

Alienation and its Avatars: Clarifying Measurement Issues

Dan Chiaburu

Inchul Cho
Black Hills State University

John Bunch
Central Michigan University

Darel Hargrove
Central Michigan University

Tomas Thundiyl
Central Michigan University

Integrating psychology-, social psychology-, sociology- and management-based perspectives, we investigate eight alienation-related constructs and dimensions using factor analyses to determine their dimensionality. Results based on factor analyses demonstrate that the dimensions proposed by Seeman (1959) for alienation – meaninglessness, powerlessness, self-estrangement, social isolation, and normlessness – do not converge toward three general measures of alienation (student alienation, work alienation, and Marxist alienation).

INTRODUCTION

If alienation pervades modern society (Fromm, 1955) and needs to be adequately measured (Neal & Salomon, 1967; Maddi, Kobasa, & Hoover, 1979), researchers need reliable and valid measures. How alienation is operationalized should be less controversial. Yet even integrative work (Kanungo, 1982; Seeman, 1959) has not provided a stable basis for dialogue, owing to lack of agreement related to alienation measurement. Our research responds to calls for clarifications concerning what alienation is and how it should be assessed (Chiaburu, Thundiyl, & Wang, 2014).

Investigating the factor structure of alienation responds to Seeman's (1975) observation that alienation studies may confound it with other measures – the “quick fix” problem (p. 115). Almost four decades later, the situation has not improved. Instead, a large number of empirical studies have been conducted (e.g., Heaven & Bester, 1986; Witt, 1993) without clarification on the measurement of alienation itself. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the extent to which the five dimensions proposed by Seeman (1959) are congruent with the generalized (unidimensional) perspective of alienation

(Banai & Reisel, 2007; Hirschfeld, Field, Bedeian, 2000). After reviewing existing definitions and measures, we present a study whereby several alienation measures are subjected to factor analyses.

ALIENATION DIMENSIONALITY

There are at least two conceptual arguments of how alienation should be conceptualized in the literature. First, in an influential theoretical paper, Seeman (1959) posited that alienation is comprised of a five-facets. By integrating existing alienation constructs, he proposed a more organized conceptualization of alienation: meaninglessness, powerlessness, self-estrangement, social isolation, and normlessness (i.e., multidimensional view).

Conversely, other researchers proposed that alienation is unidimensional (e.g., Jessor & Jessor, 1977) and should be conceptualized as a psychological construct representing indifference toward work (Hirschfeld et al., 2000) and a sense of dissociation in relation to work products or processes (Kanungo, 1982; Shantz, Alfes, & Truss, 2014). Some conceptualizations that endorse the unidimensional view of alienation include student alienation (i.e., estrangement from an aspect of student life; Jessor & Jessor, 1977), work alienation (i.e., estrangement from work; Hirschfeld et al., 2000), and Marx's alienation (i.e., estrangement from human nature; Vallas, 1988).

The fundamental question of alienation's dimensionality has been raised in the literature (e.g., Neal & Rettig, 1967). However, no research has included all of the existing constructs of alienation in a model. To accomplish this task, we conduct a factor analysis to investigate whether alienation dimensions and constructs are distinct.

Instead of selecting a specific view of alienation conceptualization, we propose a six-factor structure in which the five Seeman dimensions and one generalized alienation factor (student alienation, work alienation, or Marx's alienation) are included in a model together. First, it is important to determine whether the five Seeman dimensions are distinct from each other because a recent meta-analytic finding showed that there was insufficient convergence among them (Chiaburu et al., 2014). If these five dimensions appear to be distinct, the next step is to see whether Seeman's five dimensions will be distinct from the unidimensional view of alienation. If the five factor structure remains consistent even when a unidimensional factor of alienation is added into the model, then notion of distinctiveness among the alienation-related constructs will be supported (see Adorno (1950) for meaninglessness; Marx and Weber (discussion in Gerth & Mills, 1946) for powerlessness; Fromm (1955) for self-estrangement; Merton (1946) for social isolation; and Durkheim (1960) for normlessness).

Therefore, we hypothesize (H1): the five factors proposed to constitute alienation (meaninglessness, powerlessness, self-estrangement, social isolation, normlessness) and (H1-a) student alienation, (H1-b) work alienation, and (H1-c) Marxist alienation, respectively, are represented by six dimensions.

METHODS

Volunteers ($N = 233$) participated in the study in exchange for course credit. They were undergraduate students (male = 54.41 %) from a large Southern university in the United States. The mean age for the participants was 21.92 ($SD = 13.30$). The ethnic group consisted of Caucasians (69.97%), Hispanics (17.75%), Asian (6.93%), African American (2.6%), and others (4.76). For each measure, respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with the respective statements on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree). Concerning work experience, 49.79% had an either full- or part-time job, and some respondents had supervisory experiences (less than one year = 69.15%; 1 year to 2 years = 18.70%; more than 2 years = 12.14%).

We measured Seeman's (1959) five dimensions of alienation with scales that best captured the initial conceptualization. The measures and items are shown in Table 1 (Appendix A.)

- *Powerlessness* was measured with 7 items from Pearlin, Lieberman, Menaghan, and Mullan (1981). An example item is, "I have little control over the things that happen to me" ($\alpha = .85$).

- *Meaninglessness* was measured with 6 items from Crumbaugh (1968). An item reads, “My personal existence is utterly meaningless, without purpose” ($\alpha=.80$).
- *Normlessness* was measured with 6 items from Dean (1961). “The end often justifies the means” is an illustrative item ($\alpha=.73$).
- *Social isolation* was measured with 4 items based on Kohn and Schooler (1983). An example item is “My ideas about important matters differ a great deal from those around me” ($\alpha=.85$).
- *Self-estrangement* with 4 items from Wood, Linley, Maltby, Baliousis, and Joseph (2008; “I do not know how I really feel inside”) ($\alpha=.93$).

For the unidimensional perspective, we measured each factor as follows:

- *Student alienation* with 15 items developed by Jessor and Jessor (1977; e.g., “Most of my academic work in school does not seem worthwhile and meaningful to me”) ($\alpha = .91$).
- *Work alienation* was measured with three items (Nair & Vohra, 2009). An item reads, “I often wish I was doing something else while I am at work” ($\alpha=.84$).
- *Marxist alienation* was measured with the scale developed by Vallas (1988) to capture a Marxist-based view (5 items) consisting of (a) an instrumental (means/end) orientation toward the job, (b) a lack of subjective involvement in work, (c) an view whereby tools control the worker (rather than the opposite), and (d) an aversion toward the work. An item reads, “I really have to force myself to go in to work” ($\alpha=.87$).

RESULTS

We conducted three separate exploratory factor analyses (EFA) (i.e., the five alienation dimensions with student alienation, with work alienation, and with Marxist alienation, respectively) to test H1a-c where we proposed a six-factor structure.

It should be noted that the reason why EFAs were conducted rather than confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is that EFA tests can offer clearer evidence of potential confounds that all alienation constructs may have by displaying the loading of each measurement items onto different factors (see Martinko, Harvey, & Mackey, 2014). Although there is a widely accepted belief that CFA tests can be used to “prove” construct independence, a CFA test cannot prove whether constructs are related or not due to the default assumption that constructs are independent (the null hypothesis in a CFA). In this regard, Martinko et al., (2014) explicitly stated that “the single easiest and most effective technique for detecting empirical confounds is through EFA” (p. 1058). Thus, we used the principal factor method to extract factors and decreasing eigenvalues to determine their number.

Resulting values were 12.80, 2.95, 2.27, 1.56, 1.33 and 1.10 for student alienation; 8.87, 2.18, 1.99, 1.36, 1.07, and 0.97 for work alienation; and 9.12, 2.32, 2.16, 1.54, 1.37, and 1.03 for Marxist alienation. The expected six factor model was rotated via a varimax method, with the solution shown in Table 2. (Appendix B.)

As expected, alienation is represented by six separate dimensions in each of the three EFA models, supporting H1a-c. Nine items presented cross-loadings higher than .30. Of these, most problematic are three cross-loadings among student alienation (e.g., “I sometimes feel uncertain about who I really am”) and meaninglessness.

DISCUSSION

Integrating the viewpoints of psychologists, social psychologists and sociologists, we tested whether the Seeman’s (1959) five factors together with three generalized alienation constructs (student alienation, work alienation, and Marxist alienation) are converged in a model.

Based on our results, the five Seeman dimensions and the three alienation-related constructs (taken separately) were distinct, providing the insufficient support for the Seeman’s five dimensions as the conceptualization of alienation. This is consistent with recent findings, where Chiaburu et al. (2014)

reported weak meta-analytic correlations among most of these five dimensions. However, a six-factor structure appeared when the unidimensional dimension of alienation was added along with the five dimensions, which supported the notion that the conceptualization of alienation should be treated from the multidimensional view. Our results extend these findings by (a) providing the factor analysis results difficult to examine in a meta-analysis, and by (b) examining not only the correlations *among* the five dimensions but also *with* three other generalized alienation constructs.

Strengths, Limitations, and Future Research Directions

The strengths of our study include: we used three unidimensional views of alienation measures to (a) generalize across domains (student vs. work alienation) and (b) definitions (general vs. Marxist alienation); and we used psychological separation by introducing unrelated measures between measures. The primary limitation is the cross-sectional nature of our data, obtained from volunteers participating in exchange for rewards. Future research using longitudinal designs as well as respondents whose work experience is more extensive would be useful extensions of the current study.

While we relied on traditional psychometric approaches to assess our constructs, other perspectives are possible. If alienation is a form of “false consciousness,” it could be that not all alienated employees will recognize their self-objectification and reification (Burston, 1998; Lethbridge, 1986; O'Dwyer, 2012). As Marcuse (1964) noted, “the concept of alienation seems to become questionable when the individuals identify themselves with the existence which is imposed upon them” (p. 11). This can open the door toward alternative measures of alienation, where respondents are made aware of possible impositions on their existing selves, or are provided cues to reflect on their own difficulties to extricate themselves from their work persona (Costas & Fleming, 2009). To conclude, as noted by Seeman (1991), to assess alienation “the wedding of philosophy, social theory, and quantitative technique was never guaranteed to be easy, but that is that task that remains” (p. 366). Our research is a step in this direction.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper.
- Banai, M., & Reisel, W. D. (2007). The influence of supportive leadership and job characteristics on work alienation: A six-country investigation. *Journal of World Business*, 42, 463-476.
- Burston, D. (1998). Laing and Heidegger on alienation. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 38(4), 80-93.
- Chiaburu, D. S., Thundiyil, T., & Wang, J. (2014). Alienation and its correlates: A meta-analysis. *European Management Journal*, 32, 24-36.
- Costas, J., & Fleming, P. (2009). Beyond dis-identification: A discursive approach to self-alienation in contemporary organizations. *Human Relations*, 62, 353-378.
- Crumbaugh, J. (1968). Cross-validation of a Purpose-in-Life test based on Frankl's concepts. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 24, 74-81.
- Dean, D. G. (1961). Alienation: Its meaning and measurement. *American Sociological Review*, 26, 753-758.
- Durkheim, E. (1960). *The division of labor in society*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Fromm, E. (1955). *The sane society*. New York: Rinehart.
- Gerth, H. H., & Mills, C. W. (1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology*. New York: Oxford.
- Heaven, P. C. L., & Bester, C. L. (1986). Alienation and its psychological correlates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 126, 593-598.
- Hirschfeld, R. R., Feild, H. S., & Bedeian, A. G. (2000). Work alienation as an individual-difference construct for predicting workplace adjustment: A test in two samples. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30(9), 1880-1902.
- Jessor, R., & Jessor, S. (1977). *Problem behavior and psychosocial development*. New York: Academic Press.
- Kanungo, R. N. (1982). *Work alienation: An integrative approach*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

- Kohn, M., & Schooler, C. (1983). *Work and personality: An inquiry into the impact of social stratification*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Lethbridge, D. (1986). A Marxist theory of self-actualization. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 26(2), 84-103.
- Maddi, S. R., Kobasa, S. C., & Hoover, M. (1979). An alienation test. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 19, 73-76.
- Marcuse, H. (1964). *One dimensional man: Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Martinko, M. J., Harvey, P. & Mackey, J. D. (2014). Conceptual and empirical confounds in the organizational sciences: An explication and discussion. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35, 1052-1063.
- Merton, R. K. (1946). *Mass persuasion*. New York: Harper.
- Nair, N., & Vohra, N. (2009). Developing a new measure of work alienation. *Journal of Workplace Rights*, 14, 293-309.
- Neal, A., & Rettig, S. (1967). On the multidimensionality of alienation. *American Sociological Review*, 32, 54-64
- Neal, A. G., & Salomon, R. (1967). On the multidimensionality of alienation. *American Sociological Review*, 32(1), 54-64.
- O'Dwyer, K. (2012). Camus's challenge: The question of suicide. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 52, 165-177.
- Pearlin, L., Lieberman, M., Menaghan, E., & Mullan, J. (1981). The stress process. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 22, 337-356.
- Seeman, M. (1959). On the meaning of alienation. *American Sociological Review*, 24, 783-791.
- Seeman, M. (1975). Alienation studies. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 1, 91-123.
- Seeman, M. (1991). Alienation and anomie. In Robinson, J. P., Shaver, P.R., & Wrightsman, L. S. (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes. Volume 1 in Measures of Psychological Attitude Series* (pp. 291-371). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Shantz, A., Alfes, K., & Truss, K. (2015). Alienation from work: Marxist ideologies and 21st century practice. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 25, 2529-2550.
- Vallas, S. P. (1988). New technology, job content, and worker alienation: A test of two rival perspectives. *Work and Occupations*, 15, 148-178.
- Witt, L. A., (1993). Alienation among research scientists. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 133, 133-140.
- Wood, A. M., Linley, P. A., Maltby, J., Baliousis, M. & Joseph, S. (2008). The authentic personality: A theoretical and empirical conceptualization and the development of authenticity scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 55, 385-399

APPENDIX A

TABLE 1
ITEMS: FIVE ALIENATION FACTORS BY SEEMAN (1959)
AND THREE DEPENDENT VARIABLES

<p>Powerlessness PO1. I have little control over the things that happen to me PO2. There is really no way I can solve some of the problems I have PO3. There is little I can do to change many of the important things in my life PO4. I often feel helpless in dealing with the problems in my life PO5. Sometimes I feel that I'm being pushed around in life PO6. What happens to me in the future mostly depends on factors beyond my control PO7. I can do very few things I set my mind to do</p>
<p>Meaninglessness ME1. My personal existence is utterly meaningless, without purpose ME2. If I could choose, I would prefer never to have been born ME3. In thinking of my life, I often wonder why I exist ME4. I don't have an ability to find a meaning, purpose, or mission in life ME5. Facing my daily tasks is a painful and boring experience ME6. I have discovered no mission or purpose in life</p>
<p>Normlessness NO1. The end often justifies the means NO2. People's ideas change so much that I wonder if we'll ever have anything to depend on NO3. Everything is relative, and there just aren't any definite rules to live by NO4. I often wonder what the meaning of life really is NO5. The only thing one can be sure of today is that s/he can be sure of nothing NO6. With so many religions abroad, one doesn't really know which to believe</p>
<p>Social Isolation SI1. My ideas about important matters differ a great deal from those around me SI2. My opinions are rather different from the ones others hold SI3. My thoughts and feelings are very different from those of others SI4. I value a different way of life than what's currently valued by most people in our society</p>
<p>Self-estrangement SE1. I don't know how I really feel inside SE2. I feel as if I don't know myself very well SE3. I feel out of touch with the 'real me' SE4. I feel alienated from myself</p>

(Continued)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

<p>Student alienation</p> <p>SA1. I sometimes feel that the kids I know are not too friendly</p> <p>SA2. Most of my academic work in school does not seem worthwhile and meaningful to me</p> <p>SA3. I sometimes feel uncertain about who I really am</p> <p>SA4. I feel that my family is not as close to me as I would like</p> <p>SA5. When kids are having problems, it is not my responsibility to try to help</p> <p>SA6. I often wonder whether I am becoming the kind of person I want to be</p> <p>SA7. It is hard to know how to act most of the time since you cannot tell what others expect</p> <p>SA8. I often feel left out of things that others are doing</p> <p>SA9. Nowadays you cannot really count on other people when you have problems or need help</p> <p>SA10. Most people do not seem to accept me when I am just being myself</p> <p>SA11. I often find it difficult to feel involved in the things I am doing</p> <p>SA12. Hardly anyone I know is interested in how I really feel inside</p> <p>SA13. In general I feel that I don't have a lot of interests in common with the other students in this school</p> <p>SA14. I often feel alone when I am with other people</p> <p>SA15. If I really had my choice I would live my life in a very different way than I do</p>
<p>Work alienation</p> <p>WA1. Over the years I have become disillusioned by my work</p> <p>WA2. I often wish I was doing something else while I am at work</p> <p>WA3. I do not feel connected to the events in my workplace</p>
<p>Marxist alienation</p> <p>MA1. The only thing I look forward to on my job is getting paid</p> <p>MA2. The time really drags for me when I am at work</p> <p>MA3. On my job I feel as if the machines and equipment control me</p> <p>MA4. When I am working I feel like I become just another part of the machinery</p> <p>MA5. I really have to force myself to go in to work</p>

APPENDIX B

TABLE 2
EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS (EFA) OF 5 SEEMAN AND
3 UNIDIMENSIONAL ALIENATION FACTORS

Items	Factor											
	1			2			3			4		
	SA	WA	MA	SA	WA	MA	SA	WA	MA	SA	WA	MA
PO1	.66	.64	.64	.00	.05	.06	.01	.05	.06	.10	.11	.12
PO2	.71	.70	.71	.10	.12	.09	.11	.14	.11	.10	.10	.09
PO3	.71	.71	.71	-.03	-.01	-.04	.24	.25	.22	.03	.04	.03
PO4	.53	.54	.54	.37	.32	.33	.33	.34	.37	.05	.04	.05
PO5	.51	.52	.50	.26	.24	.27	.18	.19	.23	.02	.03	.05
PO6	.65	.64	.64	.18	.14	.15	.20	.22	.24	.09	.08	.09
PO7	.55	.54	.55	.23	.20	.18	.24	.24	.26	.12	.12	.12
ME1	.26	.25	.26	.18	.14	.14	.37	.40	.38	.12	.11	.10
ME2	.27	.24	.25	.16	.21	.18	.54	.56	.56	-.04	-.03	-.03
ME3	.16	.17	.17	.21	.16	.17	.66	.64	.65	.16	.15	.15
ME4	.34	.31	.31	.08	.09	.08	.73	.76	.75	.07	.08	.09
ME5	.29	.26	.25	.17	.17	.17	.60	.61	.65	.01	.01	.03
ME6	.17	.12	.12	.10	.12	.11	.58	.60	.61	.01	.05	.06
NO1	.13	.15	.14	-.02	-.03	-.03	-.13	-.15	-.14	.01	-.01	-.01
NO2	.20	.21	.20	.18	.18	.19	-.03	-.03	-.02	.20	.21	.22
NO3	.19	.20	.20	.21	.21	.19	.20	.19	.18	.00	.01	.01
NO4	-.02	.03	.03	.30	.25	.24	.33	.30	.31	.13	.12	.12
NO5	.01	.02	.02	.12	.11	.11	.22	.21	.24	-.03	-.02	-.01
NO6	-.15	-.14	-.15	.04	.11	.11	.29	.26	.28	.06	.09	.10
SI1	.12	.12	.12	.10	.09	.10	-.01	.01	.03	.71	.71	.72
SI2	.07	.07	.08	.06	.09	.08	.04	.06	.06	.86	.88	.88
SI3	.12	.11	.12	.12	.12	.11	.15	.17	.16	.76	.77	.77
SI4	.07	.07	.06	-.02	.00	.00	.04	.05	.05	.67	.67	.67
SE1	.15	.14	.14	.67	.68	.66	.24	.28	.29	.01	.03	.03
SE2	.25	.23	.23	.79	.82	.80	.12	.17	.18	.10	.13	.13
SE3	.20	.19	.19	.81	.86	.85	.14	.17	.19	.12	.15	.15
SE4	.21	.19	.19	.72	.77	.75	.16	.19	.21	.06	.10	.10
SA1	.09	—	—	.14	—	—	-.01	—	—	.10	—	—
SA2	.15	—	—	.05	—	—	.17	—	—	.21	—	—
SA3	.15	—	—	.59	—	—	.21	—	—	.14	—	—
SA4	.05	—	—	.15	—	—	.21	—	—	.08	—	—
SA5	-.06	—	—	-.10	—	—	.24	—	—	-.05	—	—
SA6	.01	—	—	.42	—	—	.20	—	—	.14	—	—
SA7	.11	—	—	.34	—	—	.13	—	—	-.06	—	—
SA8	.14	—	—	.27	—	—	.08	—	—	.10	—	—
SA9	.06	—	—	.19	—	—	.00	—	—	.01	—	—
SA10	.11	—	—	.19	—	—	.08	—	—	.14	—	—
SA11	.23	—	—	.30	—	—	.16	—	—	.04	—	—
SA12	.12	—	—	.15	—	—	.10	—	—	.17	—	—
SA13	-.03	—	—	.08	—	—	.12	—	—	.23	—	—
SA14	.05	—	—	.21	—	—	.13	—	—	.11	—	—
SA15	.18	—	—	.21	—	—	.23	—	—	.29	—	—
WA1	—	.11	—	—	.25	—	—	.16	—	—	.13	—
WA2	—	.15	—	—	.12	—	—	.18	—	—	.16	—
WA3	—	.06	—	—	.26	—	—	.17	—	—	.14	—
MA1	—	—	.21	—	—	.03	—	—	.17	—	—	.06
MA2	—	—	.06	—	—	.08	—	—	.20	—	—	.14
MA3	—	—	.08	—	—	.29	—	—	.04	—	—	.06
MA4	—	—	.04	—	—	.25	—	—	.06	—	—	.08
MA5	—	—	.09	—	—	.14	—	—	.10	—	—	-.03

Note. PO = Powerlessness; ME = Meaninglessness; NO = Normlessness; SI = Social isolation; SE = Self-estrangement; SA = Student alienation; WA = Work alienation; MA = Marxist alienation.

APPENDIX B

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Items	Factor					
	1			2		
	SA	WA	MA	SA	WA	MA
PO1	-.02	.00	.00	.19	.11	.07
PO2	.12	.11	.11	.02	-.09	.03
PO3	.18	.20	.18	.05	-.04	.13
PO4	.07	.06	.06	.08	.14	.06
PO5	.05	.07	.06	.21	.26	.13
PO6	.00	-.01	.00	.08	.16	.09
PO7	.19	.17	.16	.04	.11	.12
ME1	.05	.04	.05	-.03	-.03	-.02
ME2	.00	.08	.07	.25	.11	.17
ME3	.01	.07	.08	.11	.08	.01
ME4	.15	.19	.19	.20	.13	.12
ME5	.12	.18	.17	.34	.37	.28
ME6	.15	.19	.17	.26	.23	.20
NO1	.34	.32	.32	.08	.12	.13
NO2	.45	.44	.44	.14	.09	.09
NO3	.64	.65	.65	.17	.05	.14
NO4	.52	.55	.55	.17	.04	.07
NO5	.54	.58	.58	.21	.13	.06
NO6	.45	.54	.52	.40	.22	.22
SI1	.06	.07	.07	.15	.13	.06
SI2	.12	.14	.15	.20	.05	.04
SI3	.14	.14	.14	.15	.06	.05
SI4	-.13	-.09	-.09	.16	.10	.09
SE1	.16	.21	.21	.26	.11	.16
SE2	.11	.18	.17	.34	.19	.26
SE3	.12	.19	.19	.37	.22	.22
SE4	.14	.21	.20	.35	.22	.27
SA1	.09	-	-	.49	-	-
SA2	.17	-	-	.47	-	-
SA3	.17	-	-	.45	-	-
SA4	-.05	-	-	.46	-	-
SA5	.14	-	-	.40	-	-
SA6	.22	-	-	.34	-	-
SA7	.26	-	-	.53	-	-
SA8	.08	-	-	.66	-	-
SA9	.18	-	-	.64	-	-
SA10	.15	-	-	.71	-	-
SA11	.14	-	-	.68	-	-
SA12	.09	-	-	.75	-	-
SA13	.07	-	-	.71	-	-
SA14	.09	-	-	.69	-	-
SA15	.17	-	-	.56	-	-
WA1	-	.15	-	-	.62	-
WA2	-	.18	-	-	.69	-
WA3	-	.23	-	-	.76	-
MA1	-	-	.13	-	-	.73
MA2	-	-	.02	-	-	.72
MA3	-	-	.12	-	-	.71
MA4	-	-	.18	-	-	.74
MA5	-	-	.17	-	-	.71