Chapter III

ALIENATION: ITS NATURE, SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL MANIFESTATIONS AND CORRELATES

The purpose of the present chapter is to bring out the nature of alienation, particularly political alienation, by referring to the writings of prominent thinkers as well as to empirical attempts towards operationalisation of the concept, identification of dimensions underlying the overt and covert aspects encompassed within the scope of the term and also the social and psychological correlates of the state of alienation. For the convenience of discussion, this chapter has been divided into two sections, one devoted to speculations and theoretical discussions regarding the state of alienation and the other section devoted to the empirical studies.

STATE OF ALIENATION: THEORETICAL VIEWS

Alienation is an atrocious word. In its use as a general concept, scientific term, popular expression and cultural motif, alienation has acquired a semantic richness (and confusion) attained by few words of corresponding significance in contemporary parlance. Most of the scientific terms are characterised by a reasonable specificity of denotation, a clarity of meaning within particular disciplines, and of course, an absence of ambiguity. But none of these attributes adhere to the word alienation. Alienation is often used to denote a
great variety of quite dissimilar phenomena. Moreover, its meanings within separate disciplines are confusingly inter-related and the word is associated with severe inconsistency and vagueness. (Johnson, 1973).

The term alienation is a good example of 'Panchreston' -- a term coined by Hardin (1956) to refer to scientific concepts which in attempting to explain all, essentially explain nothing.

Seeman (1971) has pointed out that the concept of alienation has been "popularly adopted as the signature of the present epoch. It has become routine to define our troubles in the language of alienation and to seek solutions in those terms. But signatures are sometimes hard to read, sometimes spurious, and sometimes too casually promiscuously used. They ought to be examined with care" (p. 135). Similar concern was expressed by Johnson (1973), who characterized the concept of alienation as being capable of carrying a great deal of feeling "in an inexplicit, perplexing and deeply annoying way" (p. 28). Although in recent years many psychologists and sociologists have attempted to demystify and operationalise the concept (Vroom, 1962; Lodahl and Kejner, 1965; Lawler and Hall, 1970; Seeman, 1971; Saleh and Hosek, 1976), none of them seem to offer a scientifically organised and meaningful view of the concept that could have broad generality across cultures.

In an extensive survey of various phenomena of alienation,
Schacht (1970) has discussed the central semantic connected with the term. Stripped to its essence the word signifies separation (distance) between two or more entities.

The English term alienation is derived from the original Latin noun alienatio which in turn is derived from the Latin verb alienare, meaning 'to take away' or 'remove' (Klein, 1966). The Latin usage of the term in different contexts, however, resulted in two distinct meanings of the concept. The first meaning was derived from the Latin usage of the term in the context of transfer of ownership of property. In this context the use of the term alienation meant the "transfer of ownership of something to another person". The second meaning of alienation was derived from the Latin usage of the verb alienare meaning "to cause a separation to occur". In this sense, alienation referred to a "state of separation or dissociation" between two elements (Klein, 1966).

The concept of alienation has a long history in theology, philosophy and social criticism, and a much shorter one in contemporary social sciences. It is the very diversity of this legacy which has contributed to both the richness of the intellectual tradition of the concept and the ambiguity that currently surrounds it (Finifter, 1972).

Although, alienation as a psychological state of the individual (or as a collective social phenomenon) has been recognised of centuries, the scientific treatment of the concept with
regard to its nature and its effects was attempted first by empirically oriented sociologists and more recently by social psychologists.

The meaning of alienation as a state of separation was primarily popularised in early theological writings. Calvin (1854) used the term alienation in a commentary on spiritual death. According to Calvin, "spiritual death is nothing else than alienation of the soul from God" (p.219).

The term alienation when defined as a state of separation always implied two additional features. First, an individual must experience a state of alienation from some other element, person or thing. Thus, there can be alienation of different sorts, depending on what elements of one's environment one is separated from (such as God, one's own body, or other people). Secondly, as a consequence of separation the individual was assumed to experience a certain affect toward the object. The term alienation, therefore, always had a reference to the individual's affective experience associated with a state of separation. An alienated individual was generally perceived as showing cool aversive, hostile or unwelcome feelings (Murray, 1888; Klein, 1966) towards the object of alienation. In theological writings, the negative affective states of despair, guilt, dissatisfaction, anger and so on, were considered common manifestations of spiritual alienation. The inclusion of negative affective states as a part of the phenomenon of alienation can also be noticed in the writings of the contemporary
social scientists (Kanungo, 1982).

The meaning of the term alienation as "a transfer of ownership" was largely used by social contract theorists such as Grotius, Hobbes, Lock and Rousseau. Hugo Grotius (1853) was the first social-contract theorist to use the term alienation to mean the transfer of 'sovereign authority' over oneself to another person. According to Grotius (1853), transferring the right of self-determination to someone else is like a transfer of ownership of property. For him such alienation represents limits to individual autonomy and freedom of action and forms the basis of all political authority. Other social contract theorists such as Thomas Hobbes (1950) and John Locke (1947) have not used the term 'alienation' but have expressed views similar to that of Grotius. Rousseau (1947) in his social contract theory used the term alienation to mean the total surrender of an individual's person and power to the collective general will. In social-contract theories an alienated worker was one who gave up or surrendered personal rights, liberty, powers and controls to the general will of the community or organisation.

According to Hegel (1949) there are two types of alienation. First, there is the conscious experience of alienation as a state of separation. One experiences this type of alienation when one ceases to identify with the 'social substance' or the social, political and cultural institutions. This type of
alienation or state of separation refers to "a condition which occurs when a certain change in a person's self-conception takes place. It is neither something one does nor the intended result of a deliberate action" (Schacht, 1970, p.36).

The second type of alienation refers to the surrender or transfer of individual rights. In contrast to the first type of alienation, surrendering one's right in something deliberate, "It involves a conscious relinquishment or surrender with the intention of securing a desired end: namely, unity with the social substance" (Schacht, 1970, p.36).

Although the concept of alienation was used before Marx, it is in his writing that the concept first acquired an empirical and sociological rather than a metaphysical or theological connotation. The inspiration for much of the contemporary literature on alienation is frequently traced back to Marx's early analysis of alienated labour (Finifter, 1972).

Marx followed Hegel's philosophical treatment of the concept of alienation but carved a place for it in political economy. If Hegel, following theologians and philosophers of his time, identified the basic psychological state of alienation in individuals' lives, Marx identified it in their material working lives. Thus Marx spoke the alienation of labour rather than spiritual alienation. Labour, according to Marx (1932) represents existential activity of man, his free conscious activity not as a means for maintaining life but
developing his universal nature (p. 87-88). Besides labour and spontaneous free self-directed productive activities of individuals, Marx identified two essential aspects of the nature of human beings. These two aspects of the nature of human beings are social existence (in fellowship with other human beings) and sensuous existence (cultivation and enjoyment of the senses). "Thus for Marx, man's essential characteristics are those of individuality, sociality and sensuousness" (Schacht, 1970, p. 74). According to Marx alienation from labour represents a loss of indivuality or separation of individual from their labour.

Marx (1963) distinguished among four aspects of alienation. Although first he discussed worker's alienation from the objects produced, he saw this aspect of alienation as a result of the fact that man is alienated from the work-process itself. Marx observed: "How could the worker stand in an alien relationship to the product of his activity if he did not alienate himself in the act of production itself? The product is indeed only the resume of activity, of production". Marx noted that when man is alienated from his daily work activities, he also becomes alienated from himself from his own creative potential and the social bounds that define him as human (his "species being"). Finally, as a result of being alienated from his own humanity, he also becomes alienated from his fellow workers, and from other men in general. Thus the four aspects of alienation described by Marx are not separable and independent
dimensions of alienation but are seen as links in a complex chain of development. The original alienation from the work process is hypothesized to reverberate far beyond the work setting to lead to alienation in all other areas.

Weber's (1930) treatments of the concept of alienation is very similar to that of Marx. As Gerth and Mills (1946) put it, "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). Thus, Weber treated alienation as a much more widespread social phenomenon than did Marx. Both believed that the individuality and personal worth of workers is determined by their labour and that alienation results from working conditions that deny an expression of individuality. But Weber went a step further in asserting the historical antecedents of work alienation. With the study of the protestant ethics Weber was convinced that the ethical system of protestantism indoctrinates the individuals to be individualists and to believe in the goodness of work. The principles preached in the protestant faith such as "God helps those who help themselves" or "work is its own reward", inculcated in people a high degree of individualism and a craving for intrinsic reward and industriousness. "The job was regarded as a sacred calling and success at work was evidence
that one had been chosen for salvation" (Faunce, 1968, p.22). Such were the beliefs that resulted from protestant training, and, therefore, Weber argued that the protestant work ethic is the major source of increased work involvement. For Weber, protestantism laid the foundation for capitalism by increasing the work involvement of entrepreneurs. But for Marx protestantism was an ideological justification for capitalism, and Marx felt the capitalistic economy to be the cause of worker alienation.

Unlike Marx and Weber, who viewed alienation as resulting primarily from a perceived lack of freedom and control at work, Emile Durkheim, the French sociologist, saw it as the consequence of a condition of anomie, or the perceived lack of socially approved means and norms to guide one's behaviour for the purpose of achieving culturally prescribed goals (Durkheim, 1893; Blauner, 1964; Shepard, 1971). Robert Merton (1957) who made the concept of anomie more popular in contemporary sociology, defined it as "a breakdown in the social structure, occurring particularly when there is an acute disjunction between the cultural goals and the socially structured capacities of members of the group to act in accord with them" (p.162). Thus alienation as the consequence of the state of anomie exists when people believe that there is a breakdown of societal behavioural norms (a state of normlessness) and that cultural goals are to be achieved primarily through deviant behaviour. It is such beliefs rather than actually socially deviant behaviour, that define the state of alienation among people.
The condition of anomie is often considered a post-industrial phenomenon. As Blauaer (1964) observed, industrialization and urbanization of modern society have "destroyed the normative structure of a more traditional society and uprooted people from the local groups and institutions which had provided stability and security" (p.24). No longer able to feel a sense of security and belonging, modern men and women find themselves isolated from others. This form of social alienation often results in normlessness and in its collective form manifests itself in various types of urban unrest. In social psychological terms, this variant of alienation seems to stem from the frustration of social and security needs, the need to belong to groups for social approval and social comparison (Festinger, 1954; Maslow, 1954).

Alienation in Marx's thinking is in part, what characterizes precisely those states of the individual and conditions of society which Durkheim sees as the solution to anomie, namely where men are socially determined and constrained, when they must conform to social rules which are independent of their wills and where they are conditioned to think and act within the confines of specialized roles. Whereas, for Durkheim, anomic man is the unregulated man who needs rules to live by limits to his desires, circumscribed tasks to perform and to have limited horizons for his thoughts, for
Marx alienated man is a man in the grip of a system who cannot escape from a particular, exclusive sphere of activity which is forced upon him (Finifter, 1972). According to Marx, social constraint is a denial and for Durkheim it is a condition of human freedom and self-realization.

Durkheim saw human nature as essentially in need of limits and discipline. His view of man is of a being with potentially limitless and instable desires, who needs to be controlled by society. He writes: "To limit man, to place obstacles in the path of his free development, is this not to prevent him from fulfilling himself? But this limitation is a condition of our happiness and moral health. Man in fact is made for life in a determinate, limited environment..." (Durkheim, 1897).

For Durkheim man must be governed by "conscience superior to his own, the superiority of which he feels": Men cannot assign themselves the 'law of justice' but 'must receive it from an authority which they respect and to which they yield spontaneously'. Society alone "as a whole or through the agency of its organs, can play this moderating role". It alone can "stipulate law and set the point beyond which the passions must not go", and it alone "can estimate the reward to be prospectively offered to every class of human functionary, in the name of the common interest..." (Durkheim, 1897).
Sociologists have used the term alienation in varied context, such as urban alienation and cultural alienation. Such usage of the concept in multiple contexts has given rise to a number of meanings attributed to the concept. In an attempt to integrate the various meanings of the concept in the sociological literature, Seeman (1959, 1971) has proposed five major variants of the concept: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation and self-estrangement. According to Seeman each variant refers to a different, subjectively felt psychological state of the individual caused by different environmental conditions.

Alienation in the form of powerlessness in the most general sense refers to a perceived lack of control over important events that affects one's life. This type of alienation was the primary concern of Marx while dealing with labour alienation. Seeman (1959), however, provided a social-psychological perspective and defined the sense of powerlessness as "the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behaviour cannot determine the occurrence of the outcome or reinforcement he seeks" (p. 784).

Although Seeman (1959) conceived powerlessness to represent an individual's inability to determine the occurrence of any outcome, most sociologists (Levin, 1960; Middleton, 1963; Neal and Retting, 1963) restrict it to the individual's sense of control over socio-political events. Seeman himself
used this variant of alienation to explain and describe men's and women's alienation from the larger social order. An individual's inability to control and influence political systems, industrial economies, or international affairs may create a sense of powerlessness. Alienation in the sense of powerlessness has also been observed in job situations.

The second type of alienation is identified as a cognitive state of meaninglessness in the individual. According to Seeman (1959), "a state of meaninglessness exists when the individual is unclear as to what he ought to believe — when the individual's minimal standards for clarity in decision making are not met". In such a state the individual is unable to predict social situations and the outcomes of his own and other's behaviour. In a sense, the meaninglessness type of alienation should be characterized in terms of incomprehensibility or inability to understand one's complex environment.

Meaninglessness can also be viewed in another sense. It may represent purposelessness or the lack of any goal or goal clarity (not because of goal complexity but because of an unstructured goal or the simple absence of any goal). Thus, in work situation meaninglessness could result from an increasing specialization and division of labour.

The two other forms of alienation suggested by Seeman
(1959) have their roots in Durkheim's (1893) description of anomie. Anomie refers to the perceived conditions of one's social environment, such as the perception of the breakdown of social norms regulating individual conduct in modern societies. Merton (1957) argued that a state of anomie exists when institutionally prescribed conducts fail to achieve culturally prescribed goals. Following Merton, Seeman (1959) defined the anomie situation for an individual as "one in which there is high expectancy that socially unapproved behaviours are required to achieve given goals" (p. 788). The two forms of alienation that result from such perceived conditions are normlessness and isolation.

Individuals may develop a sense of normlessness when they find that previously approved social norms are no longer effective in guiding behaviour for the attainment of personal goals. In other words, individuals find that to achieve given goals it is necessary to use socially unapproved behaviour. Finding that they can no longer share the normative system because of its ineffectiveness, the individuals may develop norms of their own to guide behaviour. Because their norms are different from those of others, the individual may eventually perceive themselves as being separate from society and its normative system. The dissociation of one self from others results in a perception of social isolation; the dissociation of oneself from social norms results in a normlessness or cultural estrangement. Alienation, in the sense of
social isolation and cultural estrangement, refers to the perceived states of loneliness and rootlessness, respectively (Seeman, 1971). It may be noticed that these two variants of alienation are related because they stem from the same basic condition of anomie. States of loneliness and rootlessness have also been identified in work environments. Blauner (1964), for instance, suggested that these forms of social alienation may be manifested on the job owing to the lack of social integration of the workers. When an organization does not provide the worker any opportunity for developing a sense of membership or belonging in the social system, the worker is bound to show a sense of isolation from the system and its goals. From a motivational point of view, the two variants of social alienation, isolation and normlessness, seem to be based on two different social needs of the individual. Continuous frustration of the membership or the belonging need of the individual may be the crucial determinant of the isolation form of alienation. The normlessness form of alienation, however, is determined by continuous frustration of another social need, the need to evaluate oneself through social comparison (Festinger, 1954).

In the context of social influence theories, social psychologists have postulated two major kinds of influences that groups exert on the individual (Jones and Gerard, 1967). They are referred to as the normative and the informational
social influences. By being a member of the group and by adhering to the group norms, an individual desires to love and to be loved by others. When, however, the group norms are perceived to be too restrictive and are in conflict with the individual's personal goals, these norms cease to influence the individual. In such a case the group loses its normative influence on the individual, the individual becomes isolated in relation to the group, is perceived as one who no longer belongs to the group and no longer is loved by others in the group. Such a psychological state can be identified as the isolation form of alienation (Kanungo, 1982).

Individuals also depend on the group norms for self-evaluation and for evaluating their abilities and opinions (Pestinger, 1954). Group norms generally provide people with information on how to behave (what is right and what is wrong). When individuals find that group norms do not provide useful information for self-evaluation, they may separate themselves from these norms and experience a state of normlessness. Thus in terms of social influence theory the two variants of social alienation result from the failure of the groups to exercise the two forms of social influence, normative and informational.

The final variant of alienation proposed by sociologists is self-estrangement. In many ways the characterisation of
this category of alienation has posed problems for socio-
logical thinkers. Seeman (1971) admits that this is an
"elusive idea" (p.136), but then goes on to operationalise
it. According to Seeman, a person is self-estranged when
engaged in an activity that is not rewarding in itself but
is instrumental in satisfying extrinsic needs, such as the
need for money and security. Following Seeman, Shepard
(1971) considers instrumental work orientation (the degree
to which one works for extrinsic need satisfaction) to be an
index of the self-estrangement kind of alienation in the
work set up. Blauner (1964) suggests that a job encourages
self-estrangement if it does not provide the opportunity for
expressing "unique abilities, potentialities, or personality
of the worker" (p.26). Following Marx, many contemporary
sociologists believe that self-estrangement is the heart of
the concept of alienation, as if all other forms of aliena-
tion eventually result in self-estrangement. Blauner (1964)
attests to this belief when he says, "when work activity
does not permit control (powerlessness), evoke a sense of
purpose (meaninglessness) or encourage larger identification
(isolation), employment becomes simply a means to the end
of making a living" (p.3). Faunce (1968) also considers
self-estrangement to be the final form of alienation in a
causal chain. According to Faunce, the powerlessness,
meaningless and normlessness variants of alienation are pre-
disposing conditions for both social and self-estrangement.
Much of the vagueness that it associated with the meaning of the term alienation could be removed if one agrees with Keniston that for understanding alienation and its forms one has to ask four fundamental questions:

1. Alienation from what? This question enables us to know the focus of alienation.
2. What are the relations which have replaced the relations that were existing prior to the condition of alienation?
3. How alienation is manifested? This would enable us to know the mode of alienation.
4. What are the agents of alienation (i.e., the source of alienation)?

The relevance of the four questions for understanding alienation and its forms is discussed below:

Although in an ordinary speech we often speak of some one simply as "alienated", in fact we always imply that he is alienated from some thing or some one. As Keniston observed, husbands become alienated from their wives, peasants from their lands, workers from their labour, men from their gods, societies from their traditional virtues. Alienation always has an object or focus. For example "self-alienation", as discussed by Fromm, Horney and others, implies a lack of connection between an individual and some deep vital and valuable part of himself; the alienation of the intellectual implies his lack of commitment to the values of his society; the alienation of the modern worker points to his lack of
relationship to the work process or to his own labour. And although a lack of connection in one area may generalise to other areas, it need not always be same. The alienated intellectual may be unalienated from his inner productivity or 'real-self', the alienated worker may be, at least, superficially unalienated from the values of the industrial society that is purportedly alienating him. Thus the first question to ask of alienation is, 'alienated from what'?

Secondly, the concept of alienation does not specify what alienation consists of. The rhetoric of the concept implies that something desirable, natural or normal has been lost, that is a positive relationship has ceased to exist. But we need to specify what replaces the lost relationship. If a communist becomes alienated from the party, we do not know whether he is merely disenchanted, whether he now vehemently reflects communism, whether he no longer cares about politics at all, or he blames himself for the loss of his old faith. In many cases alienation merely implies lack of any relationship at all -- detachment and indifference; but in other cases it implies active rejection vehement opposition, open hostility. A second question to ask of alienation then, is, "what relationship if any, has replaced the lost one"?

Thirdly, alienation can be expressed in a variety of ways. In one sense the revolutionary and the psychotic, both
are highly alienated from the norms and values of their society and both reject these norms and values. Yet there is a vast difference in the way their rejection is expressed: the revolutionary actively attempts to transform his society; the psychotic has undergone a regressive self-transformation that leaves his society relatively unaffected. One major way of classifying alienation is, therefore, according to their modes, e.g., whether they are alloplastic (i.e., which involve an attempt to transform the world) or an autoplastic (which involve self-transformation).

Finally, alienations have different agents or sources: some are imposed while others are chosen. Merely to note that an individual is 'alienated from society' does not tell us whether he deliberately rejects his society or whether it excludes him. Most of the sociological discussions of alienation that derive from Marx deal with imposed alienation (of which the alienated individual remains largely unaware). For Fromm (1955) the alienated man is rarely aware that he is alienated from his work or himself. Thus, a further question relevant to a definition of alienation is, "who or what is the agent of alienation?"

Keniston has described four kinds of alienations:

(1) **Cosmic Outcastness** - This is related to existential view about the absurdity of human life. This kind of alienation is a direct consequence of erosion of faith on God and salvation.
(2) **Developmental Estrangement** - The expulsion of baby from mother's womb and gradual loss of symbiotic dependency with concurrent advent of responsibility, blame, guilt and loss of moral innocence give rise to this type of alienation. In adulthood developmental estrangement is expressed in the form of problems related to marital adjustment and in relation to children.

(3) **Historical Loss** - With the change of circumstances well entrenched segments of society are pushed downward in social hierarchy. This downward movement is mourned by those who have lost their position of power and prestige. Most social innovations replace customs, outlooks or technologies, and those who are most firmly attached to what has been replaced inevitably suffer the loss. In the present century, we experience rapid and worldwide social change; hence one of the most acutely felt alienations is the sense of historical loss.

(4) **Self-estrangement** - This is the type of alienation in which contact between the individual's conscious self and his real self is lost.

On the basis of the three criteria, namely attitude, focuss and mode, Keniston has presented a detailed account of behaviour associated with different forms of individual alienation. In individual alienation, the individual serving as the agent of his own alienation replaces natural or original relationship by a stance of manifest rejection. The combinations of alienation and conformism -- two
opposite poles of attitudes relevant to individual relationship with cultural and behavioural norms -- with mode or manifestations of alienation enable us to understand varieties of alienation and conformism. As many as eight varieties of alienation/conformism have been described by Keniston. These are violence vs. obedience, acting out vs. compliance, maladaptation vs. overadaptation, withdrawal vs. immersion, repudiation vs. confirmation, criticism vs. justification, change vs. conservation, and subversion vs. conformism. These varieties of alienation were derived by considering the fact whether the focus is norm or value, whether the person adopts autoplastic or alloplastic mode, and which area of behaviour (adjustment, personality, culture, politics, ideology, etc.) is taken into consideration (Keniston, 1965).

In psychology and psychiatry alienation is considered as a state of psychological isolation, interpersonal distrust, lack of feeling of competence, uncrystallized sense of identity and the feeling that the individual lacks meaning and authenticity in his life. Shizoid withdrawal is the most obvious example of withdrawal of individual from the reality and interpersonal encounters. The Shizoid person does not use withdrawal selectively in a strategic manner to deal with specific threatening conditions, but rather as a reaction to any situation sensed to be even vaguely
dangerous and noxious. However, even the Schizoid is not totally or permanently withdrawn from his self and his environment. Daly (1969) noted that Schizoid's individual does not find a comfortable hermitage but is beset with approach avoidance conflict concerning the affiliation with others.

Fromm (1955) used the term alienation in the contemporary social psychological literature. He elaborated Marx's concept of alienation and adopted to contemporary situation. He defined alienation as "... a mode of experience in which the person experiences himself as an alien. He has become, one might say, estranged from himself. He does not experience himself as the centre of his world, as the creator of his own acts -- but his acts and their consequences have become his masters whom he obeys or whom he may even worship." The alienated person is out of touch with himself, as he is out of touch with any other person (Fromm, 1955). Fromm finds alienation in modern society almost total which pervades the relationship of man to his work to the things he consumes, his fellows and to himself. Fromm (1955) who has tried to combine Marxist and Freudian perspectives, observes:

In the nineteenth century the problem was that God is dead; in the twentieth century the problem is that man
is dead... the danger of the past was that men became slaves. The danger of the future is that men may become robots. True enough robots, do not rebel. But given men's nature robots cannot live and remain sane... They will destroy their world and themselves because they cannot stand... a meaningless life (p.360).

For Horney (1946) a developing child's failure to fulfil his needs leads to the experience of 'basic anxiety'; this leads to a process of negation of the 'real self' and its substitution by the 'ideal self' whose characteristics are designed to manipulate the environment to meet these unfulfilled needs. When the link between the individuals 'real' and 'ideal self' is lost, self-estrangement or the alienation from the self is experienced. Horney (1946) comments, "we cannot suppress or eliminate essential parts of ourselves without becoming estranged from ourselves... the person looses interest in life because it is not he who lives it, he cannot make any decisions because he does not know what he really wants; if difficulties mount he may be pervaded by a sense of unreality -- an accentuated expression of his paramount condition of being unreal to himself".

Certain aspects of alienation were described by Erikson (1968) while he dealt with the problem of identity among youth. He observed that an inability to solve the childhood
conflicts may lead the school-age individual to develop an estrangement from himself and his task.

According to Sullivan (1953), the goal of human behaviour is to become an accultured social being by way of relationship with others, common living with them, and attainment of status and recognition among them. The alienated individual does not experience himself to be a member of society with which he could not have close relationship. Thus, alienation is related to Sullivan's Conceptualization of interpersonal behaviour.

Like Horney and others, Laing (1971) believes that the causes of alienation lies in the social structure. According to him the modern civilization separated the inner and outer layers of existence the 'mind' and the body, 'me here' and 'you there' experiences. Laing is of the view that the so-called 'normal' person is alienated with a split of the self, which he considers to be an essential feature of repressive normality. Laing (1967) comes down on society much harder and concludes that the whole question of social abnormality is simply lack of crystallisation of his identity contributes towards his psychological alienation because without knowing who one is, the individual is not sure of the meaning of his experiences and his self worth without which the capacity to have bonds of affection, relation with others remains ineffective.
Alienation is found in various fields. We talk of cultural, social, political and work alienation, political alienation is of crucial importance in a larger social context because it has far reaching influence on all members of the society. It also has far reaching implications. Riots, violent protests, immigration and expatriation and other behaviours that appear and values are the salient examples of the importance of political alienation as a force in contemporary political life.

In a democratic society political alienation causes hazards for the stability of the government. This alienation is rooted in certain social processes endemic to modernization, such as urbanization, industrialization, bureaucratization, i.e., different kinds of massification. As the modern democratic societies are quite fragile in structure to maintain their stability, deliberate efforts are to be made to check political alienation within manageable limits.

The alienated are susceptible to extremist, particularly right-wing, ideological movements and programmes because intolerable conditions of the present lead to a longing for a more pleasant past and thus to leaders or movements that promise 'restoration' of the elusive. Coupled with their tendency to resort to extremist politics is a pervasive negativism of the alienated directed toward the existing political institutions. "The alienated believe that all politicians are corrupt, that there are few important differences between what the established
parties and candidates stand for, that politics is for all practical purposes, a case of 'them' trying to put 'this' over on 'us' (Thompson and Horton, 1969, p.191).

Alienation and negativism of the discontented lead them to withdraw from politics under normal circumstances yet these same attributes increase their availability to groups with dictatorial ambitions (Manhaim, 1940, p.87). Lacking political restraints, the alienated are recruited for service in mass movements "bent on transformation of the world (Kornhauser, 1959, p.61)."

Many speculations about the adverse consequences of alienation for the democratic set-up are found valid by empirical methods. Recent empirical research, employing a variety of measures, has found alienation to be significantly associated with a wide range of political behaviour including revolutionary behaviour, reformism, support for demagogues, protest, voting, participation in radical political movements and vicarious use of the mass media. It is now widely accepted that magnitude and distribution of political alienation are significantly related to the stability, integration and development of political systems. Alienation then appears to be a fundamental, human political orientation (Schwartz, 1973).

In an attempt to dimensionalise the concept of political alienation, Finifter started with the five aspects of alienation identified by Seeman (1959) and brought out their implications for political behaviour, which are as follows:
Taking a number of questions that tap different aspects of alienation and analyzing the matrix of inter-correlation of responses to the items by factor analysis, Finifter demonstrated that there is empirical, in addition to theoretical, ground for considering political alienation as a multi-dimensional concept. Having identified two dimensions of political alienation, Finifter wanted to know whether they were related in the same way to a variety of social and social psychological conditions that may cause political alienation. She found that this was not the case. For example, although Blacks generally score much higher than whites on the dimension of alienation called "perceived political normlessness", they do not feel much more "powerless" than whites. Thus, there are differences between the two types of political alienation -- powerlessness and normlessness -- consequently they are likely to lead to different types of political behaviour.

Finifter has distinguished at least four different ways in which alienation towards the polity may be expressed.

1. "Political powerlessness" is defined as an individual's feeling that he cannot influence the actions of the government, that the "authoritative allocation of values for the society" which is at the heart of the political process is not subject to his influence. This mode of alienation is closely (inversely) related to the concept of political efficacy" which has achieved prominence in voting behaviour.
2. "Political meaninglessness" may be said to exist to the extent that political decisions are perceived as being unpredictable. This mode of alienation is distinguished from powerlessness in that to the individual citizen decisions may be clear and events may be predictable yet he may not have the feeling of being capable of influencing the outcome. In the situation of meaninglessness the individual is unable to distinguish any meaningful political choices and he is uncertain about the course of events in future. Also there is a feeling that making choices is of no use because none of the choices would lead to the desired change in the social conditions.

3. Following Dukhreim's use of anomie "perceived political normlessness" is defined as the individual's perception that the norms and rules intended to govern political relations have broken down and that departures from prescribed behaviour are common. A belief that officials violate legal procedures in dealing with the public or in arriving at policy decision exemplify this mode of alienation.

4. "Political isolation" refers to a rejection of political norms and goals that are widely held and shared by other members of a society. It differs from perceived normlessness in which there is implicit acceptance of some set of norms from which others are perceived to be deviating. Political isolation can be illustrated by the belief that voting and other socially defined political obligations are merely conformist formalities or that public participation in the formations of public policy is inappropriate. This type of alienation is consistent with Lane's (1962) description of alienated individuals who feel that "the rules of the game are unfair", loaded illegitimate; the constitution
is in some sense fraudulent". To the extent that social norms are dynamic, the state of isolation at one point in time may entail a different set of attitudes than at another point of time.

Using factor analysis, Nandy (1975) has dimensionalized political alienation along three axes: (i) the degree of the individual's sense of political potency, (ii) the extent of sanctity he attaches to political institutions and norms of his society, and (iii) the extent of his involvement in politics. Together they define the conceptual domain of political commitment and alienation.

Nandy (1975) acknowledged that the dimension of political alienation suggested by him are derived from such diverse sources as certain social thoughts of 19th century, accounts of political alienation given by neo-Freudians and neo-Marxian social scientists in the present century including social psychological literature of fifties and sixties on human self-alienation in full blown consumer societies, complex technologies and gigantic organisations in relation to which man finds his existence to be microscopic insignificant and negligible. It is to be observed that like Finifter, Nandy (1975) began his study of components of political alienation by conceptualizing this kind of behaviour in terms of the same five dimensions as proposed by Seeman but unlike Finifter he could identify not two but
three dimensions which are supposed to have psychological underpinnings.

Nandy emphasised that the dimension of political potency is mainly a psychological one and that consideration of this dimension is particularly more relevant to a nation with a colonial past. A colonial system protects and safeguards the sense of political potency of only a sizeable number of minority in its subject-society or colony and the self-esteem of the majority is damaged by the colonial rule. Consequently, the road from subject-hood to citizenship lies through a growing sense of political potency. Further, according to Nandy (1975), the concept is relevant to the Indian society in yet another way. In trying to give its polity a certain economy from its social and economic contexts, the Indian system has tried to dissociate the sense of political competence of its citizens from its well-known determinants such as social mobilization, differentiation or modernity. Perhaps this partly accounts for a viable participatory democratic order in a poor, predominantly rural society.

The second dimension is that of normative conformity vs. normlessness. Political normlessness in India could be the result of inexposure to the new political forms which are competitive, contractual and super imposed on a predominantly rural society. Nandy observed, these 'new' forms can hardly
have automatic and intrinsic legitimacy. Such a legitimacy has to be forged. Political normlessness in India could also be a transient characteristic of the traditionally high status, city based, educated, white collar sectors, rendered increasingly marginal by competitive, mass politics and by the growing dominance of what was only decades ago the periphery of Indian polity.

The third dimension of alienation is defined by estrangement from organised social and political life, on the one hand, and social and political engagement, on the other. Nandy pointed out that, as in the case of normlessness, there are two types of disengagements from politics in India, primary and secondary disengagements. On the one side there are those who have been exposed to participatory competitive politics for the first time and are yet strangers to it. Their estrangement from politics derives legitimacy from the India's traditional preference for non-political modes of relating to the environment. On the other side, there is the political alienation of those whom the political process in India is rendering peripheral. Their withdrawal from politics is often associated with a high degree of hostility towards all organised politics.

There is not merely a long tradition of viewing alienation as a domain defined by impotency, normlessness and withdrawal, but all the three coordinates are of obvious relevance
to Indian politics. Commenting on the studies which considered only two dimension of political alienation, Nandy observed it is strange because political participation, as opposed to political withdrawal is a significant and crucial concept in the contemporary political science. Hence, Nandy argued, any under emphasis on political isolation will truncate the concept of alienation. Nandy asserted that the component of isolation is not to be ignored because it provides important links between psychological state of alienation and political fate of the nation. What is not be disregarded is the fact that when the individual actively intervenes in the real world of politics his alienation becomes a politically significant dissent. The politically withdrawn man feeling politically impotent and rejecting the political institutions and norms of political society, is an entirely different kettle of fish from the politically active and efficacious functionary who denies the legitimacy of the system. While the former poses a long-term danger to the existing political system, the latter is the immediate threat to the system and a hope of the political counter elites. This is particularly so in a society where the roots of large-scale centralized politics are not deep and where the politics of democratic participation has not been an integral part of the traditional life style (Nandy, 1975).

Political trust is one of the significant features of
political alienation. Political trust is a must for the stability of a democratic political system. There will be threat to the political system if the trust regarding the legitimacy of the system is reduced among the citizens of the state.

Gamson (1968) brought out the circular relationship between the existing level of political trust among different segments of population and the three types of social control to be exercised for ensuring compliance namely, persuasion, inducement and constraints. On the basis of the existing level of trust, people may be divided into three categories, i.e., confident group, neutral group and alienated group.

The confident group believe in goodwill of the authorities because both the sides are committed to same rules. Usually there is no need of using any device of making the members of this group to comply with authorities. Nevertheless, in a particular case presentation of information and arguments, and making appeal in the name of loyalties and commitment is enough.

The most appropriate method of social control to be employed with the confident group is persuasion. Although campaigns for persuasion are often costly in terms of energy, money and resources, whatever these cost of persuasion may be they are likely to be less than the immediate and long-term cost of other kinds of social control. Successful
persuasion leads to the reinforcement of existing trust orientation of the members of the confident group. The other methods of social control, namely, inducement and constraints, when employed for obtaining the compliance of the confident groups lead to reduction in trust.

The neutral group has neither high trust in the authorities nor it is negatively predisposed towards them. This group includes those individuals who do not share the goals of the group but rather have their own set of goal which do not necessarily conflict or compliment with those of solidary group. The use of persuasive techniques with these groups contributes toward the increment of trust towards authorities. Inducements reinforce the existing trust orientations of the neutral group while constraints lead to decline in the level of trust.

The alienated group is comprised of those who have little expectation of favourable outcome. Obviously, such people would not comply with persuasive appeals which often appear to be hurting the common cause shared by the members of the alienated group. Nevertheless, when persuasion is successful in obtaining the compliance of alienated group, it contributes towards the increment in trust towards authorities. Because it ultimately leads to the impression that, perhaps, the conflict of interests was not as total as it was believed to be, the use of constraints for
ensuring the compliance of the alienated group leads to further strengthening of existing level of distrust towards authorities.

Gamson is of the view that the use of congruent means of influence increases the strength and stability of existing trust orientation if it is perceived to be successful. According to him the following are the congruent combination of political trust and means of influence; alienation-constraints, neutrality-inducement and confidence-persuasion. While we have already mentioned the effect of successful influence brought out by congruent and non-congruent means of influence upon the change in level of trust, we have to examine the effect of unsuccessful use of given means of influence on political trust which may either reinforce or weaken the existing trust orientation.

Trust orientation is influenced by the nature of the decision made and the satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the decision. It is to be expected that the unsuccessful influence attempts that imply unfavourable outcomes is associated with a decrease in confidence but this decrease comes from the bad outcomes rather than the experience of unsuccessful influence. The effect of bad decision on the trust orientation would be no different from the effect if influence had not been attempted at all and the same outcome had been obtained. However, political trust is not determined by decision outcomes only but also by influence experience.
The hypothesized effects of unsuccessful use of a given means of influence on political trust is described below:

If the confident group is exposed to persuasion as the means of influence and this leads to no change in the stance of the group, that is when the persuasion is ineffective, this weakens the existing trust orientation. On the contrary both inducement and constraints will reinforce the existing trust orientation. In case of neutral group both unsuccessful persuasion and constraints will reinforce the existing trust orientation; unsuccessful inducement will weaken the existing trust orientation. The alienated group would experience reinforced existing trust orientation if persuasion and inducement are applied as the means of influence. The group will experience weakened existing trust orientation if constraint is used as the means of influence.

The cause of alienation and anomie might be sought at different levels of abstraction. In a case of alienation, the cause may be the technical or organisational character of an industry or the structure of the bureaucracy; in the case of anomie, it may be a combination of personal affluence and a breakdown, rejection or conflict of norms of authority at home, at school or at work. But the characteristics of the wider society is of crucial importance. The extent and nature of social stratification, the structure of the economy,
the character of the political system, the pace of industrialisation, the degree of pluralism, the nature of the predominant social values all these have influence on the nature and distribution of alienation and anomie. Again, one can argue that some degree of alienation and of anomie is inseparable from life in an industrial society characterised as it is by the ramifying growth of organisation and bureaucracy in all spheres of life, economic centralisation, and the increasing remoteness and comprehensive character of politics, on the one hand, and on the other, by built-in and permanent social changes, the impermanence of existing status hierarchies and the increasing role given to personal ambition and career mobility. Thus, at the most general level, alienation and anomie may be seen to relate to the most universal features of social structure and social change.

In segmented societies, alienation is caused by the isolation of certain categories of people from the majority members of political community, feeling of helplessness to make the demand fulfilled from the authorities, exposure to the coercive devices for ensuring the integrity of the political system, and the feeling of two kinds of relative deprivations, namely, individual and the fraternal. It would be therefore, worthwhile to discover the pattern of political alienation of the minority groups, its social and psychological roots and its implications for national integration.
Empirical Studies

In the section devoted to the resume of empirical studies, we shall begin with the attempts toward the measurement of individual differences with respect to the feeling of alienation and efforts to discover the dimensions of the phenomenon and then proceed to present an account of the studies carried out for the purpose of finding antecedents and consequences of the feeling of alienation explored mainly through correlational or group comparison approaches.

As discussed earlier, Seeman (1959) was one of the first to conceive of alienation as a multidimensional construct of five components and to develop a scale for measuring alienation in terms of the five components. Essentially agreeing with Seeman that alienation represented a Syndrome rather than a unitary phenomenon, Dean (1961) developed a set of scales to measure three dimensions of alienation -- powerlessness, normlessness and social isolation. Dodder (1969) attempted to verify the multidimensionality of Dean's alienation scale by subjecting them to factor analysis. Dodder, however, found that the extracted factors did not coincide with the three a priori dimensions defined by Dean. This led him to conclude that the Dean's subscales did not perform as they were originally conceived and that the items ought to be regrouped to conform to the factors as he discovered by the factor analysis.

Srole's (1956) anomia scale, as a measure of alienation,
has been subjected to extensive analysis. Although, it
indeed belongs to the alienation 'family' (Erbe, 1964),
there appears to be a lack of consensus in the literature
concerning its orthogonality to other dimensions of
alienation as well as its relationship to other variables
(Roberts and Rockeath, 1956; McDill, 1961; Hamblin, 1962;
Struening and Richardson, 1965; Lutterman and Middleton,
1970). The concept of anomia as measured by Srole's scale
appears to be a measure of despair and despondency, a more
generalized form of self-to-others alienation.

Neal and Retting (1963, 1967) developed measures of
powerlessness and normlessness as dimensions of alienation
and in their 1963 study tested and confirmed by means of
factor analysis, the orthogonality of these two measures
relative to both the Srole anomia scale and a status
orientation measure. The powerlessness scale in this analysis
was defined as measurement of expectancy of control over the
outcome of political and economic events. The normlessness
scale consisted of a measure of the expectancy for unapproved
behaviour in business and government. Neither of the scales
is conceptually nor empirically identical to Dean's scales
(Neal and Retting, 1967, p.62). Neal and Retting concluded
that since both scales revealed a latent separation from
Srole's anomia scale this suggested that the a priori assump-
tion of congruence among three dimensions of alienation
(powerlessness, normlessness and anomia) was unwarranted. In addition, the fact that the relationship between mobility values (status orientation) and alienation (defined in terms of the above scale) was not established, they found that this was most likely due to the absence of any alienation concept in the conceptualisation of status orientation (Neal and Retting, 1963, p.607). In the 1967 study Neal and Retting subjected the scales to reanalysis and the results indicated further support for the multi-dimensional conceptualisation of alienation (two dimensions were again confirmed) and were found orthogonal to anomia and status orientation.

The Struening and Richardson's (1965) factor analytical study of these variables did not find evidence of a normlessness on powerlessness dimension as such but did find, among others, an "alienation-via-rejection" dimension which contained all five of the role anomia items and a factor labeled perceived purposelessness. Alienation-via-rejection, in this context is defined as a construct containing strong components of cynicism and distrust bordering on suspicion and was weakly associated with perceived purposelessness. Perceived purposelessness was defined as a measure of "projected anomia" that is the perception of others as leading goal-less, lonely, meaningless lives (Struening and Richardson, 1965, p.771). Struening and Richardson conclude that perceived purposelessness measured a type of middle class
anomia, while alienation-via-rejection measured a type of lower class anomia (p.776).

Like a priori conceptualisation of alienation by different thinkers, the empirical studies too could not lead to firm conclusion regarding the number of components that constitute the syndrome.

A number of empirical studies have shown that political alienation leads to a number of behavioural consequences. There are various interpretations on alienation and political behaviour. One widely held expectation is that the alienated are quiescent under ordinary circumstances but subject to mobilisation into mass movements (or at least support extremest, demagogic and or authoritarian political leaders) when the material and psychological circumstances are conducive and the right leader emerges at the scene. Empirical studies on support for extremist leaders and groups carried out in U.S.A. do not present a very clear picture. Thus Nelson Polsby (1963) found that senator McCarthy gathered the bulk of his support in areas where the republican party was strongest and that his reputed influence on elections outside Wisconsin had no basis. Michael Regin's (1966) study of George Wallace's (1964) democratic presidential primary campaign in Wisconsin demonstrated that Republican crossover voters gave him substantial support. The implication
of the first study is that McCarthy's impact on the behaviour of voters was negligible but the second study indicates that many Republicans may have a natural reservoir of support for classic American demagogues. Some substantiation of the later point is found in the Wolfinger's (1964) study of Christian anti-communist crusaders where the most salient characteristic of the respondents studied was that they were Republicans. The above findings lead to the conclusion that in clearly structured general elections standard reference symbols like party and group govern the direction of voting behaviour but in situations where these symbols provide no clear guide (primaries, non-partisan elections, decisions to join movement of various types) other factors can assume great importance. In the Rogin (Wallace) case many Republicans were people prone to express their regional resentment against outside interference in their lines from Government as well as Negroes and to give this feeling free reign (along with certain working class Democrats) in a primary where an issue appropriate to this sentiment was raised. In the Polsby (McCarthy) case voting was more clearly on party lines and motivations based on resentment were more obscure.

Support for the above mentioned interpretation is found in the literature on the impact of personality on politics ably summarized by Greenstein (1967). Drawing on the writings of Lane (1959), Christie and Jahoda (1954), Levinson (1959) and others in the field, Greenstein stresses that an unambiguous
environment reduces the opportunities for personal variants in behaviour. Where the situation is clearly structured, for example, an attractive reference group takes a clear and definite stand or strong sanctions are attached to certain behaviour alternatives -- the scope for personality to affect behaviour is severely limited.

Writers employing psychological measures of alienation present evidence which appears to confirm the above contention. For example, detailed investigations of referendum voting consistently emphasize the negativism of the politically alienated, leading to a stand on an issue which represents a protest against the existing system. This could also explain the behaviour of certain Republicans in relation to Wallace's candidature.

Studies of the relationship between political alienation and political behaviour have sometimes employed composite measures of different components and sometimes different components are considered separately. The focus of the measurement items in these studies was local government and the dependent variable was vote in a local referendum.

Horton and Thompson (1962) observed that referendums may serve as institutional outlets for protest on the part of the powerless and ordinary apathetic members of the community. They operationally define political alienation as a feeling of powerlessness and an identification of an appropriate
power centre as a controlling agent. They could not only find the expected relationship between the composite index of powerlessness and negative voting but could also present some evidence that the feeling of powerlessness by itself has an independent effect on voting behaviour.

William Gamson's (1961) work on attitudes toward water fluoridation proposals is also germane here. He cites Coleman's (1957) suggestion that this issue gives citizens an opportunity to vent their frustration against local administration who introduce the idea. Gamson attempted to gauge ideological differences between respondents in his Cambridge Massachusetts samples, but found that overt differences in ideology concerning individual rights and government intervention had little to do with the average voter's position of fluoridation in the Cambridge precinct. However, indication of powerlessness and meaninglessness did successfully discriminate opponents of fluoridation from proponents but measures of distrust did not. It was evident that distrust is not necessarily related to issue negativism.

Templeton (1966) found alienation measured by Srole's anomia scale was unrelated to respondents party identification or voting behaviour in 1956 and 1960. However, he found some inferential support for the notion that the quality of the vote casted by an alienated voter may be different, i.e., he tends to vote negatively and is most involved when issues are
perceived in terms of good and evil. Since under most circumstances both major parties present themselves as responsible national voices and both are committed to establish political system, neither provides the citizens with the opportunity to validate his personal rejection of the political system. As a result of this, says Templeton, the alienated citizen tends to withdraw from participation in the national political process. He manifests this through inconsistent voting and low political knowledge and interest.

There is a vast literature concerning the relationship between psychological deprivation and political unrest. In Aberbach and Walker's study it was found that both Whites and Blacks gave a variety of definitions when asked to describe the best possible life, but none of the respondents made direct reference to race relations. While Whites were much more satisfied with their past and present life, both racial groups were strongly optimistic about the future. Responses to the questions for best possible race relationship showed very substantial difference in the views of the two groups. While Blacks talked almost exclusively in terms of total integration, better personal relationship with Whites, the disappearance of colour consciousness and respect and dignity for all, more than 30 per cent of the Whites spontaneously endorsed segregation or separation of some kind. In addition, many more Whites than Blacks were pessimistic about the future. The White community, not the Black, was found to be divided over
the desirability of integration and Whites were found to be more depressed than Blacks about the prospects for future race relations in Detroit.

Some of the researchers have established correlation of alienation to age. Some of them have stated that alienation should increase monotonically with age. Studies reporting this result include Agger et al., (1961), Dean (1961), Eckhardt and Hendershot (1967), Hughes (1967), Milbrath (1965), Olsen (1969) and Wright (1975b). On the other hand, studies of the "youth revolt" have often cited political alienation as a critical factor, suggesting that discontent is highest among the young and decreases with age (Keniston, 1965; Lipset and Altback, 1966; Roszak, 1968; Flacks, 1971). Others argue that "political alienation is associated generally with lack of institutionalized power" (Thompson and Horton, 1960, 1962), that this lack is highest among both the very young and very old and therefore the relationship between alienation and age is curvilinear. Studies reporting this result include Farris (1960), Thompson and Horton (1960) and Philips (1970).

Alienation is also related with party identification. Olsen (1965, 1969), Finifter (1970) have reported that Democrats are more alienated than the Republicans. But Aberbach's (1969) study based on national sample, contradicts this finding. He suggests that the relationship may well reflect which party is in power. Those who identify with the
'in' party will be less alienated than others. Aberbach's comparative study between 1958 and 1964 supports this conclusion.

Dchley, R. Lyons (1970) has done a number of investigations on the political socialization of Ghetto children. Lyon's (1970) data were obtained from paper and pencil questionnaire administered to 2,868 fifth through twelfth grade students attending classes in the Toledo City Public School. The City's student population was divided into inner city and non inner city groupings. The inner city schools were defined as those located within Toledo's Model Cities area: This area was Toledo's hard core slum exhibiting the worst example of physical, social and economic decay in the city.

Two High Schools and eleven Elementary and Junior High Schools served the inner city students. Total student enrolment in the area was 15,174 of which 83 per cent were Negroes. In the non-inner city or 'control area' were six High schools and fifty-two Elementary and Junior High Schools with a total enrolment of 42,528 of which 92 per cent were Whites. Most of the children in the control area were from working or middle class homes. The sample was stratified by grade level (5th to 12th) with 14 class rooms randomly selected for each grade and equally divided between inner city and control areas.
The following findings were drawn from the above mentioned study: Although limited to one city, the data suggest that being Negro is a much stronger predictor of a low sense of efficacy and feelings of cynicism than the mileue. Negro youth were more cynical and felt less efficacious than their White counterparts regardless of where they lived. By the end of elementary school, Negro children had been socialized into a level of cynicism that white students did not reach until the High school years.

There are many factors other than mileue that could explain differences in the sense of efficacy and feelings of cynicism. Explanatory factors investigated in other socialisation studies include the family unit, social class, sex, intelligence, school curriculum, peer groups and the mass media. However, a potentially significant explanatory factor that has received relatively little attention is race. In Lyon's (1970) study after controls were introduced for race, it became evident that the correlations between mileue, the environment in which the children lived and the dependent variable were primarily the result of attitude differences between White and Black children. Negro children, regardless of where they lived, had a lower sense of efficacy and higher feelings of cynicism than White students.
Lyon's (1970) data indicate that sex differences do not appear prior to the end of High School. There were no significant differences between boys and girls in either subsample in regard to efficacy and cynicism. This finding generally supports previous findings made about sex differences in the development of political attitudes among children. Hess and Torney (1967) stated that girls and boys did not differ in perceiving the government to be all for the best or in their feelings of efficacy. Easton and Dennis (1968) could not distinguish between third-to-eighth grade boys and girls on an efficacy index.

There are a limited number of Indian studies on alienation. (Srivastava et al., 1971; Verghese, 1973). According to Singh (1971) alienation in combination with certain psychological characteristics can make positive contribution towards modernisation of the Indian society. He observed alienation combined with a perception of change in the society and a sense of optimism, increased socio-political modernity and aspirations are probably the most important factors of social change in contemporary India.

Sinha and Sinha (1974) factor analysed Seeman's variants of alienation and found five factors, normlessness, conformity, norturance, unfairmeans and morality. Student activism and different aspects of alienation were found to be related and it was suggested that University Campus induced alienation.
Going through the literature on alienation it becomes evident that although much progress is made towards the delineation of the meaning of the concept and its operationalization through the tools developed, to assess an individual’s level of alienation, scholars and research investigators have failed to evolve a consensus regarding the cognitive, connative and behavioural aspects to be subsumed in the concept of alienation.

As far as empirical findings are concerned, the relative importance of both social and personal factors have been recognised but except the general feeling of discontent no other factor can be named to be the factor which is likely to be associated with individual’s alienation from himself or from the social setting. As far as political alienation is concerned, people belonging to the deprived section of the society and minority groups are often found to be more alienated than the people belonging to the prosperous section and the majority community.