VALUE ORIENTATION, ROLE CONFLICT, AND ALIENATION
FROM WORK: A CROSS - CULTURAL STUDY

by
Louis A. ^{Anthony}Zurcher, Jr.

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1965

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

I hereby recommend that this dissertation prepared under my
direction by Louis A. Zurcher, Jr.
entitled Value Orientation, Role Conflict, and Alienation
from Work: A Cross-Cultural Study
be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement of the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Arnold Meadow
Dissertation Director

March 15, 1965
Date

After inspection of the dissertation, the following members
of the Final Examination Committee concur in its approval and
recommend its acceptance:*

Richard Coan
Salvatore V. Zagora
William J. MacKenzie
Henry D. Melby
Stuart A. Queen

March 15, 1965
March 15, 1965
March 15, 1965
Mar 17, 1965
June 3, 1965

*This approval and acceptance is contingent on the candidate's
adequate performance and defense of this dissertation at the
final oral examination. The inclusion of this sheet bound into
the library copy of the dissertation is evidence of satisfactory
performance at the final examination.

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: Louis A. Jander

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Research may of itself be rewarding, but when the investigator is stimulated by enthusiastic advisers and supported by non-restricting agencies, it truly becomes a joy.

The author gratefully makes acknowledgment to the following individuals and organizations for their invaluable assistance: to Drs. Richard W. Coan, William J. MacKinnon, Jerry Miller, Stuart Queen, and Lorenzo Snow, who critically reviewed the dissertation; to Dr. Arnold Meadow, who directed the dissertation and who was, by his uncommon ability to generate fruitful research hypotheses, a constant source of inspiration for the author; to Dr. Salvatore V. Zagona, who over a period of three years has, by a delicate balance of knowledge, understanding, and humor, given the author not only a broader view of psychology, but of life; to the University of Arizona and the National Science Foundation for the Cooperative Graduate Fellowship that enabled the author to pursue, unhampered, the research of his choice; and to the Bureau of Business and Public Research of the University of Arizona, whose resources made it possible for the author to get the appropriate subjects for the research. Without the complete cooperation of the management and personnel of the Valley National Bank (Tucson and Nogales, Arizona branches) and the Banco Nacional de Mexico

(Nogales, Sonora branches) this study would not have been possible.

The author wishes to make special acknowledgment to John R. Henderson, Vice-President of the Valley National Bank, for his continued interest and sound advice throughout the study.

Even under the best of conditions, graduate work has its frustrations. The investigator's reactions to such frustrations may not be reflected in the following pages, but they were apparent, most clearly, to his wife. Thus a special note of acknowledgment is made to Susan Lee Zurcher for her academic acumen, remarkable patience, and her ability to make some otherwise dark days bright.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	viii
ABSTRACT	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
PROCEDURE	30
RESULTS	33
DISCUSSION	49
CONCLUSION	56
APPENDIX A--COPY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN ENGLISH	58
APPENDIX B--COPY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN SPANISH	65
APPENDIX C--LINE EMPLOYEE PARTICULARISM BY CULTURAL ORIGIN	73
APPENDIX D--OFFICER PARTICULARISM BY CULTURAL ORIGIN	74
APPENDIX E--PARTICULARISM SCALE SCORES FOR MEXICAN-AMERICAN (TUCSON) AND MEXICAN-AMERICAN (NOGALES) SUBJECT GROUPS	75
APPENDIX F--PARTICULARISM SCALE SCORES FOR FIRST AND SECOND MEXICAN-QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTRATIONS	76
REFERENCES	77

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Cultural Origin By Particularism Scale Score	34
2. Scale Score Comparison of Subject Groups to Test the Hypothesis: Mexican Group > Mexican-American Group > Anglo-American Group in Particularistic Orientation	36
3. Cultural Origin By Alienation Scale Score	38
4. Scale Score Comparison of Subject Groups to Test the Hypothesis: Mexican Group > Mexican-American Group > Anglo-American Group in Alienation From Work . . .	40
5. Correlations Among the Variables Alienation, Particularism, Longevity, Position Level, Satisfaction with Position, and Plans to Continue Working in the Bank for All Three Groups Combined	44
6. Correlations Among the Variables Alienation, Particularism, Longevity, Position Level, Satisfaction with Position, and Plans to Continue Working in the Bank for the Mexican Subject Group	45

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
7. Correlations Among the Variables Alienation, Particularism, Longevity, Position Level, Satisfaction with Position, and Plans to Continue Working in the Bank for the Mexican-American Subject Group	46
8. Correlations Among the Variables Alienation, Particularism, Longevity, Position Level, Satisfaction with Position, and Plans to Continue Working in the Bank for the Anglo-American Subject Group	47

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure	Page
1. Graph of Particularism Scale Scores as a Function of Cultural Origin	35
2. Graph of Alienation Scale Scores as a Function of Cultural Origin	39

ABSTRACT

Value orientations, both as components of complex organizations and of individual personalities, are central to the dynamics of organizational behavior. The author discusses, in a cross-cultural framework, the sources of the value orientation "universalism-particularism" and, by administration of the Stouffer-Toby Role Conflict Scale to 230 Mexican, Mexican-American, and Anglo-American bank employees in 13 bank branches, supports the hypothesis that particularism is influenced by cultural background.

The bank is described as a universalistically oriented work organization, and the degree of employee particularism, a value orientation in conflict with bank expectations, is seen to be, as hypothesized, a factor contributing to alienation from work.

The pattern of results suggests that longevity, level of position, and expressions of satisfaction with position and plans to continue working in the bank are negatively related to both particularism and to alienation.

INTRODUCTION

The classic Western Electric studies conducted by the Elton Mayo team in the 1930's established that the employee's attitude toward the work organization is a relevant variable in determining his degree of job satisfaction and productivity. (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1959). As the employee came to be perceived as having a complex personality, components of which may or may not articulate with the expectations of the formal work organization, interested behavioral scientists began to speak of the "fusion" of these two dynamic systems. (See, for example: Bakke, 1955; Argyris, 1957, 1964; and Levinson, 1959). Generally, these theories, and the studies which have sprung from them, have been concerned with the description and amelioration of conflicts between expectations of work organizations in a given society and the expectations of employees who have been recruited from that same society. Such research, though certainly fruitful, has been somewhat restricted in its ability to demonstrate sharply the social and psychological situation of employees whose cultural orientation is markedly at odds with that of the work organization.

The purpose of this study is to examine, by cross-cultural comparison, components of a work situation in which an organizational expectation, influenced by the culture of one society, is in clear conflict

with a modal employee value, influenced by the culture of another society. The term value is here used in the sense of "a selective orientation toward experience, implying deep commitment or repudiation, which influences the ordering of choices between possible alternatives in action." (Kluckhohn, 1961, p. 18). Values are taken to have been learned by the individual in his parent culture, and "culture" is considered to be "the distinctive way of life of a group of people, their complete design for living." (Kluckhohn, 1951, p. 86).

The specific value examined in this paper has been drawn from among the "pattern variables" postulated by Parsons and Shils in their general theory of action. According to these authors, the individual in a social situation

is confronted by a series of major dilemmas of orientation, a series of choices that the actor must make before the situation has a definite meaning for him. Specifically, the actor must make five dichotomous choices before any situation will have a determinate meaning. The five dichotomies which formulate these choice alternatives are called "pattern variables," because any specific orientation (and consequently any action) is characterized by a pattern of the five choices.

(Parsons and Shils, 1959, p. 76-77)

One of the pattern variables, that which provides the concept for the present analysis, is "universalism vs. particularism."

As it will be used here, universalism is a value orientation toward institutionalized obligations to society, and particularism is a value orientation toward institutionalized obligations of friendship. Parsons

and Shils (1959) explain that the actor's cultural background will influence, in any given social situation, the selection of one horn or the other of the dichotomies presented by each pattern variable. Thus if an individual is placed in a situation in which he must choose between particularism (duty to a friend) and universalism (duty to an abstract "society"), his choice will reflect the impact of his parent culture.

Though the pattern variables (Universalism-Particularism; Self-orientation-Collectivity-orientation; Affectivity-Affective neutrality; Ascription-Achievement; Specificity-Diffuseness) postulated by Parsons are new terms, the concepts which they represent are solidly based in some of the classic analyses of society. Among the early sociologists, dichotomization (by type) of societal components was a fairly common frame of reference. Emphasizing the historical antecedents of the pattern variable "universalism-particularism," some of the relevant and more influential of these dichotomies will now be presented.

Among the earliest of these students of social structure was Henry Maine (1861) whose contrast of society based on kinship with society based on territory led to his further postulation of societal evolution in terms of status to contract. The effect of Maine's work was far reaching, and its impact can be seen in most of the dichotomous frames of reference formulated by other workers after him.

One of the sociologists (and, from the point of view of the development of this kind of social theory, perhaps the most important sociologist) impressed with Maine's approach was Ferdinand Toennies. Toennies (1887) saw within society two dynamic components: Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. Gemeinschaft was that aspect of society which appears in relations that develop without the deliberate intention of anyone, but out of the mere fact that men live together. On the other hand, Gesellschaft is that aspect of society which appears in the relations entered into deliberately by independent individuals through agreement to achieve certain recognized ends. Relative to the conceptualization "universalism-particularism," Toennies specifically presented, as a case study example of Gemeinschaft, friendship and the friendship group. As a specific example of Gesellschaft, Toennies turned to an analysis of written or codified law. Parsons (1937), in a long footnote (pp. 686-694), reveals the degree to which Toennies' writings have influenced his own work, particularly the formulation of the pattern variables.

Another early sociologist, the third member of the triumvirate (the other two being Maine and Toennies) sometimes cited as having set the stage for all later rural-urban typologies, was Emile Durkheim. Durkheim (as translated by Simpson, 1933), makes the distinction between societies whose social solidarity is "mechanical" and those whose social solidarity is "organic." Mechanical solidarity results from the sharing of common attitudes and sentiments, while organic

solidarity results from the complementary functional usefulness of the members of the group. One of the key variables for social solidarity is the division of labor within the society. As this division increases in complexity the society moves from social homogeneity to social heterogeneity. Under the latter condition the behavioral controls of the more concrete kinship relationships diminish, while those of abstract laws, societal norms, etc., increase.

Cooley (1909), dichotomizing human groups into those "primary" and those "secondary," pointed to the spontaneity, emotionality, and close interpersonal dependency within the former group, and to the rationality, purposefulness, and formality within the latter group. Goldenweiser (1922), in an analysis of five primitive societies relative to "civilized" society, observed that in the primitive societies of first importance is the network of kinship and quasi-kinship relations. The individual does not, as in more "advanced" societies, figure as a conspicuous unit.

MacIver (1927), largely following Toennies' distinction between Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, developed the contrast between "community" as a complete system of social life based on territory and "associations" which promote specific interests. Within the community the roles played by the member were fewer and broader, and interpersonal relations an end in themselves. Within the association, on the other hand, roles were narrow, and delimited in accordance with the

goals of the association. Similarly, interpersonal relations came to have meaning largely in terms of the association's goals.

In discussing the effect of the Renaissance upon such diverse societal components as ethics, arts, and politics, Alfred von Martin (1932) makes some interesting observations about changes in interpersonal relations. According to von Martin, the Renaissance was the cultural and social breach between the Middle Ages and modern times. The increased emphasis upon a money economy espoused individual competition, and broke down individual dependence upon group and community. As a result, the unifying societal factor "was no longer an organic or communal one (e.g., blood relationship, neighborhood, or the relationships of service) but an artificial and mechanized social organization. . . ." (1932, p. 11). Von Martin goes on to describe the beginning of "that characteristic of society as opposed to community" the modern trait of basic distrust - of not being able to trust, to have confidence in, or owe allegiance to one's fellow man (1932, p. 12). Thus, as the social group travels from one pole of von Martin's dichotomy to the other, from community to society, the obligations of and definitions for friendship undergo considerable change. Ruth Benedict (1934) reports similar changes in interpersonal dependence and allegiance in her analysis of the dichotomies "Apollonian" society and "Dionysian" society. Intense competition within the latter societal type stands in sharp contrast to the cooperation within the former.

Influenced by von Weise and Park, Howard Becker and R. C. Meyers (1942) distinguish between "sacred" and "secular" human associations. Within the "sacred" typology are included intense kinship bonds, as well as intense and unquestioned friendship. These close relationships are manifested in the automatic and immediate mutual aid shown by one member to another. To neglect one's duty to his fellow brings group ostracism.

The most publicized (and most controversial) of the contemporary dichotomized societal typologies is that of Redfield's "folk-urban continuum."

In one of his major works, Redfield (1941) compares four communities on the Yucatan Peninsula, each of the four differing as to the degree of isolation from urban centers of modifying influence. He observes that the less isolated communities are more secular, more money oriented, and that behavior is more individualistic and less group dependent. In those communities which were more influenced by urban centers, Redfield reports diminished importance of familial relationships, increased impersonality, and a shift from the sacred to the secular. Based upon his observations, Redfield offers the framework of the "folk-urban continuum," and states that in the urban ideal type "the increase of contracts, bringing about heterogeneity and disorganization of culture, constitutes one sufficient cause of secularization and individualization" (1941, p. 344).

In a later work, Redfield (1947) concentrates on a description of the folk society, which he describes as being small, isolated, nonliterate, homogeneous, and as having a strong sense of group solidarity. The characteristics of the folk society are, according to Redfield:

- 1) There is very little division of labor except between men and women.
- 2) Except for the family, which is the basic unit of social organization, there is an absence of differentiated associations.
- 3) The people of the small community are well known to one another.
- 4) Social control is largely exercised through folkways and mores, enforced by the informal pressures of the community.
- 5) There is an extremely strong sense of unity binding the community together.
- 6) The community is economically self-sufficient.

(1947, p. 354)

Redfield emphasizes, throughout his discussion of the folk society, the concreteness, immediacy, and matter-of-factness of interpersonal allegiance and dependence. The following quotes from The Folk Society are especially relevant to the conceptualization "universalism-particularism":

The folkways are the ways that grow up out of long and intimate association of men with each other. . . . There are no formal contracts or other agreements. . . . There is no objectivity and no systematization of knowledge as guided by what seems to be its internal order. . . . The member of this

mentally constructed society does not stand off from his customary conduct and subject it to scrutiny apart from its meaning for him as that meaning is defined in culture. Nor is there any habitual exercise of classification, experiment, and abstraction for its own sake, least of all for the sake of intellectual ends. . . . Behavior is personal, not impersonal. A "person" may be defined as that social object which I feel to respond to situations as I do; a person is myself in another form, his qualities and values are inherent within him, and his significance for me is not merely one of utility. A "thing," on the other hand, is a social object which has no claim upon my sympathies, which responds to me, as I conceive it, mechanically; its value for me exists in so far as it serves my end. In the folk society all human beings admitted to the society are treated as persons; one does not deal impersonally (thing fashion) with any other participant in the little world of that society. . . . It is not merely that relations in such a society are personal; it is also that they are familial The kinship connections provide a pattern in terms of which, in the ideal folk society, all personal relations are conventionalized and categorized.

(1947, pp. 300-303)

In Redfield's view, the folk society is a familial society, and the kin are the type persons for all interpersonal experience. The member's behavior is guided by reference to the personal and the emotional, and the reward and punishment structure of the society is not based on abstract laws or categorized sanctions, but revolves around a central value for interpersonal dependency.

The use of such conceptualizations as "the folk-urban continuum" and "ideal types" like those described above has not been without criticism. A leading critic has been Oscar Lewis, who restudied Tepoztlan, a Mexican community earlier analyzed by Redfield (1930) and upon

which analysis Redfield's theory was partly based. Lewis (1951) presents the following six criticisms of the conceptual framework with regard to its utility for the study of culture change and for cultural analysis:

- 1) The folk-urban conceptualization of social change focuses attention primarily on the city as the source of change, to the exclusion or neglect of other factors of an internal or external nature. . . .
- 2) . . . culture change may not be a matter of folk-urban progression, but rather an increasing or decreasing heterogeneity of culture elements. For example. . . the incorporation of Spanish rural elements, such as the plow . . . did not make Tepoztlan more urban, but rather gave it a more varied rural culture. . . .
- 3) Some of the criteria used in the definition of the folk society are treated by Redfield as linked or interdependent variables, but might be better treated as independent variables. . . .
- 4) The typology involved in the folk-urban classification of societies tends to obscure. . . the wide range in the ways of life and in the value systems among so-called primitive peoples. The criteria used are concerned with the purely formal aspects of society. . . . Focusing only on the formal aspects of urban society reduces all urban societies to a common denominator and treats them as if they all had the same culture. It should be clear that the concept "urban" is too much of a catchall to be useful for cultural analysis. Moreover, it is suggested here that the question posed by Redfield, namely, what happens to an isolated, homogeneous society when it comes into contact with an urbanized

society, cannot possibly be answered in a scientific way because the question is too general and the terms used do not give us the necessary data. What we need to know is what kind of an urban society, under what conditions of contact, and a host of other specific historical data.

- 5) The folk-urban classification has serious limitations in guiding field research because of the highly selective implications of the categories themselves and the rather narrow focus of the problem. The emphasis upon essentially formal aspects of culture leads to neglect of psychological data and, as a rule, does not give insight into the character of the people.
- 6) Finally, underlying the folk-urban dichotomy as used by Redfield, is a system of value judgments which contains the old Rousseauian notion of primitive people as noble savages, and the corollary that with civilization has come the fall of man. . . . It is assumed that all folk societies are integrated while urban societies are the great disorganizing force. . .

(Lewis, 1951, pp. 432-440)

Whether or not one agrees with the ideal type framework for societal analysis, one cannot dispute the fact that valuable cultural facts have been unearthed by such techniques. In his critique of the folk-urban continuum, Miner writes that "the most valuable feature of the continuum is the fact that it provides a framework within which various theoretical fields may be integrated to provide greater understanding of the nature and course of culture change" (1952, p. 537).

There appears to be little doubt that such analyses are often subjective, tend to oversimplify, and often fallaciously imply unwarranted causative relationships. However, it appears to this writer that the major errors are not with ideal type analysis itself, but with the users of the technique, especially with their tendency to reify concepts. Like any theoretical construct, ideal types can, even if in the face of later evidence they are demonstrated to be inadequate, be of immense heuristic value. Similarly, like any theoretical construct, ideal types should not be spared the test of more operationalized empirical investigations. Some of the studies to be described below (especially those of Loomis and Stouffer and Toby) and the present investigation, are attempts to define operationally and measure systematically some of the conceptual components that have sprung from ideal type dichotomies.

One recent and systematic investigation of the sociological characteristics of rural society is that presented by Charles Loomis. In Rural Social Systems, a book that he co-authored with J. Allen Beegle (1950), Loomis investigates, among other variables, the value structure in rural society. The authors devised an instrument whereby students in rural sociology classes could compare aspects of the value orientation and social structure of various systems with which they had experience. In addition to the students' comparisons, Loomis and Beegle report evaluations of other systems made by three experienced

and professional rural sociologists. The main value variables assessed were:

1) integration of roles in system	vs. conflicting roles in system
2) required integration of roles in and out of system	vs. roles outside the system irrelevant
3) all responsible for each, each responsible for all	vs. limited responsibility
4) members interaction confined to system	vs. interaction distributed to many systems
5) solidary	vs. antagonistic
6) sacred	vs. secular
7) traditional	vs. rationally efficient
8) influenced by emotion	vs. rational, designed, planned
9) personal	vs. impersonal

(1950, p. 814)

The main social systems compared for these variables were respondents' families, military units, a typical Amish family, a Mexican-American work organization, and a federal government bureau. The dichotomized variables above were taken by Loomis and Beegle to span a continuum running from familistic Gemeinschaft to contractual Gesellschaft.

In writing of those aspects of value structure that may be taken to be relevant to particularism, Loomis and Beegle write that "friendship and kinship groups have the value orientation which includes the objective which, if it can be expressed at all, may be as broad as 'preserving our way of life' or 'keeping our gang together'" (1950, p. 8). The authors' analysis of the Mexican-American work organization (located in El Cerrito, New Mexico), reveals a high value for interpersonal relationships such as those involved in friendship and kinship ties. Loomis and Beegle dramatically highlight their point when they report:

One cannot stay long in a New England or a Spanish-speaking village in the United States without noting great differences in informal groupings. In New England one is impressed with the reserve and lack of intense interaction maintained in all groups, and the general attitude that neighbors should "stay in their places." In Spanish-speaking villages there is much more interaction in which friendships as well as antagonistic relations emerge, and this interaction, at least on the surface, is more intense and emotion laden.

(1950, p. 149)

Compared with other social systems evaluated, members of the Mexican-American group manifest a very high value orientation for family solidarity, for personal rather than impersonal interpretations, and for mutual responsibility to other members. Loomis and Beegle find also the Mexican-Americans to be "particularistic." These authors' use of the concept "particularistic" is, however, broader in

scope than the friendship emphasis it has in this paper. For Loomis and Beegle, "particularism" includes such special traits as origin, race, and so forth not supposed to be related to any universal principle, such as the practice of choosing the most competent person (1950, p. 820).

Attempting to find an operational procedure for linking the study of social norms with the study of personality, Stouffer and Toby (1951) developed, with 648 undergraduate subjects, a "Role Conflict Scale." The Role Conflict Scale is a four item Guttman scale which purports to sound a respondent's particularistic value orientation by presenting four situations involving conflicts between obligations to a friend and more general social obligations, and forcing the individual to make a choice between one horn of the dilemma or the other. (See Appendix A). In preparing the research, the authors asked themselves the question "Do the answers to the items indicate the existence of a unidimensional scale, along which respondents can be ordered as to the degree to which they are likely to possess a trait or bias toward the particularistic solution of the dilemma?" (1951, p. 397). After first establishing the unidimensionality of the scale, the authors then investigated the relationship between the scale and other verbal responses relative to the role conflict, and established a tentative, but consistent degree of concurrent validity for the scale. The conclusion of the authors is that it is possible to classify people according to a predisposition to select one or the other horn of a dilemma in role conflict.

To the degree, then, that an individual is affected by the socio-cultural milieu in which he has developed, his personality will encompass certain values and he will expect certain role behavior for himself and for others shaped around these values. Similarly, such values will play a key part in his general orientation to specific situations. The specific situation presented here is a bureaucratic work organization in the United States.

Typically, the United States is described as a universalistically oriented society. Complex technology and the accompanying reverence for the "scientific" and the "abstract," emphasis on the independence and mobility of the individual, and a value for competition and achieved status tend to isolate the American from his concrete relation to others. This isolation, and its effect upon human personality, has been a favorite topic of such contemporary social philosophers as Fromm (1940), Reisman (1950), and Buber (1958). In a universalistic society, friendship, as Cohen (1961) points out, tends to be expedient and manipulative, and valued mainly in terms of material or status gain.

The American work situation reflects the societal ethos.

Parsons writes that

the American occupational system is universalistic and achievement oriented. . . . Compared with other possible ways of organizing the division of labor, the predominant norms which are institutionalized in the American society and which embody the predominant value orientation of the culture give rise to expectations

that occupational roles will be treated by their incumbents and those who are associated with them universalistically. . .

(1954, p. 79)

These universalistic expectations are strikingly manifested in that most representative of American work organizations, the bureaucracy. Weber characterizes the bureaucratic work setting as one in which there is an emphasis upon a rational organization ordered by rules, a high degree of disciplined behavior, an established office hierarchy, clearly defined areas for the power of each office, and appointed specialists to fill these offices (Gerth and Mills, 1946, p. 50). Within such a work structure, the employee is expected to be impersonal in his relationships with other employees and with clients or customers, to put loyalty to the company first above other loyalties, and to value the external motivators of status and achievement above the rewards of interpersonal relations. Merton (1956), Mills (1953), Whyte (1948), Blauner (1964), and Zurcher (1963, 1964, 1965) have discussed in detail the necessity of living up to such organizational expectations if the employee is to be a "success."

In contrast to the United States, Mexico, with its less technical, less "scientific," less urban society, appears to be predominately particularistic in orientation. A central factor accounting for the Mexican's value orientation to friendship appears to be his deep involvement in an extended kinship system (Parsons and Shils, 1959; Lewis,

1960). Furthermore, the Mexican is reported to have a general distrust of and disregard for the authority of government and laws and seldom feels responsibility under these "societal" obligations (Zurcher and Meadow, 1964). Thus whereas the Anglo-American tends to evaluate other individuals primarily in terms of their accomplishments or "worth" in the eyes of society, the Mexican primarily assesses others in terms of a personal relationship with them. The Mexican seems less inclined to abstract from the personal to the normative, to relate to others in an impersonal, objective manner. This mode of interpersonal association seems strongly to be influenced by a profound dependence upon the family. As Lewis points out, "Without his family, the (Mexican) individual stands prey to every form of aggression, exploitation, and humiliation" (1960, p. 54). This "family" goes far beyond the basic nuclear family. Not only does it extend through a web of uncles, aunts, in-laws, and distant cousins, but through a large number of compadres, or god parents. The latter are to be given all the respect and courtesy due blood relatives, and "are morally bound to stand by each other in time of need and danger" (Dozier, 1964, p. 34). This personal and intimate association within the family, with both blood and fictive kin, is extended into the entire social world of the adult. Redfield observes that the result of such a pattern "is a group of people among whom prevail the personal and categorized relationships that characterize the families as we know them, and in which the patterns

of kinship tend to be extended outward from the group of genealogically connected individuals to the whole society" (1947, p. 296). The "world view" of individuals in the type of society which fosters extended and compadre kinship systems is described by Cohen as containing definitions of human relationships in terms of "propinquity, intimacy, and solidarity" and as influencing the perception of social situations in terms of "close personal bonds" (1961, pp. 353-354).

The impact of such a "world view" is manifest in the patterns of Mexican business. According to McClelland (1961), the Mexican businessman demonstrates a significantly higher need for affiliation and a significantly lower need for achievement than does the Anglo-American businessman. Fayerweather reports that the Mexican seems to be considerably more concerned with adjusting relationships among people than with solving a problem efficiently at the expense of such relationships. He reports the case of a Mexican purchasing agent working for a United States subsidiary in Mexico, who was encouraged by his Anglo boss to crack down on a production manager for storing too many excess parts, and on a particular supplier who was delivering, consistently late, poorly manufactured parts. The Mexican purchasing agent, though he fully understood the efficiency problem, could not be punitive, because he was

more interested in the personal relations involved. . . . He felt that the American did not understand how loyal and helpful the supplier had been in a pinch in the past and how much the production manager just wanted a high inventory to feel better.

(1959, pp. 1-3)

Fayerweather further comments that

in Mexico, very few people are actively opposed to being on time, following plans, or obeying any of the other rules of industrial discipline. When they do not obey them, it is because some conflicting avenue of action appeared and they felt it was very important. One of the major conflicting avenues of action is seen to be the maintenance of personal alliances.

(1959, p. 54)

The author does not mean to imply, of course, that every Mexican is clearly particularistic and every Anglo-American is clearly universalistic. One would expect to find rural areas within the United States in which the population, involved in an extended kinship system, would manifest the particularistic orientation. On the other hand, there are some highly urbanized areas in Mexico in which one would expect to find a trend toward universalism. However, at the present developmental level of the two societies, universalism for the United States and particularism for Mexico would appear to be the mode, these orientations having a significant impact on the patterns of daily living.

In order to determine the feasibility of carrying out a cross-cultural comparison of universalism-particularism, and to appraise the degree of particularism in a group of Mexican-Americans relative to a comparable group of Anglo-Americans, a pilot study was conducted by the author. The Stouffer-Toby Role Conflict Scale was administered to 40 Mexican-American high school students and to 40 Anglo-American high school students, the two groups having first been matched for sex,

grade level, and socio-economic class. Analysis of the data revealed the Mexican-Americans to be significantly more particularistic than their counterparts (t-test, $p < .03$).

Based upon a survey of the literature, observations in both the Mexican and Anglo societies, and the encouraging results of the pilot study, the author hypothesized that a cross cultural comparison of otherwise like-situated groups of Mexicans, Mexican-Americans, and Anglo-Americans would reveal the following: that the Mexicans, by virtue of their association with the Mexican culture and kinship system, would be significantly more particularistic than the Mexican-Americans, and the Mexican-Americans, by virtue of their marginal position between the two cultures, would be significantly more particularistic than the Anglo-Americans.

When it was decided that the cross-cultural sample would be composed of employees from the same type of work organization, thus providing the design with some built-in controls, the question arose: What if this work organization were a bureaucracy? Since a bureaucracy is, in fact, forcefully universalistic in nature, might not these universalistic expectations conflict with the expectations of employees having a particularistic orientation? Might not the result of this conflict be manifest in a measure of the degree of alienation from work? It was therefore hypothesized that, in a universalistic work organization, there would be a significant positive correlation between particularism

and alienation from work and that Mexicans would be significantly more alienated than Mexican-Americans, who in turn would be significantly more alienated than Anglo-Americans. The work organization chosen for this study was the bank.

In recent years, the concept of "alienation" has become quite fashionable among American social scientists. Nisbet observed that the hypothesis of alienation "has become nearly as prevalent as the doctrine of enlightened self-interest was two generations ago" (1953, p. 15). Blauner writes that "modern man is said to be alienated from himself, from other human beings, from political life, from work, from his intellectual and artistic productions, from religion, belief, and culture" (1964, p. 2). As represented by Man Alone (Josephson and Josephson, 1962), anthologies are being published which purport to portray the all-inclusiveness of the alienation of contemporary man.

Blauner (1964) sees the current popularity of "alienation" and its various components as a further manifestation of the social climate of a society also fascinated by psychoanalysis, existentialism, and Zen Buddhism. The United States is an affluent society, and affluence spawns an atmosphere in which intellectuals can turn to concerns with the cultural and spiritual malaise. A further stimulus to the interest in alienation, according to Blauner, was provided by the belated discovery and publication of the early works of Karl Marx, especially the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844. In the latter work

Marx strongly presents his thesis concerning the alienation of the worker separated by economic exploitation from the fruits of his labor.

Since "alienation" is a complex and philosophical concept, it has been defined and dealt with in many different ways by many different theorists. In general, those who have been interested in and who have written about alienation have concentrated in one of the three following areas of alienation: 1) alienation of the individual from society; 2) alienation of the individual from a specific social situation; or 3) alienation of the individual from himself.

Before they brought their research techniques to bear on selected aspects of alienation, and in order to facilitate measurement, interested social scientists saw the need to "put the house in order," to delimit the broad philosophical conceptualizations and to provide operational definitions.

One of the first researchers to take this task in hand was Gwynn Nettler (1957), who reviewed some of the philosophical discussions of alienation, decided to concentrate on alienation of the individual from society, and constructed a seventeen item scale to measure such alienation. In setting the stage for the study, Nettler differentiates between "anomie" and "alienation," a set of distinctions which, in this author's opinion, has influenced, and been maintained in, subsequent alienation studies by other workers. Anomie, as Nettler uses it, refers to a societal condition of relative normlessness. Alienation,

on the other hand, refers to a psychological state of an individual - in his study, a feeling of estrangement from the society and the culture it carries. This view of alienation as a psychological phenomenon, as a quality of personal experience resulting from some kind of social situation, seems to be, as manifest in the literature, commonly accepted.

One of the most frequently cited articles by a social scientist concerning a research orientation to aspects of alienation is Seeman's (1959) "On the Meaning of Alienation." Seeman agrees that "alienation" and its components have an important place in behavioral studies, and after carefully reviewing the literature, presents what he feels to be the five basic ways in which the concept of alienation is used: 1) Powerlessness; 2) meaninglessness; 3) normlessness; 4) isolation; and 5) self-estrangement. (As did Nettler, Seeman considers alienation to be social-psychological in nature, and to be a property of the actor.)

Seeman sees "powerlessness" as a representation primarily of the Marxian view of alienation, and defines it as the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcome, or reinforcement, he seeks. "Meaninglessness" results 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. Durkheim's concept of anomie fosters the concept of "normlessness," which Seeman defines as a high expectance that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve

given goals. "Isolation" reflects Nettler's interest in "apartness from society" and is defined as a state in which the individual assigns low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society. The last meaning of alienation categorized by Seeman, "self-estrangement," has enjoyed great popularity with the general reading public (Fromm, 1940; Whyte, 1948; and Reisman, 1950), and is defined (by Seeman) as the degree of dependence of the given behavior of an individual upon anticipated future rewards, that is, rewards that lie outside the activity itself. Seeman declares that the task for experimental or analytical research is to determine the social conditions that produce these five variants of alienation and to understand their behavioral consequences. (Seeman, 1959, pp. 783-791).

In a follow-up study to Seeman's work, Dean (1961) developed a twenty-four item "alienation" scale which included sub-scales for powerlessness, normlessness, and isolation. He found the three sub-scales to demonstrate enough overall correlation to name alienation a syndrome, but the inter-correlations not to be high enough to discount each of the three components as a separate entity.

The first application of measurement of alienation within a social system that this writer could discover was made by Clark (1959). Clark felt that the common denominator in all definitions of alienation was powerlessness, and he defined alienation as "the discrepancy between the power a man believes he has and what he believes he should have -

the degree to which a man feels powerless to achieve the role he has determined to be rightfully his in a specific situation or situations" (1959, p. 849). In Clark's opinion, the attempt to measure alienation within any such general construct as "culture" or "society" was in vain, since the individual is differentially involved in society, and participates in varying degrees of intensity in different social situations. Following this opinion, he constructed a five item Guttman scale of alienation, which he administered to the members of an agricultural cooperative organization, and found alienation scores negatively correlated with satisfaction with, participation in, and knowledge about the organization.

Influenced by Clark's work, and impressed by the advantages of studying alienation in a specified social situation, Pearlin (1962) developed a four item Guttman scale of alienation (See Appendix A). Pearlin used the same definition of alienation, as Clark did, but operationalized that definition with a scale that attempted to measure alienation from work among 1315 nursing personnel in a large government hospital. Alienation was intensified, Pearlin found as the positional disparity between superordinates and their subject increases, when authority is exercised in a peremptory fashion, when authority figures are physically inaccessible, when there is limited potential for achievement and dissatisfaction with extrinsic work rewards, and when work must be carried on in relative isolation and without outside ties to fellow workers (1962, pp. 314-326).

By far the most ambitious and systematic study of alienation from work is that recently carried out and reported by Blauner (1964). Blauner defines alienation as quality of personal experience which results from specific kinds of social arrangements - a general syndrome made up of a number of different objective conditions and subjective feeling states which emerge from certain relationships between workers and the sociotechnical settings of employment (1964, p. 15). He describes the syndrome alienation as being composed of the five components outlined by Seeman (presented above). Drawing his data by secondary analysis from a Roper-Fortune job-attitude survey and from his own interview schedules, Blauner compares, for alienation from work, employees in four work settings: printing, textile, automobile, and chemical. Developing the thesis that alienation is no automatic product of modern industrial conditions, he demonstrates that printers, having maximum freedom in the work situation, are less alienated than the less autonomous textile workers, who are in turn less alienated from the job than are the severely controlled automobile workers. The chemical plant employees, whose jobs are within a completely automated plant, are the least alienated of all four groups of workers. Pointing to the elements of control over the work situation, the broad view of the production process, and the opportunity for social interaction on the job that are available to the employee in the chemical plant, Blauner sees automation as having the potential to mitigate

alienation from work.

Ideally, an interview schedule of the kind used by the Roper-Fortune survey or by Blauner would have been most useful to sound the degree of and components of alienation among the bank employees in this study. However, since the questionnaire packet was administered during bank working hours, the investigator was allowed a maximum of twenty minutes for the entire administrative procedure. The Pearlin Alienation from Work Scale, therefore, since it was developed for use in a bureaucracy, was short, and measured what some theorists think to be the central component of alienation (powerlessness), was chosen for administration in the banks.

The Stouffer-Toby Role Conflict Scale is, as described above, a prototype instrument, and is composed of only four Guttman items. A longer, more thorough and penetrating measure of the particularistic value orientation, perhaps after the fashion of the Loomis and Beegle continuum introduced earlier in this paper, would have been desirable. Again, the time limitation on administration made it necessary to choose a brief scale, precluding the use of a more extensive measure of particularism and its components.

The major hypotheses stated above concerning alienation and particularism suggest the corollary hypotheses: that both particularism and alienation would be negatively correlated with: 1) level of position in the bank; 2) questionnaire items concerning satisfaction with work

and intention to make bank employment a career, and 3) longevity of employment.

PROCEDURE

The work environment of the bank was chosen as the setting for this study because it provided an accessible and cross-culturally comparable bureaucratic organization from which to draw subjects. Mexican and American banks are almost identical in formal organization and operating procedures, the former being based upon the structure of the latter.

Three experimental groups were employed, the number of subjects for all three groups totaling two hundred and thirty. The first group was composed of native born, Spanish speaking (unilingual) Mexican citizens employed by two bank branches in Nogales, Sonora. The second group was composed of bilingual (Spanish-English) Mexican-Americans employed by two bank branches in Nogales, Arizona,¹ and the third group was composed of English speaking (unilingual) Anglo-Americans employed by nine bank branches in Tucson, Arizona. All eleven United States banks are branches of the same parent organization. Both of the Mexican banks are branches of the same Mexican parent organization. All employees of the banks (up to the position of vice-president

1. Bi-lingualism and United States citizenship are conditions for employment in the Nogales, Arizona, bank branches.

and including at least one vice-president for each cultural group) who were at work on that day were administered the questionnaire. The final sample included all of these employees, with the exception of one Anglo-American who was removed from the Mexican-American group, and 14 Mexican-Americans who were removed from the Anglo-American group. The employees of the Nogales, Sonora, banks are all Mexicans. The three groups were matched for proportion of officers (approximately one to every six line employees). They were comparable for employee longevity (median is two to four years for each group), and for age (median is twenty to twenty-nine years).

The mimeographed questionnaire form was administered, either before or after customer hours, to the on-the-job employees by the author himself. Prior to the administration, the employees were gathered together and told by the experimenter that their anonymous responses were considered to be confidential, would not be seen by any other bank personnel, and would be used for research purposes only by the University of Arizona. The employees were then given copies of the questionnaire, and went to their own work spaces to fill them out. When finished with the forms, the employees returned them to the experimenter. Members of management simultaneously filled out the forms and did not influence the line employees in any way. The same procedure was employed in every bank branch.

The questionnaire packet contained, in the following order: 1) Biographical and employment questions; 2) the Stouffer-Toby Role Conflict Scale; 3) the Pearlin Alienation from Work Scale; and 4) the questions "Do you expect to continue working with the bank for the rest of your working career?" _____yes _____no; and "Is your satisfaction with the position you hold _____above average _____average _____below average?" (See Appendices A and B for copies of the questionnaire in both English and Spanish).

The questionnaires were coded, and the data tabulated and analyzed by the Numerical Analysis Laboratory of the University of Arizona. In addition to the appropriate correlations and tests for significance of differences, both the Stouffer-Toby and the Pearlin scales, since they had been originally developed with different subject groups and since they had been translated into Spanish for the Mexican group, were again submitted to tests for Guttman scalability.

RESULTS

Table 1 and Figure 1 present the number of Mexican, Mexican-American, and Anglo-American subjects for each particularism scale score. Since the Stouffer-Toby Role Conflict Scale is a four item Guttman Scale, the scores may range from zero to four, with a score of zero indicating a minimum and a score of four indicating a maximum orientation toward particularism. Statistical analysis of these data by use of the Extended Median Test for k Groups (Siegel, 1956, p. 179-184) demonstrates the orientation toward particularism to be significantly different among the Mexican, Mexican-American, and Anglo-American subject groups.

In order to test the hypothesis of directionality, that the Mexican group is more particularistic than the Mexican-American group, which is in turn more particularistic than the Anglo-American group, the pattern of scale scores in each of the three groups was compared by the One-Tailed Median Test for Two Independent Groups (Siegel, 1956, pp. 111-116) with the pattern of scale scores in the other two. The results of these comparisons, presented in Table 2, are all statistically significant beyond the .02 probability level.

The alienation data were similarly analyzed. The Pearlin Alienation from Work Scale is also a four item Guttman Scale, and the

TABLE 1
CULTURAL ORIGIN BY PARTICULARISM SCALE SCORE*

Cultural Origin	0	Scale Score		3	4	Number in Group
		1	2			
Mexican	4	7	9	8	10	38
Mexican-American	21	12	4	5	1	43
Anglo-American	102	26	11	8	2	149
Total	127	45	24	21	13	230

* χ^2 for k groups = 41.95
With two degrees of freedom, $p < .001$

**Fig. 1. Graph of Particularism Scale Scores
as a Function of Cultural Origin.**

TABLE 2

SCALE SCORE COMPARISON OF SUBJECT GROUPS TO TEST

THE HYPOTHESIS: MEXICAN GROUP > MEXICAN-
AMERICAN GROUP > ANGLO-AMERICAN GROUP

IN PARTICULARISTIC ORIENTATION

Subject Groups	Median for Combined Groups	Chi Square	df	p=
Mexican vs. Mexican- American (N = 81)	1	16.69	1	<.0005
Mexican vs. Anglo- American (N = 187)	0	53.29	1	<.0005
Mexican-American vs. Anglo-American (N = 192)	0	4.75	1	<.025

scores may range from zero (minimum alienation) to four (maximum alienation). Table 3 and Figure 2 present the frequency of scale scores for alienation by groups. Application of the Extended Median Test to the pattern of alienation scores by groups demonstrates the degree of alienation from work to be significantly different among the Mexican, Mexican-American, and Anglo-American subject groups.

The hypothesis of directionality, that the Mexican group is more alienated from work than the Mexican-American group, which in turn is more alienated than the Anglo-American group, was partially supported by the One-Tailed Median Test. As indicated in Table 4, the Mexicans were found to be significantly more alienated from work in the bank than the Mexican-Americans and the Anglo-Americans, but the Mexican-Americans were not significantly more alienated than the Anglo-Americans.

During the analyses of the data, some additional questions relevant to experimental control arose. Are there any sex differences manifest in the degree of particularism and alienation? Even though the three cultural groups are matched for the proportion of bank officers to line employees, are the differing degrees of particularism more a function of position level than of cultural background? Does the fact that the three cities in which the subjects work and live differ in population, size, and degree of urbanization confound the impact of cultural differences in particularism?

TABLE 3
CULTURAL ORIGIN BY ALIENATION SCALE SCORE*

Cultural Origin	<u>Scale Score</u>					Number in Group
	0	1	2	3	4	
Mexican	8	7	4	17	2	38
Mexican-American	8	7	16	8	4	43
Anglo-American	36	25	50	30	8	149
Total	52	39	70	55	14	230

* χ^2 for k groups = 8.759
With two degrees of freedom, $p < .02$

**Fig. 2 Graph of Alienation Scale Scores
as a Function of Cultural Origin.**

TABLE 4
 SCALE SCORE COMPARISON OF SUBJECT GROUPS TO
 TEST THE HYPOTHESIS: MEXICAN GROUP >
 MEXICAN-AMERICAN GROUP > ANGLO-
 AMERICAN GROUP IN ALIENATION
 FROM WORK

Subject Groups	Median for Combined Groups	Chi Square	df	p=
Mexican vs. Mexican- American (N = 81)	2	3.29	1	<.05
Mexican vs. Anglo- American (N = 187)	2	7.50	1	<.005
Mexican-American vs. Anglo-American (N = 192)	2	.02	1	NS

The sex distribution for the entire subject group was 102 males, 128 females. The within-groups sex distribution was: Mexican, 22 males, 16 females; Mexican-American, 14 males, 29 females; and Anglo-American, 66 males, 83 females. Since all the bank officers in this study were males (with the exception of 2 Anglo females), it was decided to make a comparison of alienation and particularism by sex using only the bank line employees. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov Two Sample comparison of particularism scale scores by sex revealed that male-female differences were not significant at or beyond the .05 level ($D_{\max} = .112$; $D_{\max}$ needed for .05 level, .204). Using the same statistical procedure, a comparison of alienation scale scores by sex revealed that the male-female differences were not significant at or beyond the .05 level ($D_{\max} = .124$; $D_{\max}$ needed for .05 level, .205). Similarly, no significant correlations were found among the variables alienation, particularism, longevity, satisfaction with position, and plans to continue working in the bank. A significant correlation ($-.44, p < .01$) was found between sex and position level.

To assess the effect of position level on particularism (more accurately than the correlational data in Tables 5-8), the patterns of particularism scale scores for line employees were analyzed. The extended Median Test for k Groups applied to all cultural groups combined, and the One-Tailed Median Test for between group comparisons, were all significant beyond at least the .05 level. (See Appendix C for

scale score patterns and individual significances). The patterns of scale scores for officer personnel were also analyzed, the Extended Median Test for all groups combined and the Fisher Exact Probability Test (Siegel, 1956, pp. 127-136) again all significant beyond at least the .05 level. (See Appendix D for scale score patterns and individual significances).

As a means of determining the degree of confounding due to variability in urbanization among the three bank locations, the particularism scale scores of the 14 Mexican-American Tucson subjects (who had been removed from the Tucson Anglo sample) were compared with those of the 43 Mexican-American Nogales, Arizona subjects. Tucson, Arizona (population approx. 250,000) is considerably more urbanized than Nogales, Arizona (population approx. 7,000). The Kolmogorov-Smirnov Two Sample analysis revealed the scores of the two Mexican-American groups to be not significantly different at or beyond the .10 level. (See Appendix E for scale score patterns and individual significances). Though the number of subjects for this comparison is very small, the data may cautiously be interpreted to indicate that urbanization, per se, is not a confounding factor. Supporting this interpretation is the fact that the particularism scale scores for the Mexican bank employees are clearly higher than those of the Mexican-American, Nogales, Arizona group. The population of Nogales, Sonora, the place of work and residence for the Mexican bank

employees, is approximately 40,000 (as compared with 7,000 in Nogales, Arizona). If urbanization, as an isolated variable, were the major factor of influence, one would have expected the results of the two groups' particularism scale scores to have been reversed. As additional supporting data - the correlations of particularism scale scores with size of place of respondent's birth and size of place of respondent's longest residence were not significant for all groups combined or within any of the individual cultural groups.

Table 5 presents, for all three cultural groups combined, correlations among the variables alienation, particularism, longevity, position level, satisfaction with position, and plans to continue working in the bank. Inspection of the table indicates that alienation is significantly and positively correlated with particularism, and significantly and negatively correlated with longevity, position level, satisfaction with position, and plans to continue working in the bank. In addition to its relation with alienation, particularism is significantly and negatively correlated with position level, satisfaction with position, and plans to continue working in the bank, but not significantly correlated with longevity.

Tables 6 - 8 present the correlations among the same variables for each cultural group separately. Inspection of these tables reveals a significant positive correlation between alienation and particularism for the Anglo-Americans, but not for the Mexican-Americans or the

TABLE 5
CORRELATIONS AMONG THE VARIABLES ALIENATION, PARTICULARISM,
LONGEVITY, POSITION LEVEL, SATISFACTION WITH POSITION, AND
PLANS TO CONTINUE WORKING IN THE BANK FOR ALL THREE
GROUPS COMBINED***

	Alienation	Particularism	Longevity	Position Level	Satisfaction with Position	Plans to Continue
Alienation	---	---	---	---	---	---
Particularism	.151*	---	---	---	---	---
Longevity	-.154*	-.101	---	---	---	---
Position Level	-.276**	-.170*	.307**	---	---	---
Satisfaction with Position	-.274**	-.141*	.074	.145*	---	---
Plans to Continue	-.237**	-.260**	.130*	.169*	.270**	---

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

N = 230; df = 228

*** All correlations reported in this paper are Pearson Product-Moment Coefficients.

TABLE 6

CORRELATIONS AMONG THE VARIABLES ALIENATION, PARTICULARISM,
LONGEVITY, POSITION LEVEL, SATISFACTION WITH POSITION, AND
PLANS TO CONTINUE WORKING IN THE BANK FOR THE MEXI-
CAN SUBJECT GROUP

	Alienation	Particularism	Longevity	Position Level	Satisfaction with Position	Plans to Continue
Alienation	---	---	---	---	---	---
Particularism	.068	---	---	---	---	---
Longevity	-.130	-.242	---	---	---	---
Position Level	-.100	-.050	.063	---	---	---
Satisfaction with Position	-.270	-.159	.219	-.021	---	---
Plans to Continue	-.218	-.247	.237	-.023	.194	---

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

N = 38; df = 36

TABLE 7
CORRELATIONS AMONG THE VARIABLES ALIENATION, PARTICULARISM,
LONGEVITY, POSITION LEVEL, SATISFACTION WITH POSITION, AND
PLANS TO CONTINUE WORKING IN THE BANK FOR THE
MEXICAN-AMERICAN SUBJECT GROUP

	Alienation	Particularism	Longevity	Position Level	Satisfaction with Position	Plans to Continue
Alienation	---	---	---	---	---	---
Particularism	.023	---	---	---	---	---
Longevity	-.307*	-.026	---	---	---	---
Position Level	-.491**	-.242	.270	---	---	---
Satisfaction with Position	-.253	-.145	.176	.511**	---	---
Plans to Continue	-.075	-.151	.021	.176	.171	---

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

N = 43; df = 41

TABLE 8
CORRELATIONS AMONG THE VARIABLES ALIENATION, PARTICULARISM,
LONGEVITY, POSITION LEVEL, SATISFACTION WITH POSITION, AND
PLANS TO CONTINUE WORKING IN THE BANK FOR THE ANGLO-
AMERICAN SUBJECT GROUP

	Alienation	Particularism	Longevity	Position Level	Satisfaction with Position	Plans to Continue
Alienation	---	---	---	---	---	---
Particularism	.209*	---	---	---	---	---
Longevity	-.118	-.127	---	---	---	---
Position Level	-.282**	-.217**	.365**	---	---	---
Satisfaction with Position	-.314**	-.151	.104	.145	---	---
Plans to Continue	-.300**	-.243**	.334**	.180*	.420**	---

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

N = 149; df = 147

Mexicans.

The correlations among the variables for all groups combined and within each of the three groups are generally low, and thus account for a relatively small amount of the variance. Nevertheless, these correlations are all in the expected direction (many of them significantly so), and the resultant pattern supports the initial hypotheses.

The Guttman coefficient of reproducibility derived from the subject's scores in this study was .924 for the Stouffer-Toby Role Conflict Scale and .928 for the Pearlin Alienation from Work Scale. The Chi Square comparison of the frequency of perfect scale scores with non-perfect scale scores was significant beyond the .001 level for the Role Conflict Scale and beyond the .02 level for the Alienation from Work Scale. Thus it would appear that the two instruments maintained scalability and unidimensionality with cross-cultural subject groups and after translation into Spanish.

DISCUSSION

Though both the Stouffer-Toby Scale and the Pearlin Scale demonstrate scalability and unidimensionality, the small number of items (four in each) may limit the generality of the results. Furthermore, neither the concept of particularism nor the concept of alienation, even as operationally defined, are unequivocal. Friendship obligations, in the terminology of Parsons, are diffuse and affectively toned as well as particularistic. Pearlin's "alienation" focuses largely on the feeling of lack of control over the work situation, and thus may be insensitive to other important components of alienation in the present bank study. If it had been possible to do so, the use of more exhaustive questionnaires sounding particularism and alienation from work, plus inspection of employee records for absenteeism, disciplinary actions, and other indicators of industrial pathology, might have yielded better insights into the relationships among the variables with which this paper is concerned. However, in spite of the limitations imposed upon the data, the consistency of obtained results suggests several conclusions.

The hypothesis that the Mexican bank employees would be more particularistic than the Mexican-Americans, and the latter more particularistic than the Anglo-Americans is supported. Thus a specific culturally learned value is demonstrated to have measurable impact upon

behavioral intent. Keeping in mind that hypothetical scale items might encourage a respondent to adopt more stereotyped roles than he would in a real-life situation, it can be said that when presented with a choice between duty to a friend and duty to society, the Mexican employees, and less the marginal Mexican-American employees, tend to align themselves with the friend. On the other hand, the Anglo-American employees perceive their duty to society to be more important and tend to choose the universalistic horn of the dilemma in the social situations described by the scale.

Following administration of the questionnaire to the subject groups, the experimenter informally asked many of the employees what they thought the questionnaire was testing. The alienation scale was interpreted by all interviewed as a means of "finding out how much we like our job." But the particularism scale was differentially viewed - by the Mexicans as "a test of our friendship," and by the Anglo-Americans as "questions to see how honest we are." The contrasting value orientation was apparent even in the subject's informal interpretation of the purposes of the scales.

Also as hypothesized, the data indicate that the Mexican bank employees are more alienated from work than are the Mexican-American or Anglo-American employees. However, the Mexican-Americans, in spite of their relatively high degree of particularism, are not more alienated than the Anglo-Americans. Informal interviews indicated a

feeling among the Mexican-American employees that they "are making it" in their reference group, the Anglo white collar world. The Mexican-American respondents indicated that they receive considerably higher pay than their Mexican counterparts across the border, a fact which certainly may serve to mitigate alienation from work. The experimenter further observed that the Mexican-Americans are extremely active in a social club sponsored by the bank. Many of the officers of the club have been Mexican-Americans. This observation is in accord with Officer's Tucson study (1964), which reports that Mexican-Americans, as a means of re-establishing primary group dependencies which they have lost in migration, tend to be "joiners" of social clubs. Meadow and Bronson (1964) described similar manifestations of this phenomenon in their analysis of the emotional support provided to Mexican-Americans who participate in small Protestant religious sects.

The direction of the results supports the hypothesis that there is a positive correlation between particularism and alienation. That is, employees with particularistic orientations tend to be alienated from work in the universalistically oriented bank. The relatively small correlations between alienation and particularism, for all groups combined and within each group, may be at least partially explained in terms of measurement error, complexity of the concepts involved, and the fact that employees can be alienated from work for reasons other than a high degree of particularism (e. g. pay differential, promotional

opportunities, etc.).

The results further indicate that alienation is consistently related to the other variables under consideration, both for all groups combined and within the groups. That is, alienation from work is less: 1) the longer the employees have been working in the bank, 2) the higher their position, 3) the more satisfied they are with their jobs, and 4) with an indication of plans to make the bank a career. These relationships, of course, cannot be explained solely in terms of the gradual socialization of new employees. In addition to the adjustment process, a selection factor operates. The highly alienated employee may not stay long with the bank, either because he voluntarily resigns or because his alienation supports behavior which leads to his dismissal. This same selective factor must be assumed when considering the lower degree of alienation among the higher positioned employees. The negative relationships between satisfaction and alienation, and between plans to continue and alienation, lend support to the validity of the alienation scale itself.

The very low negative correlation between alienation and plans to continue working in the bank for the Mexican-American group as compared with the other two subject groups may indicate that a feeling of lack of control over the work situation, or of inability to enact a "rightful role" in the bank, may not be as important to the Mexican-American employees as the relatively high pay and Anglo white collar status. This is similarly reflected in the comparatively strong relationships between

level of position and satisfaction with position (positively correlated) for this group.

Particularism, for all groups combined and within each group, also shows a consistent relationship with the other variables. Generally, particularism diminishes (and conversely, universalism increases) as:

- 1) length of employment increases, 2) level of position increases, 3) satisfaction with the job increases, and 4) indications to continue with the bank as a career increase.

As with the alienation data, the relationships between particularism and the other variables can be considered as a function not only of gradual adjustment to and internalization of the bank's expectations, but as a function of a selection process. The bank, as a universalistic formal organization, encourages with continued employment, service awards, and promotions those individuals who meet the bank's expectations for employee behavior and attitude. Predominant among those expectations are the impersonality, unquestioning loyalty to the organization, and respect for the chain-of-command that are associated with universalism. The universalistically oriented individual is likely to be at home with these expectations, to be more satisfied with his job, to plan to make the bank a career, and have the best chances for promotion. On the other hand, the particularistic individual is likely to feel uncomfortable with the universalistic components of the job environment, and may resign or be dismissed for cause after a short time.

If the data were to be interpreted as describing the influence of the social system's pressures for conformity, these results would be in line with Merton's (1956) analysis of the effect of the bureaucratic organization on personality. Value orientations are, of course, important components of personality structure. However, such an interpretation must be cautiously offered, since the relations between longevity and particularism and position level and particularism may be as much influenced by a selection factor as they are by a socialization process.

When compared with the other two groups, the low negative correlations between longevity and particularism for the Mexican-American group may be interpreted as supporting the observation that particularistic needs are being met and thus maintained, even through extended years of service, in the close interpersonal relationships of the bank social club. The low negative correlation between position level and particularism for the Mexicans (again as compared with the other two groups) indicates that the Mexican management, at least in responses to questionnaires, can maintain a particularistic view even within the influence of the bureaucracy. This is supported by the very low correlations for the Mexican group between position level and satisfaction with position, position level and plans to make the bank a career, and position level and alienation. It may be that the Mexican managers, though not comfortable with the dissonance between their particularistic orientation and the relatively universalistic expectations of the bank, still value

their jobs which are, as compared to other jobs in Nogales, Sonora, well-paying and prestigeful.

CONCLUSION

The results of this study, especially the between-group comparisons of particularistic value orientations, support Parsons and Shils' assumption that particularism is influenced by culture. The universalistic societal expectations in the United States and the particularistic expectations in the Mexican society are reflected in the measures of the behavioral intent of otherwise comparable Anglo-American and Mexican subjects. The marginal Mexican-Americans, though still influenced by their parent culture, tend to favor the universalistic value orientation of the country in which they now work and live, and within whose status structure they now function.

The pattern of results also indicates that particularistic individuals tend to be alienated from work within the universalistically oriented formal organization of a bank. This relationship suggests that the compatibility of the value orientations of the individual with the expectations of the work organization is one of the determinants of alienation from work. In this study, a high value orientation for particularism was not always associated with a high degree of alienation. Correlations between alienation and particularism, though in the expected direction, were very low for the Mexican and Mexican-American groups. These data point to the complexity of the interaction between the individual and the

organization, and emphasize that other job factors may compensate for or offset the impact of a specific value conflict.

The influence of value orientations, as components both of the organization and the personality, has largely been overlooked in considerations of the "fusion" process between individual and organization. These value structures, their sources, points of conflict, and their effect upon behavioral expectations are an important part of the dynamic of organizational behavior. In this paper, the author has attempted to sound the sources of one value orientation, to measure the impact of conflict concerning it, and to analyze its relation to organizational expectations and occupational success.

APPENDIX A

COPY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN ENGLISH

DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME

QUESTIONNAIRE

Note: This information is strictly confidential. It will be analyzed by an office of the University of Arizona. In no way will it be associated with your name, and the questionnaire you complete will be examined by only University academic personnel. Please do not discuss your answers before returning the form. Your cooperation is much appreciated.

Thank You.

Position in the bank: _____

Length of time you have been with the bank: _____

Place of birth: _____

Place of longest residence: _____

Age: _____

Sex: M _____, F _____

Do you speak more than one language? Yes _____, No _____.

If yes, which language is spoken predominantly in your home? _____

This is not an examination of any kind. Starting on the next page there are four situations that might have been taken from everyday life, and you are asked only to express what you feel and what you might do about that situation. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers, no "passing" or "failing" score. There are many people who will agree with you, no matter what your choice of answer. Answer the questions as quickly as you can. Give your first impression. There are only a few questions, so it should not take you long.

1. You are riding in a car driven by a close friend, and he hits a pedestrian. You know he was going at least 35 miles an hour in a 20-mile-an-hour speed zone. There are no other witnesses. His lawyer says that if you testify under oath that the speed was only 20 miles an hour, it may save him from serious consequences.

What right has your friend to expect you to protect him?

Check one:*

- ☐ My friend has a definite right as a friend to expect me to testify to the lower figure.
- ☐ He has some right as a friend to expect me to testify to the lower figure.
- ☐ He has no right as a friend to expect me to testify to the lower figure.

What do you think you'd probably do in view of the obligations of a sworn witness and the obligation to your friend?

Check one:

- ☐ Testify that he was going 20 miles an hour.
- ☐ Not testify that he was going 20 miles an hour.
- ☐

*The scoring procedure for the Role Conflict Scale is as follows: For a given item, the response "My friend has a definite right. . ." is considered particularistic. The response "He has no right. . ." is considered universalistic. If the respondent marks "He has some right . . ." the response is labeled particularistic if in the second part of the question he says he would favor the friend in action; universalistic if he says he would not favor the friend.

2. You are a New York drama critic. A close friend of yours has sunk all his savings in a new Broadway play. You really think the play is no good.

What right does your friend have to expect you to go easy on his play in your review?

Check one:

☐ He has a definite right as a friend to expect me to go easy on his play in my review.

☐ He has some right as a friend to expect me to do this for him.

☐ He has no right as a friend to expect me to do this for him.

Would you go easy on his play in your review in view of your obligations to your readers and your obligation to your friend?

Check one:

☐ yes

☐ no

3. You are a doctor for an insurance company. You examine a close friend who needs more insurance. You find that he is in pretty good shape, but you are doubtful on one or two minor points which are difficult to diagnose.

What right does your friend have to expect you to shade the doubts in his favor?

Check one:

- ☐ My friend would have a definite right as a friend to expect me to shade the doubts in his favor.
- ☐ He would have some rights as a friend to expect me to shade the doubts in his favor.
- ☐ He would have no right as a friend to expect me to shade the doubts in his favor.

Would you shade the doubts in his favor in view of your obligations to the insurance company and your obligations to your friend?

Check one:

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no

4. You have just come from a secret meeting of the board of directors of a company. You have a close friend who will be ruined unless he can get out of the market before the board's decision becomes known. You happen to be having dinner at that friend's home this same evening.

What right does your friend have to expect you to tip him off?

Check one:

 He has a definite right as a friend to expect me to tip him off.

 He has some right as a friend to expect me to tip him off.

 He has no right as a friend to expect me to tip him off.

Would you tip him off in view of your obligations to the company and your obligations to your friend?

Check one:

 yes

 no

1. How often do you do things in your work that you wouldn't do if it were up to you? Never _____; Once in a while _____; Fairly often _____; Very often _____.*
 2. Around here it's not important how much you know; it's who you know that really counts. Agree _____; Disagree _____.
 3. How much say or influence do people like you have on the way the bank is run? A lot _____; Some _____; Very little _____; None _____.
 4. How often do you tell (your superior) your own ideas about things you might do in your work? Never _____; Once in a while _____; Fairly often _____; Very often _____.
 5. Do you expect to continue with the bank for the rest of your working career? Yes _____; No _____.
 6. Do you believe your satisfaction with the position you hold is Above average _____; Average _____; Below Average _____.
-

*Items 1 through 4 above constitute the Alienation Scale.
Responses considered to indicate alienation from work are:

Item #1: "very often"
Item #2: "agree"
Item #3: "very little"; "none"
Item #4: "never"; "once in a while"

APPENDIX B

COPY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN SPANISH

NO FIRME USTED

CUESTIONARIO

Atención: Esta información es completamente confidencial y anónima.

Será analizada por personal académico de la Universidad de Arizona.

Le pedimos el favor de no platicar con respecto a sus respuestas

antes de regresar el cuestionario. Le agradecemos mucho su cooperación.

Puesto en el banco: _____

Tiempo que ha permanecido con el banco: _____

Pueblo de nacimiento: _____

Pueblo de más residencia: _____

Edad: _____

Sexo: M _____, F _____.

¿Es usted bilingüe? Si _____, No _____.

Si la respuesta es afirmativa, ¿que idioma habla usted más en casa?

Esta no es una examinación. Comenzando en la próxima pagina hay cuatro situaciones ordinarias, y a usted le solicitan únicamente expresar lo que usted siente, y lo que pueda que usted haría respecto a la situación. No hay respuestas "equivocadas" o respuestas "buenas." Hay muchas personas que le darán la razón a usted con cualquiera respuesta que usted escoja. Responda usted a todas las preguntas lo más pronto que se puede. Queremos su primera impresión. Solo hay unas pocas preguntas, así es que no le debe de costar mucho tiempo.

HIPÓTESIS NO. 1

Usted va en un automóvil manejado por un amigo íntimo suyo, quien atropella a un peatón. Usted sabe que el iba a 35 kilómetros por hora en una zona de 20 kilómetros por hora. No hay más testigos. El abogado de su amigo dice que si usted declara bajo juramento que la velocidad era 20 kilómetros solamente, usted puede evitar serios problemas a su amigo.

¿Qué derecho tiene su amigo de esperar que usted lo proteja?

Señale una respuesta nada más:

_____ Mi amigo tiene todo derecho como amigo de esperar que yo dé en mi testimonio la cifra de 20 kilómetros.

_____ Mi amigo tiene algún derecho como amigo de esperar que yo dé en mi testimonio la cifra de 20 kilómetros.

_____ Mi amigo no tiene derecho como amigo de esperar que yo dé en mi testimonio la cifra de 20 kilómetros.

¿Qué haría usted teniendo en cuenta sus obligaciones como testigo juramentado y sus obligaciones con su amigo?

Señale una respuesta nada más:

_____ Atestiguaría que mi amigo iba a 20 kilómetros.

_____ No atestiguaría que mi amigo iba a 20 kilómetros.

HIPÓTESIS NO. 2

Usted es un periodista que reporta sobre las comedias en la ciudad de Nueva York. Un amigo íntimo suyo tiene todo su dinero invertido en una nueva comedia de Broadway. Usted firmemente cree que la comedia es un fracaso.

¿Qué derecho tiene su amigo de esperar que usted en su critica haga aparecer la comedia mejor de lo que usted la cree?

Señale una respuesta nada más:

_____ El tiene todo derecho como amigo de esperar que yo en mi revista de la comedia la hago aparecer tal como la cree, un fracaso.²

_____ El tiene algún derecho como amigo de esperar que yo haga eso por el.

_____ El no tiene derecho como amigo de esperar que yo haga eso por el.

¿Representaría usted la comedia de su amigo mejor de lo que es en vista de las obligaciones que usted tiene como crítico de teatro para con sus lectores y de sus obligaciones con su amigo?

Señale una respuesta nada más.

_____ Sí.

_____ No.

2. The alternative response to "Hipotesis No. 2" which reads "El tiene todo derecho como amigo de esperar que yo en mi revista de la comedia la haga aparecer tal como la cree, un fracaso" is incorrectly translated from the English. The literal translation of the above

would be "He has every right as a friend to expect that I in my review of the play make it appear exactly as I believe it to be, a failure."

The correct Spanish translation for the alternative is "El tiene todo derecho como amigo de esperar que yo en me revista de la comedia la haga aparecer mejor de lo que yo la creo." This translates literally into English as "He has every right as a friend to expect that I in my review of the play make it appear better than I believe that it is."

The error in translation had the effect of reversing the intent of the alternative. That is, instead of indicating particularism, the choice of the alternative by the respondent indicated universalism.

The incorrect translation was not discovered by the author until after the questionnaires had been administered to the Mexican subjects. Analysis of the data indicated that the error had little or no effect upon the results, but in order to demonstrate more adequately the degree of effect, the Mexican subject group was administered the corrected questionnaire.

The second administration followed the first by approximately two years, thus explaining the increase in the number of subjects. The administrative procedure used for the second administration was identical to that used for all the other subject groups.

No significant difference was found between the pattern of particularism scale scores for the first administration and that of the second, corrected, administration. (See Appendix F for scale score patterns, comparisons with other cultural groups, and individual significances).

HIPÓTESIS NO. 3

Usted es un médico de una compañía de seguros. Usted examina a un amigo íntimo que necesita un seguro más alto. Encuentra usted que su amigo no está mal de salud pero duda de una o dos cosillas de poca importancia pero difíciles de diagnosticar.

¿Qué derecho tiene su amigo de esperar que usted en su reporte medico representa a esas cosillas difíciles de diagnosticar en su favor?

Señale una respuesta nada más:

_____ Mi amigo tiene todo derecho como amigo de esperar que yo en mi reporte médico represento esas cosillas en su favor.

_____ El tiene algún derecho como amigo de esperar que yo en mi reporte médico las represento en su favor.

_____ El no tiene derecho como amigo de esperar que yo en mi reporte médico las represento en su favor.

¿Representaría usted las cosas en favor de su amigo en vista de sus obligaciones para con la compañía y de sus obligaciones con su amigo?

Señale una respuesta nada más.

_____ Sí.

_____ No.

HIPÓTESIS NO. 4

Usted acaba de regresar de una reunión secreta de la junta directiva, (consejo de administración), de una compañía. Usted tiene un amigo íntimo que se arruinaría si no se quita del mercado antes de que se sepa publicamente lo que se ha decidido en la asamblea. Ocurre casualmente que usted va a cenar en casa de su amigo esa misma noche.

¿Qué derecho tiene su amigo de esperar que usted le avise de lo ocurrido?

Señale una respuesta nada más:

_____ El tiene todo derecho como amigo de esperar que yo lo ponga al tanto de lo ocurrido.

_____ El tiene algún derecho como amigo de esperar que yo lo ponga al tanto de lo ocurrido.

_____ El no tiene derecho como amigo de esperar que yo lo ponga al tanto de lo ocurrido.

¿Lo pondría usted al tanto de lo ocurrido en vista de las obligaciones que usted tiene para con la compañía y de sus obligaciones con su amigo?

Señale una respuesta nada más:

_____ Sí.

_____ No.

Indica una respuesta a cada pregunta

1. ¿Cuántas veces hace usted cosas en su trabajo que usted no haría si fuera cosa que usted pudiera disponer?
Nunca_____, De vez en cuando_____, Frecuentemente_____,
Muy frecuentemente_____.
2. Por aquí lo que uno sabe no es tan importante como conocer a las personas que importan.
Estoy de acuerdo_____, No estoy de acuerdo_____.
3. ¿Cuánta influencia tienen personas como usted respecto al modo en que manejan el banco?
Mucha_____, No mucha_____, Muy poca_____, No tienen_____.
4. ¿Cuántas veces le avisa usted a su superior las ideas que usted tiene acerca de cosas que usted pudiera hacer en su trabajo?
Nunca_____, De vez en cuando_____, Frecuentemente_____,
Muy frecuentemente_____.
5. ¿Espera usted seguir como empleado del banco por el resto de su carrera?
Sí_____, No_____.
6. Cree usted que la satisfacción que usted siente con el empleo que tiene aquí es
Mucha_____, Regular_____, Poca_____.

APPENDIX C

LINE EMPLOYEE PARTICULARISM BY CULTURAL ORIGIN

Cultural Origin	<u>Scale Score</u>					Number in Group
	0	1	2	3	4	
Mexican	5	5	6	7	10	33
Mexican-American	17	12	4	4	0	37
Anglo-American	82	23	10	8	2	125
Total	104	40	20	19	12	195

Extended Median Test for All Groups Combined:

$$X^2 = 75.17$$

$$p < .001$$

Median Test (one-tailed) for Between Groups:

$$\text{Mexican vs. Mexican-Americans: } X^2 = 14.44$$

$$p < .0005$$

$$\text{Mexican vs. Anglos: } X^2 = 24.80$$

$$p < .0005$$

$$\text{Mexican-American vs. Anglos: } X^2 = 3.9$$

$$p < .025$$

APPENDIX D

OFFICER PARTICULARISM BY CULTURAL ORIGIN

Cultural Origin	<u>Scale Score</u>					Number in Group
	0	1	2	3	4	
Mexican	0	2	2	1	0	5
Mexican-American	4	0	0	1	1	6
Anglo-American	21	3	0	0	0	24
Total	25	5	2	2	1	35

Extended Median Test for All Groups Combined:

$$X^2 = 15.36$$

$$p < .001$$

Fisher's Exact Probability Test;
(Subjects who scored 0 vs. those
who did not)

Mexican vs. Mexican-American: $p = .045$

Mexican vs. Anglo-American: $p = .0004$

Mexican-American vs. Anglo: $p = .008$

APPENDIX E

PARTICULARISM SCALE SCORES FOR MEXICAN-AMERICAN (TUCSON) AND MEXICAN-AMERICAN (NOGALES) SUBJECT GROUPS

City	<u>Scale Score</u>					Number in Group
	0	1	2	3	4	
Tucson	7	4	1	1	1	14
Nogales	21	12	4	5	1	43

Kolmogorov-Smirnov Two Sample Test:

$$D_{\max} = .049$$

$$D_{\max} \text{ needed for } .10 \text{ significance level} = .373$$

APPENDIX F

PARTICULARISM SCALE SCORES FOR FIRST AND SECOND (TRANSLATION ERROR RERUN) MEXICAN ADMINISTRATIONS

Cultural Origin	<u>Scale Score</u>					Number in Group
	0	1	2	3	4	
Mexican #1	4	7	9	8	10	38
Mexican #2	7	7	8	9	12	43

Kolmogorov-Smirnov Two Sample Test;
Mexican #1 vs. Mexican #2

$D_{\max} = .057$

$D_{\max}$ needed for .10 level, .270

Coefficient of Reproducibility for
Mexican #2 = .94

Median Test Comparisons:

Mexican #2 with Mexican-Americans:

Chi Square = 15.2
 $p < .0005$

Mexican #2 with Anglo-Americans:

Chi Square = 34.9
 $p < .0005$

REFERENCES

- Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper, 1957.
- Argyris, Chris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Bakke, E. Wight. The Fusion Process. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955.
- Becker, Howard and Meyers, R. C. "Sacred and Secular Aspects of Human Association," Sociometry. 5(August, 1942), pp. 207-229.
- Benedict, Ruth. Patterns of Culture. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1934.
- Blauner, Robert. Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker and His Industry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Buber, Martin. I and Thou. New York: Scribner's, 1958.
- Clark, John P. "Measuring Alienation Within A Social System," American Sociological Review, 24(December, 1959), pp. 849-852.
- Cohen, Yehudi A. "Patterns of Friendship," in Yehudi A. Cohen (ed.), Social Structure and Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961, pp. 353-383.
- Cooley, Charles H. Social Organization. New York: Scribner's, 1909.
- Dean, Dwight G. "Meaning and Measurement of Alienation," American Sociological Review, 26(October, 1961) pp. 753-758.
- Dozier, Edward P. "Folk Culture to Urbanity: The Case of Mexicans and Mexican-Americans," Unpublished Paper, University of Arizona, 1964.
- Fayerweather, John. The Executive Overseas. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1959.

- Fromm, Eric. Escape from Freedom. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1940.
- Gerth, Hans, and Mills, C. Wright (eds). From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Goldenweiser, A.A. Early Civilizations. New York: Knopf, 1922.
- Josephson, Eric and Josephson, Mary (eds). Man Alone. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1962.
- Kluckhohn, Clyde. "The Study of Culture," in Daniel Lerner and Harold D. Lasswell (eds), The Policy Sciences. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1951.
- Kluckhohn, Clyde. "The Study of Values," in Donald N. Barrett(ed.), Values in America. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961.
- Levinson, Daniel J. "Role, Personality, and Social Structure in the Organizational Setting," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 58(March, 1959), pp. 170-180.
- Lewis, Oscar. Life in a Mexican Village: Tepoztlan Restudied. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1951.
- Lewis, Oscar. Tepoztlan: A Village in Mexico. New York: Holt, 1960.
- Loomis, Charles P. and Beegle, J. Allan. Rural Social Systems. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1950.
- MacIver, Robert M. Society: A Textbook of Sociology. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1937.
- Maine, Henry. Ancient Law. London: J. Murray, 1861.
- Marx, Karl. The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1961.
- McClelland, David. The Achieving Society. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1961.
- Meadow, Arnold, and Bronson, Louise. "Religious Affiliation and Psychopathology in a Mexican-American Population," Unpublished Paper, University of Arizona, 1964.

- Merton, Robert. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality," Social Forces, 18 (March, 1940), pp. 560-568.
- Mills, C. Wright. White Collar. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.
- Miner, Horace. "The Folk-Urban Continuum," American Sociological Review, 17 (October, 1952), pp. 529-537.
- Nettler, Gwynn. "A Measure of Alienation," American Sociological Review, 22(September, 1957) pp. 670-677.
- Nisbet, Robert. The Quest for Community. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.
- Officer, James E. "Sodalities and Systematic Linkage: The Joining Habits of Urban Mexican-Americans," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Arizona, 1964.
- Parsons, Talcott. The Structure of Social Action. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1937.
- Parsons, Talcott. Essays in Sociological Theory. Glencoe: Free Press, 1954.
- Parsons, Talcott, and Shils, Edward A. (eds). Toward a General Theory of Action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Pearlin, Leonard I. "Alienation from Work: A Study of Nursing Personnel," American Sociological Review, 29(June, 1962), pp. 314-326.
- Redfield, Robert. Tepoztlan, A Mexican Village. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930.
- Redfield, Robert. The Folk Culture of Yucatan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.
- Redfield, Robert. "The Folk Society," American Journal of Sociology, 52(January, 1947), pp. 293-308.
- Riesman, David. The Lonely Crowd. New Haven. Yale University Press, 1950.

- Roethlisberger, Fritz, and Dickson, William. Management and the Worker. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Seeman, Melvin. "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, 24(December, 1959), pp. 783-791.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Simpson, George. Emile Durkheim on the Division of Labor in Society. New York: Macmillan Co., 1933.
- Stouffer, Samuel A., and Toby, Jackson. "Role Conflict and Personality," American Journal of Sociology, 56 (March, 1951), pp. 395-406.
- Toennies, Ferdinand. Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft. Translated and Edited by Charles P. Loomis as Fundamental Concepts of Sociology. New York: American Book Company, 1940.
- von Martin, Alfred. Sociology of the Renaissance. New York: Oxford University Press, 1932.
- Whyte, William H. The Organization Man. New York: Harper, 1948.
- Zurcher, Louis A. "Knock Before Entering" (Employee and Management Resistance to the Organizational Function of the Position Classification Specialist), Personnel Administration, 26 (May, 1963), pp. 1-8.
- Zurcher, Louis A. "The Sailor Aboard Ship: A Study of Role Behavior in a Total Institution," Social Forces, 43(March, 1965), pp. 389-400.
- Zurcher, Louis A. "The Naval Recruit Training Center: A Study of Role Assimilation in a Total Institution," In Press, Sociological Inquiry, 1965.
- Zurcher, Louis A., and Meadow, Arnold. "On Bullfights and Baseball: An Analysis of the Interaction of Social Institutions," Unpublished Paper, University of Arizona, 1964.