:** a factor which affects the realization or expression of values related to mystical experience, communication with a Supreme Being, etc.
7. **General**: a factor which affects the realization or expression of two or more values equally strongly.

An additional category for duplicate and ambiguous items was also provided. The judges classified the items as follows:

- 23 items unanimously agreed upon as to the value category (14 out of 14 judges).
- 14 items agreed upon as to value category by 13 out of 14 judges.
- 18 items agreed upon as to value category by 12 out of 14 judges.
- 11 items agreed upon as to value category by 11 out of 14 judges.
- 9 items agreed upon as to value category by 10 out of 14 judges.
- 5 items agreed upon as to value category by 9 out of 14 judges.
- 1 item agreed upon as to value category by 8 out of 14 judges.

There were two items (Appendix C, items 9 and 62) which were placed in both the social and political subscales because they were placed equally frequently in those two categories. There were 13 additional items that were placed in the "General" as well as a number of other value categories by the judges. These items were retained as part of the "General" expectancy subscale.
The items chosen were 96 out of 100. Four items were eliminated - three, on the basis of extremely poor interjudge consistency, and one, because it duplicated an earlier item. The entire scale and the various subscales are presented in Appendix C.

Responses to the expectancy scale were obtained by having the subjects indicate the degree to which they felt a particular factor (item) was helping or blocking them with respect to the attainment or expression of their values. Degrees of helping or blocking were indicated by circling +3, +2, +1 or -3, -2, -1, respectively, with 3 representing the strongest effect. A rating of 0 meant the factor was neither helping nor blocking the individual in the pursuit of his values.

Two-week test-retest reliability coefficients for the expectancy subscales were determined for 66 subjects. The Pearson r's are as follows:

General = .79
Theoretical = .77
Economic = .75
Aesthetic = .87
Social = .82
Political = .72
Religious = .88

Due to the nature of the scoring and non-equivalence of items, it was not feasible to compute split-half reliabilities for these subscales. The subscales were found
to be generally interdependent, although correlations coefficients ranged from -0.03 between religious and economic to 0.63 between political and social. It was also significant to note that General correlated rather well with all the other subscales (0.29 to 0.57). The interdependence of the subscales was not unexpected in view of the way in which the items were constructed. However, the magnitude of the correlations are low enough to consider these scales as separate dimensions of expectancy.

Procedure
Subjects were administered the Study of Values and Alienation Scale during a 50-minute period usually reserved for a lecture. On the following day, they were given the Opinions and Reactions Survey, the measure of expectancy in this study. Test-taking time for the latter measure was approximately 15 to 20 minutes. Subjects were informed that the various tests were being given as part of a research project in the measurement of interests and attitudes. After all three instruments had been administered, subjects were informed of the real purpose of the study.

Scoring
The following scores were obtained for each subject.

Study of Values: scores on theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious values.
Alienation Scale: YES-YES score (objective or world alienation), YES-NO score (subjective or self alienation), the sum of YES-YES and YES-NO scores (overall alienation). These scores were also obtained for each subscale and all taken together.

Expectancy Scale: scores for general, theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious values.

Value-Expectancy Discrepancy: scores derived from subtracting expectancy subscale scores from their respective value in the Study of Values. This procedure yielded discrepancies for individual values. The measure used for determining the groups for the analysis of variance was the sum of all discrepancy scores minus the general discrepancy score.
RESULTS

For each of the six subscales of alienation and for the Alienation Scale as a whole, three separate one-way analyses of variance (Winer, 1964) were performed. In addition, Pearson r's, expressed in an intercorrelation table, were computed for discrepancy scores and alienation.

The first analysis of variance in each series tested the hypothesis that subjects with low discrepancies between values and expectancies express more objective or world alienation than subjects with high discrepancies between values and expectancies. The type of response examined here is the YES-YES type in which the individual, having endorsed an alienated statement, expresses satisfaction with the response. As Table 2 indicates, this hypothesis was not confirmed for any of the subscales nor for the total Alienation Scale. It is interesting to note that the difference in the means between the two groups are also in the opposite direction to what was predicted for all subscales except Hopelessness. These differences, however, are not statistically significant.
TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and F Values for the High and Low Discrepancy Groups on Alienation-Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>High Discrepancy</th>
<th>Low Discrepancy</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloneness</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopelessness</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuelessness</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaninglessness</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Abasement</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scale</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second analysis of variance in each series tested the hypothesis that individuals with high discrepancies between values and expectancies express more subjective or self alienation than individuals with low discrepancies between values and expectancies. The type of response examined here is the YES-NO type in which the subject, having endorsed an alienated statement, expresses dissatisfaction with the response. An analysis of Table 3 reveals that the hypothesis is confirmed for the total Alienation Scale and for all subscales except Valuelessness and Meaninglessness. For these two scales, however, the data does fall in the predicted direction. Probability values of less than .01 were obtained for the subscales
Powerlessness and Aloneness with F values of 6.76 and 5.28 respectively (df. 1,80). For the subscales Hopelessness and Self Abasement the "p" values are less than .01 and .001 respectively and for all subscales taken together the "p" value is less than .01.

**TABLE 3**

Means, Standard Deviations, and F Values for the High and Low Discrepancy Groups on Alienation-Dissatisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>High Discrepancy</th>
<th>Low Discrepancy</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloneness</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopelessness</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuelessness</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaninglessness</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Abasement</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scale</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>8.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third analysis of variance in each series tested the hypothesis that subjects with high discrepancies between values and expectancies express more overall alienation than subjects with low discrepancies between values and expectancies. The items considered were the sum of the YES-YES and YES-NO responses which were examined separately for the preceding hypotheses. Inspection of Table 4 reveals that
Means, Standard Deviations, and F Values for the High and Low Discrepancy Groups on Total Alienation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>High Discrepancy</th>
<th></th>
<th>Low Discrepancy</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloneness</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopelessness</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuelessness</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaninglessness</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Abasement</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>19.89</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scale</td>
<td>19.51</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hypothesis is confirmed for all subscales individually and for the total Alienation Scale. Probability values range from less than .05 for Hopelessness, Valuelessness, and Meaninglessness to less than .01 for Powerlessness and Aloneness, and less than .001 for Self Abasement and the Total Scale. Thus, individuals with low discrepancy scores are consistently lower than those with high discrepancies on all dimensions of alienation when the Alienation-Satisfaction and Alienation-Dissatisfaction scores are combined for both groups.

The fourth hypothesis that discrepancies between specific values and their respective expectancies are more highly associated with alienation than discrepancies between other values and expectancies for them is tested in terms
of the frequency of significant correlations of the discrepancies for each value and alienation. This statistical approach was taken due to the interdependence of the scales in the Study of Values. Inspection of Table 5 indicates that the hypothesis is confirmed. Discrepancies between theoretical, aesthetic, and political values and the expectancies for them are more frequently and intensely associated with overall alienation than discrepancies between economic, religious, and social values and expectancies for them. There are 12 significant correlations between discrepancies for theoretical values and alienation, and nine each for aesthetic and political values. On the other hand, there are only six, five and two significant correlations between discrepancies and alienation for economic, religious and social values respectively.

Inspection of Table 6 reveals that the dimensions of satisfaction-dissatisfaction with endorsement of alienated statements are also related to discrepancies for specific values. The only values for which there are significant correlations between discrepancies and alienation-satisfaction are economic and theoretical (60 and 40 percent respectively). The significant correlations between discrepancies and alienation-dissatisfaction are most common for aesthetic and political values
TABLE 5
Intercorrelations of Discrepancies Between Individual Values and Expectancies and Alienation (N=441)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALES</th>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>DS-GE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POWERLESSNESS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALONENESS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPELESSNESS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUELESSNESS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEANINGLESSNESS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF ABASEMENT</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCALE</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level

RESPONSE CATEGORY: S= Alienation-Satisfaction (YES-YES)
D= Alienation-Dissatisfaction (YES-NO)
T= Theoretical Discrepancy
E= Economic Discrepancy
A= Aesthetic Discrepancy
S= Social Discrepancy
P= Political Discrepancy
R= Religious Discrepancy
DS-GE= Discrepancy Sum Minus General Expectancy
TABLE 6

Totals and Percentages of Significant Correlations Between Discrepancy and Alienation for the Six Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Dissatisfaction</th>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th></th>
<th>Subscales &amp; Totals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(27 percent each), followed by theoretical and religious values (20 percent each), social (6 percent), and economic (0 percent).
DISCUSSION

The traditional view that alienation results from value conflicts engendered by rapid shifts in the social, political and technological realms of society does not completely explain the absence of a pervasive alienation problem in our society.

It appears that a more fruitful understanding of the development of alienation may lie in a value-expectancy discrepancy formulation in which each individual's subjective expectancy level regarding his values is the crucial variable. In this event, one should not have to resort to social-structural or demographic variables to "explain" differences in alienated status within and between various segments of the population. Flacks (1968) has pointed out that conflicts in today's youth are probably emanating from the condition of affluence in our society rather than from a condition of deprivation.

In attempting to come to grips with the social-psychological or internal-external aspects of alienation, it is desirable to draw a distinction between two modes of subjective experience of alienation. Specifically, it may be asked whether or not alienation necessarily
involves psychological conflict. The position taken here is that alienation does not necessarily represent a condition of conflict or of psychological disequilibrium.

The traditional value-conflict theories of alienation have typically emphasized that alienation, as man's estrangement from himself, as a sense of increasing powerlessness, meaninglessness, and social isolation, derives from competing "value tendencies" in an advancing society. In this regard, therefore, alienation was necessarily defined as a situation of conflict.

As the findings of this study indicate, alienation is not definable in terms of conflict only. In light of the non-confirmation of the first hypothesis, individuals with high discrepancies between value desirability and expectancy do not manifest less objective or world alienation than those with low discrepancies between their values and expectancies for attaining them. Theoretically, if alienation were strictly a matter of conflict, the low discrepancy group would give more of the YES-YES type of response (alienated-satisfied) than the high discrepancy group when only this response class is considered. However, the fact that the high discrepancy group gave more alienation-satisfaction responses than the low discrepancy group (except on the subscale, hopelessness) may indicate that there is less of all types of alienation in low discrepancy groups. Since the differences between the two
groups were not statistically significant, this interpretation must be taken lightly for the moment.

A consideration of YES-NO responses (alienated-dissatisfied) by themselves does show quite convincingly that high and low discrepancy groups differ significantly on all dimensions of alienation except valuelessness. Thus, persons whose subjective expectancy regarding value attainment and expression is low are more alienated than those who have a high expectancy. Specifically, the former are apt to perceive themselves as powerless, alone and hopeless; they also view their lives as devoid of meaning and are also rejecting of themselves. The confirmation of the second hypothesis lends support to Jackson's (1968) rationale for including the self abasement subscale as a measure of alienation. The highly significant difference in alienation-dissatisfaction found between high and low discrepancy groups on self abasement indicates that the individual is more denigrating of his self worth, the wider the discrepancy between his values and his subjective expectancy of attaining or realizing them. If self abasement is indeed a pathological orientation, then it may be concluded that the high discrepancy group experiences more conflict and psychological disequilibrium than the low discrepancy group.

The only subscale for which there was no significant difference between the high and low discrepancy groups was
valuelessness. A possible explanation for this might lie in the fact that this dimension of alienation, more than any other, is probably "selected out" in a college population. Valuelessness (having the expectancy that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve goals) is a factor which selects people "out" of college, not in. Therefore, the variability of such a trait is, at best, minimal in the college population.

The third hypothesis that high and low discrepancy groups differ significantly on total alienation was confirmed. This hypothesis was formulated on the expectation that (1) world or objective alienation (YES-YES response) was higher in the low discrepancy group, and (2) that the difference between the two groups on subjective or self-alienation would be much greater than the difference on world or objective alienation. Since the first assumption was not borne out by the data, it was thus easier to support the third hypothesis. The differences between the high and low discrepancy groups are maintained for all subscales including valuelessness. The latter subscale is weakest (followed by hopelessness) in distinguishing the two groups when both YES-YES and YES-NO responses are combined; this is so despite the fact that hopelessness is second to self abasement when only YES-NO responses are considered. It appears that there is much less hopelessness in individuals who give YES-YES
(objective or world alienation) responses than those who express YES-NO (subjective or self alienation) responses.

The results regarding the fourth hypothesis suggest that discrepancies for certain values do indeed have a greater impact on an individual's alienated status than discrepancies for other values. Alienation-dissatisfaction is highly positively associated with discrepancies for political, aesthetic, theoretical and religious values. Discrepancies for social and economic values are not highly tied to alienation-dissatisfaction. On the alienation-satisfaction variable, the only discrepancies that are significantly correlated with alienation are those for theoretical and economic values.

There are a number of reasons why there is a greater percentage of correlations that are significant for certain values than for others. If the discrepancy is high for theoretical values, especially in a college population, it is highly plausible that the student will feel frustrated as he goes along the business of obtaining an education; the educational process places a high premium on theoretical interests, and if the student has a low expectancy regarding them, it is likely that alienation and self-dissatisfaction will ensue.

As far as the discrepancy for political, aesthetic, and religious values are concerned, one can appreciate that the college and late adolescent years demand much
restructuring in values and attitudes (Horrocks, 1962).
The lessening impact of institutionalized religion on the younger generation has also been hypothesized as a source of alienation (O'Dea, 1969). The gap between ideals and reality may not be fully appreciated by these youth. Again, the restructuring of values demands certain changes in expectancy levels which may make goals seem unattainable. Furthermore, the issue of college youth's pessimism over the ability of governmental and social institutions to solve pressing human problems may affect political as well as religious value expectancies. In the area of aesthetic values, it is assumed that the high discrepancy college student, faced with several opportunities demanding some form of aesthetic appreciation, is bound to feel "left-out" and dissatisfied with himself.

Discrepancies for social and economic values are not associated with alienation-dissatisfaction to any great degree. It may be that college students, for various reasons, find these values highly desirable and generally have high expectancies regarding their attainment. In this respect it may be pointed out that discrepancies for economic values yield the highest percentage of significant correlations with alienation-satisfaction. Thus, higher discrepancies for economic values are associated with alienation (powerlessness and valuelessness), but of the non-conflict, non-paralyzing
type. This relationship also holds for theoretical values and perhaps characterizes the situation of a student, who, to use a popular phrase, "tries harder".

When one takes a look at the total alienation picture for the college student, it is found that discrepancies between value and expectancy are more likely to be associated with alienation for theoretical, aesthetic, and political values than for religious, social and economic values. It might be of interest to find out how alienation resulting from discrepancies between value and expectancy for political, theoretical, and aesthetic values could be "reversed" in the college population.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The present research represents an attempt to formulate and test a theory of alienation based on the psychological concept of value-expectancy. The theory is not directly opposed to traditional approaches to alienation, in that it does not deny the importance that values have in the motivation and behavior of the human organism. In the present framework, alienation is conceived as resulting from large discrepancies between values and the subjective expectancy of attaining them. In the traditional approaches to alienation, rapid changes in values are often seen as the producers of conflict and hence of alienation in the individual.

The discrepancy score resulting from subtracting the expectancy scores from values scores was the independent variable in this study. Two groups designated as High and Low Discrepancy subjects were chosen for comparison on the Alienation Scale and its subscales. The hypotheses were: (1) Low discrepancy Ss express more world or objective alienation, (2) High discrepancy Ss manifest more subjective or self alienation (conflict), (3) High discrepancy Ss manifest more total alienation and (4) discrepancy levels for particular values are more associated with
alienation than others.

The data supported all of the hypotheses except the first. It was discovered that (1) alienation is not necessarily a condition of psychological conflict, (2) alienation with psychological conflict, as defined in this study, is significantly a function of the discrepancy between values and expectancies, (3) high discrepancies between values and expectancies lead to high alienation levels, and (4) for a college population, alienation is more likely to be associated with discrepancy levels for theoretical, political, and aesthetic values, than for religious, social, and economic values. An additional finding deserving of some emphasis is that one dimension of alienation, self abasement, is consistently more pervasive in high discrepancy than in low discrepancy subjects. If this dimension of alienation is indicative of a pathological orientation, it may be safely assumed that low expectancy or high discrepancy groups are more likely to be in a condition of dissatisfaction and unhappiness than high expectancy or low discrepancy groups. In light of the data, the concept of alienation as a sociological as well as a psychological variable has gained additional theoretical significance.

The findings of the present investigation have a number of implications for further research. First, since high and low discrepancy groups cannot be distinguished on the basis of alienation-satisfaction responses only,
researchers should consider the merits of introducing the alienation-dissatisfaction response category in all future scales. There is a fundamental difference between the individual who rejects certain values and views of his society but works within available lines to correct what he perceives as wrong and the individual who rejects his society, isolates himself from others, or seeks to destroy the institutional means provided for correction of injustice.

Another implication of this study is that perhaps more emphasis should be placed on discovering how the individual, within his social-cultural context, develops in terms of values and expectancies regarding their attainment rather than sticking to traditional ways of conceptualizing alienation. It seems that various types of "intervention" programs are more likely to emanate from research geared to the former approach. The number and degree of significant differences obtained between High and Low Discrepancy groups lends additional support to this proposition. In Jackson's study (Jackson, 1968) the approach to alienation in terms of age differences yielded only a few significant results.

At present very little is known about the middle ranges of discrepancy levels as related to alienation. Is alienation a monotonic function of discrepancy level? Additional research is needed to discover the relationship
between alienation and discrepancy level at all ranges of the latter variable.

The final implication of the findings of this study deals with a philosophical as well as a psychological issue, that of the uniqueness of the human organism. It appears that in taking a strictly traditional or value-conflict approach to alienation, social scientists have tended to view the person generally as "member of a group" and have not given full consideration to individual motivation, individual values, and individual expectancies. The individuality of the person is lost when he is evaluated as alienated "because he comes from the inner city", or lives on the "wrong side of the tracks." It is time to develop an approach to alienation that does not lose sight of the individual factor, no matter what the group is, because alienation, after all, is merely the individual's personal interpretation of the impact of the environment upon him; and this interpretation does not have to be objectively correct.
APPENDIX A
THE SROLE SCALE

1. There's little use writing to public officials because they aren't really interested in the problems of the common man.

2. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.

3. In spite of what some people say the lot of the average man is getting worse, not better.

4. It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.

5. These days a person doesn't know whom he can count on.
APPENDIX B
Age ______
Male ______
Female _____

Respond to the statements so that your answer best describes how you feel, react, or believe most of the time.

Yes, I feel like that, (agree).

No, I don't feel like that, (disagree).

Yes, I am satisfied with the way I react or the way I feel about that statement because this is the way I want to be.

No, I am not satisfied with the way I react or the way I feel about that statement, because this is not the way I want to be.

Check one answer from each pair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree-ment</th>
<th>Satis-faction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Everyone "takes" something if they have a need for it and feel they can get away with the act. 1.

2. I don't know many of the people around me. 2.

3. When things do not turn out as planned, I accept only that part of the responsibility for its failure that was a direct result of my misdoing. 3.

4. I prefer not to get involved in political matters. 4.

5. I could never do anything that would be considered "great" by others who are important to me. 5.

6. There is little rhyme or reason for living in today's world. 6.
7. Our popular magazines do little about presenting the real truths.  

8. It's getting more difficult all the time to find happiness.

9. In order to get ahead, you sometimes have to resort to "shady" methods.

10. Sometimes I ache so much inside at what I see about me, but it doesn't seem to bother anyone else.

11. It is the function of each adult to instill in each child the belief that it is he (the child) who determines the outcomes of his endeavors.

12. Most people don't know what they want out of life.

13. I can't accept most of the goals and values that are being forced upon us by our society.

14. Education has not made any real contributions toward realization of ideals and values.

15. Most people wear masks; we can never really know a man until we probe beneath the surface.

16. In a society such as ours, each person's opinion carries a great amount of influence in the running of our country.

17. Moral values change so much there is no real basis for judging things.
18. There is little use writing to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the common man.  

19. No one really cares how I feel.  

20. There is little chance of protecting the rights of the "little guy" when they are opposite from those of the dominant pressure group.  

21. Despite the fact that there are so many capable people in this world, I will achieve what I have determined as important and necessary for me.  

22. Most people are out for themselves and don't care about anyone else.  

23. These days a person doesn't know whom he can count on.  

24. I feel that I have the potential of doing something that will cause me to be recognized by people who are important.  

25. Newspapers are biased in their political outlook and can't be trusted.  

26. Most people know exactly what their values and goals in life are.  

27. It's hard to figure out whom you can really trust.  

28. I always put "my foot in my mouth."  

29. Every normal person is tempted at times to hoist the black flag and start slitting throats.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree-ment</th>
<th>Satisf- faction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. I am optimistic and confident about the future.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I doubt whether I can rely on my family for help when I need it.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I'm just a helpless, miserable creature.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The only reason people contribute to campaign drives is that they want something out of it for themselves.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. People are not tempted to strike back in revenge when things go wrong, just to get even.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I have no real attachment to my community or neighborhood.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Everything worthwhile is gradually slipping away.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I really feel that I'm not worthy of someone's love.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Every successful business man has somewhere in his climb to success done something of which he is not proud.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I often feel that I will never achieve much because there are so many capable people ahead of me.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. A person can't always follow the rules if he wants to get ahead.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. In our society, in which everyone is out for himself, it is easy to distrust others.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree-</td>
<td>Satis-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. Our society is so complex, a person has very little to say about how things should be.  

43. The current state of world events offers hope and assurance that everything will turn out the right way.  

44. We are so regulated that there is not much choice even in personal matters.  

45. Each man's rights are of utmost importance in our government's functioning.  

46. We are all "cogs" in a big machine.  

47. To be a politician, a person must be of high moral character.  

48. I don't think I'll ever be successful in any endeavor.  

49. People are open, candid, and earnest; we do not have to probe deeply to know what they are really like.  

50. I was never allowed to express my opinions on important matters.  

51. Moral values are constant and form a real basis for judging things.  

52. I am not quite sure of what I'm supposed to "get" from my schooling.  

53. Most people are very conscious of others' needs and will think of them before their own.  

54. Nowadays, an individual has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.
55. Most police and even judges will take a bribe if they feel they can get away with it.  

56. Each man is free to determine his own future if he really wants to.  

57. The politicians are run by complex political machines.  

58. A person's life is not just for nothing; there is real purpose behind everything.  

59. Success depends upon adherence to the rules and regulations of your society.  

60. Work is only a means, not a sense of fulfillment.  

61. Children should be taught early that there isn't much one can do about the way things turn out.  

62. The notion that man and nature are governed by regular laws is an illusion based upon our desire for certainty.  

63. It doesn't do any good to discuss changes in government; a person can't change the way things are.  

64. A man is no longer the master of his destiny.  

65. No matter how unscrupulous your enemies, you will win by being moral and ethical in your tactics.  

66. I feel a sense of despair about the future.
67. One of the easiest things in today's world is knowing whom you can trust.

68. The dignity of each individual is lost in this complex world.

69. It doesn't make much sense to vote nowadays because one vote really doesn't affect the candidate's chances.

70. I feel that within each of us is some greatness and I'll eventually follow the path that will lead to my fulfillment.

71. Most people don't realize how much of their lives is controlled by others.

72. People really care how I feel, and are concerned about my happiness.

73. When things go wrong, I feel that I am more to blame than anyone else.

74. I would have no second thoughts about asking help from my family because they stand firmly behind me.

75. I have serious doubts about my abilities.

76. The police and local judiciary members are above reproach; stories of bribes are just started to besmirch their character.

77. The only way to win a fight against your enemies is by their methods.

78. I doubt whether anything can really be done about poverty, war and inequalities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement/Satisfaction</th>
<th>79</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>81</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>83</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our government has become so autocratic that a man's rights mean less and less.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>79.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I was young, my opinion was requested on important family decisions.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>80.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty compels us to admit our lives are without regularity, purpose and form.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>81.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything seems more hopeless today with the world situation the way it is.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>82.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in the world seem to be concerned about the distress of others.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>83.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things are changing so fast, it's hard to know what to expect.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>84.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person can be successful in business without compromising his moral principles.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>85.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is one thing for certain: You can be sure of nothing.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>86.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It seems that everytime a man takes a step forward he slips two steps back.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>87.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to be successful, you never need to compromise moral principles.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>88.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse, not better.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>89.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The only way to be successful is through luck; not ability.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>90.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The easiest thing to find nowadays is happiness.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>91.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
92. I feel most others are better qualified than I am.  
93. The end often justifies the means.  
94. Luck plays little part in achieving success.  
95. To be a politician, a person has to be shrewd, dishonest and insincere.  
96. I feel that I am inferior to others in most respects.  
97. Magazines present unbiased, unaltered true pictures and stories, presenting facts as they occur.  
98. There is no real meaning or purpose in this world, so we might as well live for the moment.  
99. People contribute to political campaigns because they firmly believe in their government and this is their way of promoting the ideals upon which the country was established.  
100. You alone can't really do anything to make the world a better place to live in.  
101. Those of us who fail to vote forget how significant our vote is for the election of a candidate.  
102. It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.  

Agree- Satisf-  
ment faction  
Yes No Yes No  
92.  
93.  
94.  
95.  
96.  
97.  
98.  
99.  
100.  
101.  
102.
103. I am convinced that poverty, war and other inequalities will be abolished by us. 103.

104. Religion seems to have little effect on the morals and values which we follow. 104.

105. A man's work is a man's dignity; it can be an end unto itself. 105.

106. The world is full of acquaintances; no real friends. 106.

107. Most people are failures; it's usually circumstances beyond their control that caused this. 107.
Items Listed Under Appropriate Subscales

ALONENESS*

ITEM

2 I don't know many of the people around me.

4 I prefer not to get involved in political matters.

7 Our popular magazines do little about presenting the real truths.

10 Sometimes I ache so much inside at what I see about me, but it doesn't seem to bother anyone else.

13 I can't accept most of the goals and values that are being forced upon us by our society.

15 Most people wear masks; we can never really know a man until we probe beneath the surface.

19 No one really cares how I feel.

22 Most people are out for themselves and don't care about anyone else.

23 These days a person doesn't know whom he can count on. (Srole)

25 Newspapers are biased in their political outlook and can't be trusted.

27 It's hard to figure out whom you can really trust.

31 I doubt whether I can rely on my family for help when I need it.

35 I have no real attachment to my community or neighborhood.

41 In our society, in which everyone is out for himself, it is easy to distrust others.
106 The world is full of acquaintances; no real friends.

* Items 49, 53, 67, 72, 74, 83 and 97 were reversed stated based on the above items for this category.
POWERLESSNESS*

ITEM

18 There is little use writing to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the common man. (Srole)

20 There is little chance of protecting the rights of the "little guy" when they are opposite from those of the dominant pressure group.

42 Our society is so complex, a person has very little to say about how things should be.

44 We are so regulated that there is not much choice even in personal matters.

46 We are all "cogs" in a big machine.

50 I was never allowed to express my opinions on important matters.

57 The politicians are run by complex political machines.

61 Children should be taught early that there isn't much one can do about the way things turn out.

63 It doesn't do any good to discuss changes in government; a person can't change the way things are.

64 A man is no longer the master of his destiny.

69 It doesn't make much sense to vote nowadays because one vote really doesn't affect the candidate's chances.

71 Most people don't realize how much of their lives is controlled by others.

78 I doubt whether anything can really be done about poverty, war and inequalities.

79 Our government has become so autocratic that a man's rights mean less and less.
ITEM

90  The only way to be successful is through luck; not ability.

100 You alone can't really do anything to make the world a better place to live in.

107 Most people are failures; it's usually circumstances beyond their control that caused this.

* Items 11, 16, 45, 56, 80, 94, 101 and 103 were reverse stated based on the above items for this category.
MEANINGLESSNESS*

ITEM

6  There is little rhyme or reason for living in today's world.

12  Most people don't know what they want out of life.

52  I am not quite sure of what I'm supposed to "get" from my schooling.

54  Nowadays, an individual has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself. (Srole)

62  The notion that man and nature are governed by regular laws is an illusion based upon our desire for certainty.

81  Honesty compels us to admit our lives are without regularity, purpose and form.

84  Things are changing so fast, it's hard to know what to expect.

86  There is one thing for certain - you can be sure of nothing.

98  There is no real meaning or purpose in this world, so we might as well live for the moment.

*  Items 26 and 58 were reverse stated based on the above items for this category.
VALUELESSNESS*

ITEM

1. Everyone "takes" something if they have a need for it and feel they can get away with the act.

9. In order to get ahead, you sometimes have to resort to "shady" methods.

14. Education has not made any real contributions toward realization of ideals and values.

17. Moral values change so much there is no real basis for judging things.

29. Every normal person is tempted at times to hoist the black flag and start slitting throats.

33. The only reason people contribute to campaign drives is that they want something out of it for themselves.

38. Every successful business man has somewhere in his climb to success done something of which he is not proud.

40. A person can't always follow the rules if he wants to get ahead.

55. Most police and even judges will take a bribe if they feel they can get away with it.

68. The dignity of each individual is lost in this complex world.

77. The only way to win a fight against your enemies is by their methods.

93. The end often justifies the means.

95. To be a politician, a person has to be shrewd, dishonest and insincere.
ITEM

104 Religion seems to have little effect on the morals and values which we follow.

* Items 34, 47, 51, 59, 65, 76, 85, 88 and 99 were reverse stated based on the above items for this category.
HOPELESSNESS*

ITEM

8  It's getting more difficult all the time to find happiness.
36  Everything worthwhile is gradually slipping away.
60  Work is only a means, not a sense of fulfillment.
66  I feel a sense of despair about the future.
82  Everything seems more hopeless today with the world situation the way it is.
87  It seems that everytime a man takes a step forward, he slips two steps back.
89  In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse, not better. (Srole)
102 It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future. (Srole)

* Items 30, 43, 91 and 105 were reverse stated based on the above items for this category.
SELF ABASEMENT*

ITEM

5  I could never do anything that would be considered "great" by others who are important to me.

28 I always put "my foot in my mouth."

32 I'm just a helpless, miserable creature.

37 I really feel that I'm not worthy of someone's love.

39 I often feel that I will never achieve much because there are so many capable people ahead of me.

48 I don't think I'll ever be successful in any endeavor.

73 When things go wrong, I feel that I am more to blame than anyone else.

75 I have serious doubts about my abilities.

92 I feel most others are better qualified than I am.

96 I feel that I am inferior to others in most respects.

* Items 3, 21, 24 and 70 are reverse stated based on the above items for this category.
OPINIONS AND REACTIONS SURVEY I

Name: _________________________________

Instructions: This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. This survey lists a number of items which may have a bearing on whether or not you can attain or express some of your values. Some of these factors are general in that they may affect all or most values; others are specific in that they may affect the realization or expression of only one or two types of values. For each item you must decide, by circling the appropriate point on your answer sheet, how and to what degree a particular factor is affecting you regarding the attainment or expression of your values. If you feel a factor is helping you attain or express your value(s), you would use a plus (+) sign, if a factor is blocking you in the attainment or expression of your value(s), you would use a minus (-) sign. On the rating scale provided, circling the 0 would mean that a factor is neither helping nor blocking you with respect to attainment or expression of your value(s).

1. My socioeconomic background
2. The level of my knowledge of contemporary painters
3. My political philosophy
4. My capacity for experiencing religious feeling
5. The way I view work
6. My problem solving ability
7. My ability to appreciate literary style
8. Theology
9. Other people's influence and control over me
10. My capacity to read about and understand science and research
11. The way I get along with others
12. My ability to achieve practical or financial goals
13. My capacity to consider the color and pageantry of an event
14. The United States government
15. My capacity to feel and be concerned for others; sensitivity to others
16. My ability to participate in the community
17. My understanding of the Universe
18. Political machines
19. My ability to appreciate architecture or stained glass
20. The educational system
21. My mathematical ability
22. My capacity to appreciate ancient Greek culture
23. Modern industry and technology
24. My capacity for being a social activist
25. My ability to handle intellectual challenges
26. The ecumenical movement
27. My ability to be attentive to decorative details
28. My ability to counsel and help others
29. My ability to influence, direct, or control others
30. My capacity for involvement in religious activities
31. My intellectual ability
32. My ability to enjoy an orchestral concert
33. My ability to face social problems or issues
34. My ability to understand the stock market
35. The political system in the United States
36. My ability to argue and debate - to persuade others
37. My proficiency in reading serious books and educating myself
38. My ability to develop or maintain a sense of reverence or worship
39. "Pressure" or "outside" groups
40. My ability to write or appreciate poetry
41. My ability in science subjects
42. My capacity for involvement in civil rights issues
43. Religion in the United States
44. My ability to wait for bigger and better things
45. The kinds of courses I take
46. My ability to be charitable and altruistic
47. My administrative ability
48. The kind of parents I have
49. My capacity for sympathy, unselfishness, and generosity
50. My capacity to look for or find harmony and design in art objects
51. Supreme Court decisions
52. My racial or ethnic background
53. The economic system in the United States
54. My ability to accept Divine Revelation
55. My ability to get things done
56. My ability to understand scientific apparatus
57. The level of my ambition
58. My ability to appreciate sculpture and paintings
59. College life
60. Commerce and industry
61. Other people
62. My ability to make use of group influence and strength
63. Preaching or sermons
64. My personality
65. My capacity for belief in God
66. My leadership qualities
67. My ability to get what I want
68. The kinds of risks I like to take
69. My ability to understand ballet
70. My capacity for reading about new scientific theories
71. College instructors or professors
72. My ability to organize and plan
73. My vocational goal(s)
74. The level of my efficiency
75. The social climate in the United States
76. My ability to formulate reasonable hypotheses
77. My proficiency in music and fine arts
78. My basic abilities
79. My level of perserverance or stick-to-it-iveness
80. My capacity for dealing with abstractions or concepts
81. My job or earning potential
82. My home town influence upon me
83. My ability to "get across" to or convince people
84. The level of my self-confidence
85. The clarity of my thinking
86. My capacity for artistic sensitivity
87. The college or University administration
88. My energy and drive level
89. My admiration of philosophers
90. My ability to work out and stick to a budget
91. My thinking about ethical conduct
92. My ability to appreciate "cultural" events
93. My academic performance or grades
94. My attitude about the meaning of life
95. My curiosity about things that seem difficult to understand
96. My religious affiliation or preference
Items Listed Under Appropriate Expectancy Subscales

GENERAL EXPECTANCY

ITEM

1  My socioeconomic background
17 My understanding of the Universe
20 The educational system
31 My intellectual ability
44 My ability to wait for bigger and better things
45 The kinds of courses I take
47 My administrative ability
48 The kind of parents I have
52 My racial or ethnic background
55 My ability to get things done
57 The level of my ambition
59 College life
64 My personality
66 My leadership qualities
67 My ability to get what I want
68 The kinds of risks I like to take
71 College instructors or professors
72 My ability to organize and plan
73 My vocational goal(s)
74 The level of my efficiency
75 The social climate in the United States
My basic abilities
My level of perserverance or stick-to-it-iveness
My home town influence upon me
My ability to "get across" to or convince people
The level of my self-confidence
The college or University administration
My energy and drive level
My thinking about ethical conduct
My attitude about the meaning of life
THEORETICAL EXPECTANCY

ITEM

6  My problem solving ability
10 My capacity to read about and understand science and research
21 My mathematical ability
25 My ability to handle intellectual challenges
37 My proficiency in reading serious books and educating myself
41 My ability in science subjects
56 My ability to understand scientific apparatus
70 My capacity for reading about new scientific theories
76 My ability to formulate reasonable hypotheses
80 My capacity for dealing with abstractions or concepts
85 The clarity of my thinking
89 My admiration of philosophers
93 My academic performance or grades
95 My curiosity about things that seem difficult to understand
ECONOMIC EXPECTANCY

ITEM

5  The way I view work
12 My ability to achieve practical or financial goals
23 Modern industry and technology
34 My ability to understand the stock market
53 The economic system in the United States
60 Commerce and industry
81 My job or earning potential
90 My ability to work out and stick to a budget
AESTHETIC EXPECTANCY

ITEM

2 The level of my knowledge of contemporary painters
7 My ability to appreciate literary style
13 My capacity to consider the color and pageantry of an event
19 My ability to appreciate architecture or stained glass
22 My capacity to appreciate ancient Greek culture
27 My ability to be attentive to decorative details
32 My ability to enjoy an orchestral concert
40 My ability to write or appreciate poetry
50 My capacity to look for or find harmony and design in art objects
58 My ability to appreciate sculpture and paintings
69 My ability to understand ballet
77 My proficiency in music and fine arts
86 My capacity for artistic sensitivity
92 My ability to appreciate "cultural" events
### SOCIAL EXPECTANCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Other people's influence and control over me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The way I get along with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>My capacity to feel and be concerned for others; sensitivity to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>My ability to participate in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>My capacity for being a social activist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>My ability to counsel and help others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>My ability to face social problems or issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>My capacity for involvement in civil rights issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>My ability to be charitable and altruistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>My capacity for sympathy, unselfishness, and generosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>My ability to make use of group influence and strength</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLITICAL EXPECTANCY

ITEM

3 My political philosophy
9 Other people's influence and control over me
14 The United States government
18 Political machines
29 My ability to influence, direct, or control others
35 The political system in the United States
36 My ability to argue and debate - to persuade others
39 "Pressure" or "outside" groups
51 Supreme Court decisions
62 My ability to make use of group influence and strength
RELIGIOUS EXPECTANCY

ITEM

4  My capacity for experiencing religious feeling
8  Theology
26 The ecumenical movement
30 My capacity for involvement in religious activities
38 My ability to develop or maintain a sense of reverence or worship
43 Religion in the United States
54 My ability to accept Divine Revelation
63 Preaching or sermons
65 My capacity for belief in God
96 My religious affiliation or preference
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