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Abstract

Of 637 students in Psychology I who responded to a loneliness survey, 30 volunteered, weeks later, to take part in small groups for, what appeared to be, an unrelated study of acquaintance. They were asked to write and video-record self-characterizations which were then swapped between groups. Members of groups rated videos recorded by subjects in groups outside of their own, to indicate how much they would like to get better acquainted with them. Evidence in the literature supports the hypothesis that the lonely evaluate others negatively but that others, in general, do not view the lonely unfavourably. Results showed the contrary: Loneliness was significantly correlated (r=.39, df=28, p<.05) with being less attractive as an acquaintance; in contrast, the loneliness of raters did not appear to correlate with the ratings they gave. Material from the character-sketches and results of the loneliness survey provide clues as to why students were less interested in making the acquaintance of the lonely individual. An independent group of 10 raters helped establish that sketches by highly lonely subjects tended to (a) have an overall negative content, (b) lack references to friends/benefits of friendship, and (c) express values deviant from the peer group norm. Prospects for loneliness therapy are discussed, leading to the point that not all socially undesirable characteristics communicated by the lonely to potential friends and intimates can, or should be withheld, or replaced, by the expression of more positively regarded aspects of personality.
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He is afraid.  
He is totally alone.  
He is three million light years from home.

Spielberg's ET The Extra-Terrestrial stands as one of the biggest money-spinners in film history. Its appeal is universal because ET's feelings are familiar to those of us who have experienced loneliness, and felt "light years from home", without leaving behind the planet, or even the front doorstep.

Surveys identify loneliness as a common social problem. In America, 26% of respondents to a national survey said that during the past few weeks they had felt "very lonely or remote from other people" (Bradburn, 1969). Dr Tony Lake, author of Loneliness, a book published in the United Kingdom, writes: "From the results of different surveys it seems likely that nearly half the single adult population and more than a quarter of the married population are to some extent lonely at this moment" (quoted by Byrnes, 1982).

The high prevalence of loneliness can be inferred from the interest shown in the problem by the media, businesses and community welfare organizations. Radio talk-back programs and television panel-games ostensibly help the lonely and are popular entertainments. The theme of loneliness has been pursued in film by the acclaimed Australian director, Paul Cox. His films, especially "Lonely Hearts", "Man of Flowers" and "My First Wife" have been critical and box-office successes.
Advertisers skillfully sell a motley array of products and services as cures for loneliness. If you buy a pair of jeans or a bottle of suntan lotion, subscribe to a magazine or take a holiday then, the ads imply, popularity and friendship are yours. Businesses catering specifically for the lonely customer range from introduction services to courses designed to enhance social desirability. The quaint matchmaker of olden days is superseded by agencies boasting the latest in technology -- computer-assessed compatibility. Their effectiveness is unknown.

The Wesley Central Mission runs a substantial community welfare program as well as Life Line, a telephone counselling service. Life Line's Annual Statistics for the year July 1979 to June 1980 assign 2110 calls to "social isolation", a major problem category, along with "Anxiety/Depression" (4711 calls) and "Marital Problems" (2237 calls). Rev Gordon Moyes, superintendent of the Wesley Centre attributed the increase in calls to Life Line in 1980 to loneliness "eating at the hearts of people" (Easter Dawn Service, 1980).

Long before loneliness became the focus of scientific study, it was well trodden ground in philosophy, literature and religion. From the pool of ideas outside of the discipline of science, the psychologist can find wisdom and imagination which, when correctly tempered,
spawn testable hypotheses.

Mijuskovic (1977), an associate professor in philosophy, argues that in the man whose physiological and biological needs are met, loneliness becomes the principle through which his behaviour can be understood. To support his thesis, Mijuskovic instances many famous figures from literature: Sophocles' Oedipus Rex, a man condemned through blindness to a life alone, Nietzsche's Zarathustra, a man seeking solitude away from the flies of the market place, and Sartre's Existential Man, lonely in his choosing to create being from nothingness.

Another scholar has taken an eclectic approach to describe a kind of loneliness which invades the man who observes life instead of losing himself in the experience of it. Like Mijuskovic, Wilson (1963) discusses Nietzsche, Sartre and a host of characters from literature to illuminate the Outsider, "a man who is interested to know how he should live instead of merely taking life as it comes" (p.70, op. cit.).

Philosophers have shown men how to question and doubt, stimulating a very intellectual, rather than heart-felt, experience of loneliness. Men of faith have persuaded others to believe, to find meaning through faith in religion. A believer may be deserted by men but not by his God. For Christians the ear of God is never deaf to sincere prayer, a balm for the lonely. Of course, doubt or
sin can crumble the bridge between man and God leaving loneliness in its place. Alternatively, solitude may lead to a strengthening of the tie with God. The asceticism of strict contemplative orders such as the Cistercians is justified by the belief that in "the wilderness", free of worldly distractions, a man is most open to God's teachings. So, like the philosopher, the theologian is prepared to examine loneliness, but in terms unfamiliar to the contemporary psychologist who, given the constraints of scientific method, attempts to deal with the experience as it is born of more mundane circumstances: friendship or intimacy, unfound or lost.

There is a saying, credited to Harold Pinter, (Cohen & Cohen, 1980) that "the more acute the experience the less articulate its expression". Because loneliness is an acutely painful, distressing experience it could be said that only the most articulate of men can convey it well in their writing. This may in part explain why loneliness expressed by the novelists and poets have long moved readers, while loneliness researched in science is only now beginning to draw attention. Having suggested the prominence of loneliness in a list of social problems, researchers (e.g. Russell et al., 1978) keenly point out that in psychology its study has, until recently, been neglected. The APA's Psychological Abstracts confirm this. In the 1968 Index, the subject heading "Loneliness" did not exist. Five years later, 4 abstracts were listed under
"Loneliness" and, in the 1983 Subject Index (Vols 69 & 70) there were 9 listings.

Personal experiences are acceptable ingredients of the writer's work but their influence in a work of science would normally be called intrusive, breaking down detachment, threatening objectivity. Because loneliness is so common, the researcher is prone to see in others a projection of his own experience of the phenomenon. This, however, only partly explains why psychologists have been slow to take up the study of loneliness. A better explanation would mention that loneliness defies precise definition and measurement, two basic elements of scientific method. Since the condition is in the main neither pathological nor as exotic as a mental illness like schizophrenia, the psychologist's expertise is less likely to go unchallenged by the layman who can stick to his own experience or commonsense. For example, Horowitz and de Sales French (1979) announce that the lonely report problems of inhibited sociability. Such unremarkable conclusions, albeit rigorously tested, are easily scoffed at by the layman. "I could have told you so", or, "Anyone knows that", he retorts.

DEFINING LONELINESS

In 1953, Sullivan in The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry conceived of loneliness as an "exceedingly unpleasant and driving experience connected with an
inadequate discharge of the need for human intimacy". The experience, according to Sullivan, emerges in adolescence with the need for friendship and the awareness of sexuality. Since Sullivan's writing, the definitions have multiplied, the similarities between most of them making for a conceptual pea soup. Fromm-Reichmann (1959) aimed for clarity by distinguishing "real loneliness", the condition she was interested in discussing, from other types of loneliness. She ruled out the type of loneliness philosophers showed was the lot of every human being. She also put aside constructive loneliness, the state of being alone and the feeling of grief following the death of a loved one. Whereas Sullivan spoke of a "driving experience" and Mijuskovic (1977) of the motivating power of loneliness, Fromm-Reichmann wrote about emotional paralysis and helplessness, believing that prolonged loneliness is toxic, a path to psychosis. While loneliness has been linked with depression (Ortega, 1969), characterized as it is by feelings of hopelessness and a loss of motivation, loneliness researchers have shown that the two conditions, while related and probably sharing common causes, are quite different (Weeks et al., 1980).

In May, 1979, the first national conference on loneliness was held at UCLA (Rubin, 1979) drawing attention to the new and growing body of empirical research, efforts to move away from the clinician's casebook to generalisations about the nature of loneliness and those
who suffer it. One of the speakers was Robert Weiss whose book, *Loneliness: The Experience of Emotional and Social Isolation*, helped make the field popular with researchers. He defines loneliness as "a response to the absence of some particular relational provision" (Weiss, 1973, p. 17). He identifies two types of loneliness, "emotional isolation", the response to the lack of one intimate relationship, for example a spouse or confidant, and "social isolation", a response to a lack of contact with a supportive social network. It follows that a person can have a wide circle of friends and be an active member of a community yet feel lonely for want of an emotional attachment. It also follows that a couple happy in their marriage can be lonely when friendships, kept before the marriage, dissolve.

Peplau and Perlman (1979) prefer a cognitive approach where loneliness results from "a discrepancy between the person's desired and achieved levels of social interaction" (p. 55). So loneliness arises when either (1) the desired level of social contact increases while the actual level remains the same, or, (2) the actual level decreases while the desired level remains the same. The first instance is common in adolescence when the increasing desire for intimacy with the opposite sex is felt before it can be found. The second instance may be illustrated by loss of a partner through death, separation, divorce, or by dislocation from a socially
supportive network through migration, retrenchment or retirement from work, or incapacitating sickness.

MEASUREMENT

Loneliness is an experience not a behaviour. What a person thinks or feels can, of course, be inferred from behaviour, though the confidence with which these inferences are made often belie their accuracy. A paper with the pert title, If You Want to Know How Happy I am You'll Have to Ask Me (Irwin et al., 1979), like two studies before it, shows that people are surprisingly poor judges of another's happiness, even when that other is an old acquaintance, a friend or relative. The same point applies to loneliness. To measure it the psychologist relies on self-reports.

The simplest measures are variations of the direct question "Are you lonely?". Measures of this form are popular in surveys such as the one conducted by Bradburn (1969). One of their disadvantages lies in their explicitness. Loneliness is associated with failure ("To be lonely is to have failed"; Gordon, 1976, p.15) and so people may be disinclined to admit to loneliness when confronted bluntly by it. In one survey, students who supplied their names revealed significantly less loneliness than those who remained anonymous (Powling, 1982). Another problem with this single-item measure is that it is left to the respondent to judge what
sort of experience how keenly felt warrants an affirmative answer. I may be lonely but indicate I am not if I believe that my experience in some sense is "normal" and that the researcher could not be interested in something I share with everyone else.

Multi-item measures, though more time consuming to administer and score, are able to discriminate between types and degrees of loneliness. Data collected from the BELS, a 60-item scale, when factor-analyzed by Belcher (Russell, 1982) revealed 8 overlapping factors which he labelled alienation, anomie, estrangement, existential loneliness, loneliness anxiety, loneliness depression, pathological loneliness, and separateness. The more recently developed DLS (Differential Loneliness Scale) is able to pin-point in what type of relationship a deficit is most felt: romantic-sexual, friendship, familial or community (Schmidt & Sermat, 1983). Some scales are concerned with capturing items which reflect a psychological theory of loneliness. The UCLA Loneliness Scale, for example, is biased towards the way the respondent sees his social situation. He is asked to indicate how often he feels the way described in each of the 20 items, ("There are people who really understand me","I lack companionship") none using the word "loneliness". In contrast, the NYU (New York University) Loneliness Scale carries a dispositional bias. Every item asks the respondent to consider him or herself as a lonely
A comprehensive review of loneliness measures, and the UCLA Loneliness Scale in particular, is provided by Russell (In Peplau & Perlman, 1982. See Tables 6.1 & 6.2). A glance at his summary of the measures' characteristics shows high reliability (split-half, test-retest or coefficient alpha) but somewhat shallow tests of validity. The most common evidence for validity is given as a correlation between scores from the measure and responses to the question "Are you lonely?" Of course, the latter question is not necessarily any more likely to elicit a truer response. The other approach involves comparing the difference in scores between two groups, one of which is assumed likely to be lonelier than the other (e.g. a general sample of students with students who seek help from on-campus counselling service). The weakness with this method is that the groups are likely to be different along any number of variables. The researcher may therefore end up measuring a compound of shyness, social adjustment, depression, anxiety, and so on.

CORRELATES

With measures developed in the late 1970s, a spate of empirical studies proceeded to find the place of loneliness in the tapestry of already well-researched psychological, behavioural, physiological and biological problems. Seeking concurrent validity for their measure,
the UCLA Loneliness Scale,, Russell et al. (1978) found that loneliness significantly correlated with feelings of emptiness, self-enclosure, awkwardness, boredom, and restlessness. Rubenstein and Shaver (In Peplau and Perlman, 1982) factor analysed the feelings of the lonely to produce 4 factors they called Desperation, Depression, Impatient Boredom and Self-Deprecation. Maroldo (1981) confirmed the association between loneliness and shyness. This connection has also been drawn by Zimbardo (1981) who, made famous by his simulated-prison experiment, turned his attention to the emotional prison which isolates the shy from other people. While investigating the construct validity of the Bradley Loneliness Scale, Loucks (1980) named low self-esteem as another close cousin of loneliness (and, for that matter, shyness).

If loneliness is associated with a host of negative feelings, especially arising from self-perceived problems in socialising, then the lonely might be expected to differ markedly in their social behaviour. Jones (1981) asked college students to monitor their conversations over a four-day period. In proportion to the total number of interactions, the lonely tended to interact with a greater diversity of people and interactions arose from less intimate relationships (fewer conversations with family; more with strangers and acquaintances than with friends). Russell et al. (1980) found that lonely students reported spending more time alone and less time in social activity.
But not all studies find reduced social contact. Cutrona, Russell and Peplau (cited in Chelune et al., 1980) report that loneliness was unrelated to dating status, number of close friends, and the frequency of family contact. Since these sorts of studies rely on reports by the lonely on their own behaviour, the question as to the extent the lonely are acting differently (e.g. are spending more time alone), or are seeing themselves as acting differently, is open. The lonely may record fewer contacts with friends because they might be more inclined to call an acquaintance what a nonlonely person would call a friend.

Another cluster of studies have correlated loneliness with different aspects of communication. Sufferers typically attribute their negative feelings to "the lack of an opportunity to talk about personally important, private matters with someone else" (Sermat and Smyth, 1973, p.332). Perhaps the lonely fail to develop intimate relationships and find confidants because they fail as communicators. In one experiment (Gerson and Perlman, 1979), subjects were video-taped as they assessed the pleasantness of slides. A group of "receivers", by watching the videos, were asked to guess "senders" responses to the slides. Chronically lonely "senders", defined as those who reported both feeling lonely during the past few weeks and usually feeling that way in life, were less effective "senders" than the situationally lonely, those who reported feeling lonely only during the
past two weeks.

If the lonely are more poker-faced, then they would also seem to be cautious and reserved about what they express verbally. In writing about debatable social issues such as abortion and juvenile delinquency, lonely students were less confident of their opinions and less inclined to express these publicly (Hansson and Jones, 1981). This reserve is also apparent in what they choose to say about themselves. In my previous study (Powling, 1982), partners of lonely mixed-sex dyads rated each-other's self-disclosures as being less intimate in topic but more negative in content (Powling, 1982). Solano et al. (1982) reported less intimate self-disclosure in mixed-sex dyads but not in same-sex dyads where the lonely tended, at an early stage only, to disclose too much.

A modern approach to health care gives increasing recognition to the role of psychological factors in disease. Taking an extreme position, Harrison (1984) argues that virtually all illness is, to some extent, self-created, a patient's way of, for instance, gaining the attention of someone who otherwise would not lend a sympathetic ear. Loneliness would appear to account for a good proportion of "somatizers", patients whose ailments have a non-organic basis, ailments which by a conservative estimate cost the American health care system $20 billion a year (Ford cited by Toufexis, 1983). Apart from these
diseases, manufactured by mind to soothe mind, mounting evidence implicates loneliness in the aetiology of serious diseases. Lynch (1977) presents social isolation as a factor increasing the risk of Coronary Heart Disease. Mehrtens and Thompson (1983) report on research by Dr. C.B. Thomas: "One of the strongest prognosticators of cancer, mental illness and suicide was "lack of closeness to parents" and a negative attitude toward one's family". In their article on stress, Mehrtens and Thompson cite the work of Leonard Syme who found that "even after adjusting for such factors as smoking and histories of major illnesses, people with few close contacts were dying two to three times faster than those who regularly turned to their friends".

**EPIDEMIOLOGY**

As with disease, the distribution of loneliness through a population can be studied with respect to a host of demographic and other variables which define groups or strata in society. The value of taking an epidemiological view of the problem is clear: pockets of loneliness in a community, once located, can be studied with a view to developing therapies tailor-made to suit the type of loneliness arising from the personal characteristics or circumstances shared by those in the group. Consider, for example, migrants in Australia who are isolated by their inability to speak English. Individuals belonging to this group can be put in touch with others of the same
nationality who live with the communication barrier. Arrangements might then be made to provide the group with language classes.

When it comes to loneliness, the elderly are popularly believed to constitute the group most "at risk". Certainly, a number of life events common in old age can precipitate loneliness: retirement from the work-force bringing the loss of work-mates and the possibility of the accustomed social life diminished by a lowered income; grown-up children leaving parents to an "empty nest"; the death of one's friends and especially the death of one's spouse. Kivett (1979) associated loneliness in old age with widowhood, poor health, lack of transport and being female, the latter presumably due to the tendency of women to outlive men. Similar results were reported in a Swedish study (Berg et al., 1981) where, once again, widowhood was a powerful predictor of loneliness. Using interview material, Lopata (1969) described the various forms loneliness took in a sample of widows, some not only missing their husband as companion and lover but also as someone who provided status, opportunities to socialize and around whom domestic life was organized. Her paper is one of many supportive of Bowlby's thesis (1980) that just as intimate attachments are the source of great strength and pleasure, their disruption can be the cause of long and various suffering.
In the span of life, it is among adolescents and young adults, however, that self-reported loneliness is highest, and this is not merely attributable to what may be the younger generation's greater willingness to admit to the experience (Peplau et al. in Peplau and Perlman, 1982, viz. Table 20.1.). The Bildungsromane of Hermann Hesse typically trace the growth of a youthful hero through the pain of feeling disconnected from other people. One character (Hesse, 1910/1983), Lohe, an old teacher, speaks of a "state of complete loneliness" as a curable sickness in young people which is "part of the inevitable period of development". Decades later, Erikson (1950, *Childhood and Society*) proposed his "Eight Stages of Man". According to his theory, the inevitable task of the young adult is to resolve the conflict between intimacy and isolation. Good relationships with peers and, to a lesser extent with family, seem necessary in the resolution of the conflict (Goswick and Jones, 1982).

The struggle to find work and the stigma of belonging to the dole culture (Windschuttle, 1981; Chap. 3) are likely aggravators of loneliness in Australian youth. Indeed, the unemployed constitute another sizeable group "at risk". A Gallup Poll (McNair Anderson, 1984) conducted in December, 1983, asked Australians to choose from a list of 13 problems the one most concerning them. Chief concern, a problem chosen by 40% of the sample, was youth unemployment, ranked ahead of problems such as inflation,
the road toll and loneliness. Turtle et al. (1978) compared employed and unemployed Sydney youth. She found those without jobs withdrawn from society, socially inactive, sapped of energy and cut-off from friends.

Of the young, students are not immune to loneliness. The start of tertiary studies is often accompanied by the first taste of independence, a taste soured by physical or psychological separation from family and school friends. A study of university dropouts (Lawrence, 1971) revealed many who had found campus an unfriendly and cold place which left them friendless and lonely.

The elderly, the unemployed, widows. The list of groups vulnerable to loneliness is easily expanded. Attention can be drawn to those isolated by handicaps such as paraplegia or deafness. Alcoholics and compulsive gamblers take a different path to loneliness. Ex-psychiatric patients and ex-prisoners find they are isolated by the powerful and cursed stigma of their past. The universality of loneliness together with the many diverse elements of which society is composed means that hundreds of studies might bear a title like "Loneliness in a group of ... ". Seabrook's (1973) portraits of the lonely introduce the reader to people from all walks of life. The psychologist, looking at the detail of these lives, is faced with almost as many forms of loneliness as there are sufferers from it. The task of developing a useful theory of loneliness which can shed light on each
and every case is therefore quite daunting.

EXPLANATIONS OF LONELINESS

Loneliness is experienced at the organism level. A systems approach (Flander, 1982) allows for the integration of explanations from different levels. At the highest level, the question is why mankind should suffer from loneliness at all. This is the favourite domain of philosophers who talk of consciousness and free will, and of theologians who may follow the consequences of man's exile from Eden. Also at this level are the evolutionists who seek to explain loneliness as an experience promoting attachment behaviour. Members of the species who stick together, who are attached to one another, have a better chance of surviving, of fending off predators and of finding a suitable mate. (Bowlby on "Attachment Theory", 1980). Paradoxically, loneliness would seem to have negative survival value at the cellular or organ level. Recall its suspected correlation with disease (p.14)

Moving down a level, from mankind to human society, explanations offered by sociologists and historians become relevant. The latter can point to changes in society conducive to loneliness. High density cities have grown and with the revolution in communication a man's potential contact with others is far greater than ever before. The ekistic principles of Doxiadis (1970) apply: maximization of potential contact does not necessarily optimize the
quality of relationships between people. On the contrary, if I know I can speak to millions of people over the telephone or walk in a street bustling with pedestrians the pain of being friendless is greater. The crowd bestows anonymity. The scenario parallels that of the unresponsive bystander (Latane and Darley, 1970): surrounded by large numbers, no one person is likely to shoulder the responsibility of my welfare.

The relationship between social contact and the urban environment, in particular the layout and design of buildings, is beginning to be explored (e.g. Crabbe and Alexander, 1983). The corner store, with its personalised service, provides a meeting place for the socially isolated that a supermarket does not (Horne, 84, SMH 10.3.84). Students are more satisfied with their peer and staff relationships if they attend a smaller university (Williams, 1982). The message repeats itself: Intimacy is swallowed up in a multitude.

The 20th century is a period of such enormous change that the individual, failing to keep pace, contracts "future shock". Toffler (1970), who coined the expression, sees modern man's mobility, his regimented life and compartmentalized relationships contributing to social dissatisfaction. Slater (1970) places more emphasis on American ideals, arguing that the striving for individuality over dependence, and the valuing of
competition over cooperation amount to a pursuit of loneliness. Riesman (1961) also targets modern America and other affluent countries as dominated by loneliness-promoting social forces. His idea is that societies characterized by "incipient population decline" (i.e. low birth and death rates) enforce conformity by developing other-directed people who display "exceptional sensitivity to the actions and wishes of others (p.38)". Compared with members of other societies, more are employed in tertiary industry and all have more time for leisure. For them, people-worries tower over material worries because they are judged by their social behaviour and they care about what others think of them.

Descending another level in the systems hierarchy we consider loneliness as it relates to groups. One of the most common pieces of advice the lonely must receive is "join a group". Unfortunately group membership can contribute to, as much as alleviate, loneliness. Jerrme (1983) found that the women who needed the companionship offered by a "Friendship Club" were less likely to secure it. The group, instead of solving their problem, exposed their social inadequacies. One thinks of the family as a refuge from the turbulence and strangeness of society but this is often not the case. Families are beset by internal strife, the delicate balance between members upset by problems such as rivalry, the generation gap, and the insidious ebbing away of affection. So often the parents
wait impatiently for divorce and the children cannot wait to leave home. Many of those who strive to create a family some time later strive to escape from it without psychological injury. But the disintegration of close bonds rarely leaves every member unharmed.

It may never be possible to "cure" loneliness at these higher levels in the system without altering the nature of man himself. If such a change could be imagined it almost certainly would not be desirable, for the same reason that "soma", the panacea in Huxley's "Brave New World" was undesirable from the Savage's point of view. Few men would say they like pain but, at the species level, pain is useful. One can speculate that a society made up of members all perfectly content with their lot would die, metaphorically, of stagnation, or quite literally, from not being able to adapt to change. Attempts to "cure" loneliness at the person level are at least feasible. We know this simply because under certain conditions even the most persistent and chronic loneliness evaporates. But it is difficult to be specific and predict these conditions in a single case. It is even more difficult to create therapeutic conditions. To speak of a cure is to falsely imply that a single remedy is all that is required. Multifactorial problems are rarely solved by the manipulation of one factor. It is with the ultimate aim of alleviating loneliness, however, that psychologists have reflected upon its aetiology.
According to Peplau and Perlman, loneliness arises from a difference between actual and desired social contact. Skill in minimising the discrepancy comes from being able to strengthen relationships we want to develop and weaken others. The importance of having control over one's social life has been emphasised by Schulz (1976). He noted that residents of a retirement home who could choose when a student would come and visit them were less lonely than those who had no choice, even though the duration of visits for both groups was the same.

C.E.M. Joad (1980) wrote about the enormous effort that is put into social control: "My life is spent in a perpetual alternation between two rhythms, the rhythm of attracting people for fear I may be lonely and the rhythm of trying to get rid of them because I know that I am bored".

Commonsense would dictate, and most theories assume, that lonely people have difficulty getting into the first rhythm: the lonely try to attract others but fail. And because they are rejected by others they have to put up with a suboptimal social life. I shall call this a Type 1 explanation of loneliness. A less obvious possibility is that the lonely are themselves not interested in getting closer to those with whom they have contact and so fail to hold up their end in a relationship. In this, a Type 2
explanation of loneliness, others do not initially discriminate against the lonely. I say initially because once the lonely person's lack of interest is communicated to others, then these others will be inclined to cease their friendly overtures. The two explanations should therefore not be regarded as mutually exclusive.

Theories of interpersonal attraction and the process of acquaintanceship have undertaken the intriguing but frightfully difficult job of explaining how, and under what circumstances, relationships grow. They can therefore suggest why lonely people fail to grow loneliness-relieving relationships. An important first step is to distinguish between different types of relationships and different stages in their evolution. Factors predicting growth will not be the same for a relationship between two children, two same-sex friends, husband and wife, employer and employee, and so on. Similarly, what may be signs of stability in a relationship years old may be the symptoms of a break-up between two people who have known each other for only weeks.

When the lonely are rejected it is important to establish at what stage in a relationship this rejection occurs. By "stage" it is usual to refer to the type of information parties have of each other. Altman and Taylor (1973) model personality as an organized structure
resembling a layered onion. Information about a person can be classified according to the area it takes up and the depth at which it lies. Surface areas offer the most visible and least intimate information about a person such as physical appearance, clothes worn, bearing and mannerisms. At lower levels are ideas, beliefs, feelings -- information which must be either inferred from the visible or communicated directly. The core of personality contains the most intimate, and private characteristics. Here, stored well away from public view, are what a person regards as undesirable aspects of self, including, perhaps, loneliness.

According to the model, a deepening relationship is accompanied by the disclosure of increasingly intimate information. Whether the relationship does progress depends on how each partner assesses the rewards and costs involved. The judgement is based on how favourable previous encounters were and whether the information exchanged predicted good times ahead. A person may be lonely because of appearance (unattractive) or because of what others infer from appearance (unattractive therefore unfriendly, unkind, uninteresting, etc.; see Dion et al., 1972). Socially undesirable characteristics (such as being lonely) may percolate to the surface against the wish of the person to keep them hidden. Others may be unfavourably assessed after the relationship has developed by a measure, and information at middle layers of
personality is revealed. Byrne (1961) showed that "liking" goes with "being alike", that we prefer others who hold similar attitudes to our own. In some cases, the lonely may maintain their condition by holding attitudes which do not conform to those of the groups with whom they identify.

Duck (1977) defines acquaintance as "a communication process whereby an individual transmits (consciously) or conveys (unintentionally) information about his personality structure and content. Poor communication of the lonely may stem from the content and structure of their personality. On one hand, they may disclose less of themselves to others because they believe -- and perhaps rightly so -- that what they reveal would be damaging. On the other, they may break a relationship when, in thinking they cannot play with open cards for fear of others' judgements, they are spurned for reticence. One of Jourard's (1971) most robust findings is that, within limits, openness and attraction go together; unreciprocated self-disclosure is interpreted as a sign of mistrust and disliking.

If the lonely differ from others in the way they view the world, they are most likely to differ in the way they model the social world. Explaining the origin of such models has been the forte of psychodynamic theorists who have linked adult loneliness to infantile experience (e.g. Klein, 1963). Bowlby (1980) looked at the relationship
between infants and mothers in primates and humans. Infants whose "primary attachment figures" did not take time or care with them displayed disturbances in social behaviour called "anxious attachment" and "detachment". Shaver and Rubenstein (1980) note that these two states in the young mirror the behaviour of lonely adults who tend to be "clingy" in their relationships or cold and distant. They mention the "intergenerational transmission of marital instability", an interesting hypothesis which states that a poor relationship between parents damages their child's capacity to develop a healthy model of the social world such that when it grows up it will relive in a new family some of the problems of the old.

Theories of IPA (Interpersonal Attraction) and acquaintance suggest what might be "wrong" with people who are rejected by others. I want to consider now the possibility of the lonely person being the rejecting party. On the surface this, what I have called a Type 2 explanation of loneliness, seems implausible. A man dying of thirst in the desert is hardly expected to walk away from an oasis he has just sighted. But, to continue the analogy, the man may believe what he sees is a mirage or hallucination in which case he may be inclined to stay put and conserve his energy. By the same token, what may appear to be opportunities for social fulfilment to one, may seem unsatisfying or downright threatening to the lonely person.
Jones et al. (1981) collected data from dyads which showed that lonely members attributed unfavourable characteristics to their partners and so were less attracted to them. The same paper also added to the pile of evidence indicating that the lonely think badly of themselves. One might argue that they project their self-perceived faults onto others and so come to dislike them.

Extending Weiner's (1978) work on attribution, Peplau, Russell and Heim (1979) classify what the lonely person believes are the causes of the failure to achieve the desired social life. Classifying these attributions along the dimensions of internality, stability and control give valuable clues about the lonely person's emotional responses, view of the future, and what coping strategies, if any, he or she considers are worth taking. If I attribute my loneliness to a personal defect (internal cause) which, of its own accord, will not go away (stable cause), and which I am powerless to change (uncontrollable cause) then I am likely to resign myself to a miserable fate. From this perspective, my approaching others would be a waste of time and effort, and if they happen to approach me then it must be out of sympathy, nothing more.

Henderson (1977) quotes Kessel on the "armour of loneliness": "whereas some suffer loneliness, others achieve it". Armour, of course, is a defence against attack, and in the lonely, it can refer to a protective
shell of behaviours aimed at pleasing others. From behind this shell the inner self can feel free from judgement but also freed from the acceptance of others which it needs to grow strong. Rogers (1977) believes that the most profound loneliness is experienced by the person who, with defences lowered or overcome, feels rejected. To avoid the pain, the person may resolve to repel others before they can exert influence. Thus Type 2 loneliness may be explained as a preemptive strike based on the philosophy that if I leave you before you decide to leave me I shall suffer less harm.

Finally, there is a type of person who chooses a path in life realising full well it winds through valleys of loneliness. Social satisfaction is displaced by a higher good. Such a choice could be made by an artist who finds creativity in discontent, a philosopher who would never grapple so violently with truth as in unhappiness, and a sinner who sacrifices the company of cherished sinners in favour of God's grace.

THE PRESENT STUDY

Two broad types of psychological explanations of loneliness have been presented. In the first, the lonely seek emotional and social attachments from those around them but are rejected due to some combination of undesirable personal characteristics and gauche social behaviours. In the second, the lonely make a move away
from others who would not normally discriminate against them, one possible reason for this withdrawal being the avoidance of the pain previously experienced from rejection.

Data bearing on the adequacy of these two explanations is sparse and equivocal. Jones (in Peplau and Perlman, 1982) writes: "there has been only weak and inconsistent evidence that lonely subjects are differentially evaluated by others" (p.247). Yet, this is surprising in the light of studies which find behavioural correlates of loneliness and argue that these behaviours decrease social competence. It is reported, for example, that the lonely give their partners in conversation less attention (Jones et al., 1982) and seem prone to inappropriate self-disclosure (Chelune et al., 1980). Jones et al. (1981), in their study of loneliness and interpersonal judgements, paired subjects and instructed them to converse for 15 minutes. One might expect that an unstructured and unmonitored interaction of this kind might not expose the factors which are said to impair a person's social functioning, hence the "weak and inconsistent findings". As to the response of the lonely, they do view others negatively (Jones et al., 1981) but whether they therefore do not wish to know them is unclear. Differences between the lonely and nonlonely on social contact is not so pronounced as might be expected if indeed the lonely do "pull away" from others.
The aim of the present study is to weigh these types of explanations, one with the other, by encouraging the exchange of information between subjects (external, impersonal and interpersonal; Duck and Craig, 1977) and then testing for an association between loneliness and subjects' interest in getting to know their new acquaintances better. The two main hypotheses can be described as follows:

(1) Subjects will be less interested in developing a relationship with new acquaintances who are lonely,

(2) Lonely subjects will be less interested in developing a relationship with their new acquaintances,

In planning to test these hypotheses, it was considered desirable to employ a technique called self-characterization (Kelly, 1955) to promote and guide acquaintanceship, and to record information elicited by this technique on video. Initially, it was decided to foster acquaintance within small groups so that members would be able to gain a reasonable impression of each of the others. They would be instructed to write a character-sketch of themselves -- a "self-characterization" -- and share what they had written with the group. In this way, subjects would be able to compare their liking for one person with their liking for the rest. Naturally, a group
of this nature allows some degree of interaction between its members but this, in fact, presents a problem. Any one group-member's response to another, say, A's response to B, will be influenced not only by the characteristics of A or B considered separately, but by B's response to A. For this reason, it would be impossible to decide between one hypothesis and the other using the responses of members to each other within the one group. Instead, by exchanging between groups the video recordings, it would be possible to obtain subjects' responses uncontaminated by their targets' reactions to them.

What subjects write about themselves is, of course, useful in the interpretation of results. Should one or both of the hypotheses be supported, then these pieces of writing could suggest reasons why, in one particular case, loneliness and unsociability, or loneliness and unattractiveness, should go together. One might expect the circumstances to be quite different from one person to the next, however, these individual differences should provide fertile soil for discussion.
METHOD

MEASURING LONELINESS

Human subjects, and especially psychology freshmen, often quite correctly assume, that the researcher is looking for relationships between scores on the tests he administers. Subjects are not automata -- they reflect upon the purpose of the task they are given and put themselves into the experimenter's shoes: "If this was my experiment, what would I be wanting to show?" It is particularly important to take this point into account when looking at loneliness because, as it is measured from subjects' self-reports, it is almost impossible to measure unobtrusively, though mislabeling and embedding can be taken as diversionary measures.

To minimise "demand characteristics" (Orne, 1962) loneliness scores were obtained from a "Social Satisfaction Survey" conducted four to five months before groups were conducted, this second part purporting to investigate the process of acquaintance between members. The two sets of data were therefore well and truly divorced in time, place and context. Given the passage of time, however, it is important to question the accuracy of the measure as a predictor of loneliness as experienced at the time the groups were held. The problem is more apparent than real: loneliness is such an enduring condition that about 3/4 of the respondents who showed they were lonely at the time of the survey could still be
fairly described as lonely some months later when the groups were conducted. In support, Cutrona, Russell and Peplau (cited in Jones et al., 1981) noted that "two-thirds of a group of lonely, beginning college students were still lonely 7 months later".

The so-called "Social Satisfaction Survey" was administered in March to Psychology I classes. Tutors were asked to present it as teaching material, an example of the many paper-and-pencil tests commonly used by psychologists. Some results from the survey were then made available to tutors who could use them to illustrate to students the descriptive statistics taught in the syllabus (mean, median, mode, etc.). A listing of social satisfaction scores was printed next to student numbers and posted on the Psychology I notice board. A level of privacy preserved, a student could still look up his or her own score and find its place in the distribution.

Two other advantages stem from the measurement of loneliness by survey. Firstly, because of the fair degree of anonymity it affords, possible distortion of scores through a social desirability effect is reduced. In a previous survey (Powling, 1982), those who did not identify themselves by name were significantly more likely to admit to loneliness. Secondly, normative data is provided, against which the adequacy of the smaller sample, consisting of volunteers recruited into groups, can be
judged. A small sample, by virtue of its size alone, may be a poor representation. Rossiter (1976) cites studies which show that volunteers often differ in numerous respects from those who do not step forward.

The Social Satisfaction Survey sheet (Appendix A) consisted of demographic items on one side (e.g. Age, Sex, Nationality, etc.) and the Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell et al., 1980) on the reverse. Like the original scale with which it correlates $r = .91$, the 20-item, UCLA measure has high internal consistency indicated by a coefficient alpha of .94. Unlike the older measure, negative statements (e.g. "I lack companionship" and "People are around me but not with me") are counterbalanced by an equal number of positive statements (e.g. "I feel in tune with the people around me" and "I feel part of a group of friends"). This arrangement avoids response bias and serves to mask our interest in those whose scores push them out towards the scale's negative pole. Respondents are asked to indicate how often they feel the way described by each item. The loneliness score is the total of the subject's responses to each of the 20 statements and can range from a minimum of 20 to a maximum of 80.

Affective states theoretically related to loneliness correlate with the measure, an indication of concurrent validity. To demonstrate discriminant validity, Russell et al. (1980) showed that after mood (e.g. negative affect)
and personality variables (e.g. social risk taking) were entered into a regression equation for the prediction of loneliness as measured by the scale, a significant additional proportion of the variance was predicted by a single-item index, "Are you lonely?". Although the UCLA scale, like other loneliness measures, is far from ideal, its properties are at least well known. It has been applied extensively in recent research. For these reasons it was chosen for this study in preference to lesser-known measures.

FORMATION OF GROUPS

With data from the survey on file, the next step was to recruit volunteers who would participate in small groups, get acquainted with each other, convey something of their natures to video, and finally, rate recordings made by those they had not met before. A request for research participants was displayed on a notice-board where, throughout the year, other psychology researchers advertise their projects and offer credit in return for students' time. The request (Appendix B) carried the project title "Acquaintance in Groups". It promised students that they would "have the opportunity to get to know a bit about each other and explore their interest in others' self-descriptions". Volunteers were instructed to leave their names, telephone and student numbers, the latter providing the key to the survey data. The "total
number of participants" was hoped to exceed 50. With this number, a better than 4 in 5 chance of rejecting the null hypothesis of nil correlation between loneliness and a variable based subjects' ratings could be enjoyed given $a=0.05$ and an expected $r$ of 0.40 (Cohen, 1969, Table 3.3.5.)

At the beginning of second session in July, over 80 names had been collected. Unfortunately, not more than half that number could be recruited into groups for the following reasons:

1/ About 1/4 of those who signed up provided student numbers which could not be traced to the listing from the loneliness survey.

2/ The ideal group would be composed of members ranging widely in loneliness but otherwise quite homogeneous. Mature age and married students could be isolated in a group of young, single school-leavers merely because of their age and marital status. They were excluded from the study.

3/ Some volunteers when contacted could not attend at a time convenient to the rest of the group and the researcher. Others were unable to be contacted.

An effort was made to group subjects who ranged widely in loneliness. They were assigned to same-sex groups because the balancing of the sexes was impractical. Reflecting the Psychology I class, the majority of volunteers were girls. It was therefore impossible to match females with males without further threatening the sample size.

Taking a worst case of $n=30$, and assuming $r=0.40$ and $a=0.05$, power drops to just below 2 in 3. In a last ditch
attempt to boost numbers and still keep the groups and the
survey within a reasonable time frame, permission was
sought to solicit students by phone. Instead, access was
granted to student addresses. The failure of a trial batch
of 14 hastily dispatched letters of invitation to elicit
even one reply left only two options open (Appendix C):
(1) repeat the study in the new academic year bringing n
to 60 and boosting power to 90%, or (2) draw what
conclusions could be made from the small sample with the
considerable chance of failing to detect a moderate
effect. The second option was chosen. The cost of
faithfully replicating the study was considered to
outweigh the benefit of increased power afforded by (1).

PROCEDURE IN GROUPS

SELF-CHARACTERIZATION

Once assembled, group members were introduced to each
other and to the task of getting better acquainted with
those in their own group. To facilitate what is often a
slow and awkward process --"What do you say to a bunch of
strangers?" -- the technique of self-characterization was
adopted from Kelly (1955,p.315) along with his script:

"I want you to write a character sketch of yourself,
just as if you're the principal character in a play. Write
it as it might be written by a friend who knows you very
intimately and very sympathetically, perhaps better than
anyone could really know you. I'd like you to write it in
the third person. So, for example, I would start off by
writing 'Markus is ...' ".

A pilot study conducted at an earlier date confirmed
the promise of self-characterization as a technique for encouraging self-disclosure among groups of students who would normally be cautious, detached and reticent. Through what they write about themselves, subjects are prepared to share details of their lives they would otherwise hold back from strangers. Writing peels away the layers hiding personality. In the pilot, students wrote about their problems in relationships with family and friends, their difficulties in coping with the demands of study, and their doubts about their ability to reach their goals. The pilot study demonstrated that character-sketches can largely circumvent the problem of the tied tongue and overcome the superficiality of what is conveyed in brief laboratory exercises. It is as if the concentration and control involved in writing lowers inhibitions.

Subjects were given about 20 minutes to complete their sketches. As a precaution against the feeling that intimate disclosure would be forced, subjects were asked to read through what they had written and mark off anything they considered private, any parts they would not feel comfortable sharing with the group. Next, subjects, in turn, read out aloud the non-private sections of the sketches. The researcher himself, a 23-year-old student, presented his own sketch to the group (Appendix D). It was believed that this act would promote subjects' trust in him, without introducing any systematic bias: at the time the researcher read his own sketch, subjects had already
written their pieces. If subjects were given a measure of insight into the researcher's own life and personality, then, it was thought, they would feel less apprehensive about their own contribution. The threat to the subjects of being judged could be neutralized or weakened by allowing them some information by which they could judge the person conducting the group.

VIDEO

The final step in generating the stimulus material, the block of information about each participant, involved video-recording subjects as they read their character-sketches. The rationale for using video lay in the need to overcome the problem of observer-target interaction. If I am sitting in the same group as you, then my rating of you, say, as a potential friend, will not be independent of your rating of me. Your antipathy towards me or disinterest in me, for example, can be communicated in a split-second of eye-contact. Of course, if you appear on video you may react to whom you think your audience will be but you cannot react to each viewer personally. This much subjects were told. What they were not told was that this simplification, this control over the flow of information, was dictated by an interest in two sorts of explanations of loneliness.

The eye of the camera unsettles the untrained
subject. The anxiety of being recorded affects behaviour in predictable ways. Ethical problems, however, precluded candid photography and so the task was to make the shooting as low-key as possible. Even so, one student refused to be recorded and another consented to only a sound recording. This was a pity because both had been remarkably frank in what they had written and both scored high on loneliness. One could say they declined video-recording because they had been exceptionally open.

Fig. 1 Position of camera

The seats in the laboratory were arranged in a semi-circle (see Figure 1) Group members could see each other and the camera could see them, panning easily between them. Up to the time of filming, the video equipment was pointed away from the group so that, while it was in view,
it did not appear as an obvious part of the session. When the group was ready to record, a technician was called to operate the equipment. Subjects were instructed to read their pieces as they had done before, without paying the camera any attention. Nervousness and other "side-effects" of using video usually reduce and distort what a subject says. Self-characterization, however, eliminated this problem. Although nervousness sometimes showed in the monotone or speed with which a sketch was read, the content of a subject's delivery was fixed before the stress induced by video could take its toll.

RATING PLAY-BACKS

A measure was needed to gauge the interest each subject had in getting to know better those appearing in the group on video. A five-point rating scale was devised for this purpose (Appendix E). At one extreme, the subject could indicate that s/he would not want to meet the person on screen; at the other extreme, s/he could indicate that a meeting with that person would be most welcome.

Recordings were made of 30 subjects belonging to 5 groups ranging in size from 5 to 7 members. The plan was to run groups in pairs and swap recordings between them. A glance at the table of results shows that the transfer was somewhat more complicated. Not all members of one group rated the same group of sketches. For example, 2 girls in Group 3 rated Group 4 while the rest rated Group 1. This
irregularity, harmless in itself, arose when appointments could not be arranged at times suitable to the plan of research.

Where possible, subjects rated recordings immediately after they had made their own. When tapes of the target group were unavailable, subjects were asked to return to the laboratory a matter of days later. Before the screening, subjects were told that their ratings, unlike their character-sketches, would only be seen by the researcher. While it was hoped that subjects would be unacquainted with their targets, they were instructed to make a note in the event that any were known to them (e.g. a school friend) Sketches were separated on video by several seconds of blank tape. Ratings were made during these pauses. It was suggested to subjects that they might like to change their ratings after they had seen the entire group.

At the end of the exercise, subjects were asked to offer any comments or suggestions they had about the study. Several students who wanted to see their own videos were allowed to do so. Questions were answered as honestly as possible within the constraints of withholding specific hypotheses and keeping secret the topic of interest, loneliness. The common "What was it really about" was parried by a few thoughts on self-disclosure, acquaintance, and the link between them. Students still
curious were advised to phone the researcher after the data had been collected and when the veil over purpose could be lifted.
RESULTS

COMPARISON OF SURVEY SAMPLE WITH VIDEO SAMPLE

Respondents to the survey were 637 Psychology I students, 233 males and 404 females, 70% (443/626) of whom were under 22 years of age. Most were single (90% or 558/623), Australian (75% or 461/617) and in the first year of their course (70% or 430/615). About half lived with parents (49% or 307/626) and just over half were unemployed (53% or 334/626).

Mean loneliness score for the survey sample was 37.56 for males and 36.92 for females with respective standard deviations (SDs) of 9.82 and 9.63. Scores ranged from the lowest possible of 20 to a maximum of 75. This distribution of scores is remarkably similar to that obtained by Russell et al. (1980), developers of the UCLA scale, using a sample of American students: Mean (males)=37.06 with SD=10.91, mean (females)=36.06 with SD=10.11.

A total of 39 subjects were recruited into the laboratory, 6 of these for the sole purpose of rating the fifth "unpaired" group on video. Of the 33 remaining, 3 did not make recordings for the following reasons: (1) had to leave lab early to attend lecture, (2) could not write a character sketch due to an injured arm, and (3) wished to keep information disclosed private. One of the 30 subjects consented only to a sound recording but was still
included as a target.

Subjects who recorded character-sketches (n=30), like respondents to the survey, were young (80% under 22 years of age with the oldest being 26), Australian (70% or 21/30) and in their first year of studies (63% or 19/30). The majority lived at home with parents (63% or 19/30). Of those on video, 83% were female, partly reflecting the larger proportion of females to males in Psychology I as well as the even larger proportion of females who volunteered for the study, an effect possibly attributable to the fact that females tend to be more attracted to "vaguely explained" or "standard sounding" tasks (Rossiter, 1976). All volunteers selected were single.

Loneliness scores of those on video averaged 39.07, SD of 10.48, and ranged from 22 to 65. The video sample was therefore reasonably representative of the survey sample with respect to the degree and spread of loneliness.

ASSEMBLING RATINGS

Scores from the rating scale were assembled for each group in a (rater x target) matrix. Mean ratings of the rows indicate the interest a rater had in making the acquaintance of members of the target group, the subjects presented on video. Mean ratings of the columns show relative "popularity" or "attractiveness" of the targets as acquaintances among the group of raters.
From an inspection of Table 1, it can be seen that R1 expressed the least interest in getting to know the group on video better (mean rating = 2.3) and that the most interest was shown by R3 (mean rating=3.2). Looking at Table 1 Data matrix showing ratings of Group 2 by Group 1 (for mean ratings, given and received, of all subjects see Appendix F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>Means (rows) Group Mean</th>
<th>Means less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means (cols)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Gp Mean=16/6 =2.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means -</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gp Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: R3 knew R4 and so X appears in place of a rating. Mean is calculated from the remaining ratings.

column means, T1 and T3 were, with means of 3.2 and 2.2 respectively, the most and least highly rated targets in the group. The small differences between means stem from subjects' reluctance to choose items from either extreme of the rating scale. In this group, the number of times each point on the scale was chosen is as follows:

Item (Times Chosen): 1(1),2(14),3(17),4(2),5(1)

So ((14 + 17)/35) x 100 or almost 90 percent of the
ratings amounted to a choice between item 2 and item 3, "I don't particularly care whether or not I have the opportunity to get to know X better" and "I'd be quite happy to get to know X better without particularly wanting to pursue the acquaintance". This is an indication that in some proportion (a) raters had not formed strong attitudes towards the subjects they "met" on screen, and (b) they did not want to admit that they had formed stronger attitudes, that they had been moved to an extreme on the scale by the brief exposure to each target. More subtly graded items could have been combined to form what would appear on paper as a more sensitive scale. But then it is improbable that raters would feel confident or comfortable making such fine discriminations.

To see at a glance by sign which raters and which targets scored above (+) and below (-) average for their group, differences between means and the group mean were taken. These differences were then correlated with loneliness scores to determine whether, and if so, to what extent, the lonely person rejects others in a group of acquaintances and/or is rejected by them.

SIMPLE AND PARTIAL CORRELATION

Since the groups on video were not matched on the loneliness of their members, deviation scores were calculated to remove differences in means between groups. Loneliness deviation scores were then correlated with the
deviation scores of mean received ratings, the rating of any target being conceivably influenced by the loneliness of other targets appearing in the group. Raw loneliness scores were correlated with deviation scores of mean given ratings, the rating made by one subject not susceptible to influence by the loneliness of others making ratings of the same group on video.

Table 2 Correlation of loneliness, ratings given ("sociability") and received ("attractiveness").

1. Ratings given with loneliness = .164 (n=30)
2. Ratings received with loneliness = -.391 (n=30)
3. Ratings given with ratings received = .288 (n=28)

   r crit. for 1. & 2. = .349 (a=.05, two-tailed)
   r crit. for 3. = .361 (a=.05, two-tailed)

The data revealed that subjects, having viewed their sister group on video, were likely to express less interest in getting better acquainted with the lonelier members of the group. As presented in Table 2 above, appearing with less lonely colleagues on video was significantly correlated with receiving lower ratings from one's peers. Contrary to expectation, no evidence was found that the lonelier the subjects, the less interest they would show in bettering their acquaintance with the targets on video. Thus, only the first of the two hypotheses received support.

To elucidate the relationship between the variables (loneliness and ratings received, loneliness and ratings
given) partial correlations were calculated. In each case, the association between two of the variables was increased when the effect of variation in the third variable was removed. On its own, ratings received accounted for \((-0.391)^2\) or 0.153 of the variance in loneliness scores. When ratings given is considered also, the percentage of total variance "explained" rises to 0.236 (Appendix G).

Table 3 Partial Correlations

1. Loneliness with ratings given holding ratings received constant = 0.314
2. Loneliness with ratings received holding ratings given constant = -0.464
3. Ratings given with ratings received holding loneliness constant = 0.388

If the critical value presented in Table 2 is applied to the partial correlations, the relationship between ratings given and ratings received moves into significance when loneliness is kept constant. In other words, in a group where everyone was equally lonely, how "sociable" a person was would be a predictor of how "attractive" s/he would be as an acquaintance.

SELF-CHARACTERIZATION: TWO EXTREME CASES

Self-characterization grew from Kelly's (1955) belief that the therapist, if he is prepared to listen, can learn a lot from the patient's own account of himself and his condition. To learn why lonelier group members were less highly rated, it is instructive to read their character-
sketches. Qualitative material explains quantitative results.

Here, then, are two sketches, each transcribed verbatim except for minor changes to protect the writers' anonymity. For contrast, the two examples are taken from the least lonely (score of 22) and the most lonely (score of 65) subject in the sample. There is no need to label them. The polarity of each is obvious. Differences between extremes are easily picked. These two cases, along with others will fuel discussion in a later section.

CASE 1

"Leanne" is a funloving, energetic girl who loves the country life, but also enjoys Sydney life. She enjoys social work and the different avenues it allows her to explore. She loves swimming, tennis, anything outdoors. She loves animals, especially dogs. If she could she would travel every year and ski if she could afford. At the moment she lives with her younger sister -- which is great fun. She enjoys playing the piano and [she has] begun guitar lessons. After university she hopes to work in a hospital, focusing mainly on helping quadriplegics (she can't spell)[sic:her own words].

After leaving school, she did one year of Arts and one year of education at Sydney University, then deferred, going to N.S.W. uni last year. At Christmas, she spent 3 months overseas visiting friends and relatives in England, Switzerland, Italy, Monaco and New York. She really loved it, being her first trip overseas.

CASE 2

"Natale" is a mixed bundle of characteristics. She can be both serious and outrageously funny. She has a dry sense of humour and is very brittle when she talks. She can "cut" into people and hurt them brutally with her words. She is forthright and honest -- she speaks her mind to her friends when she agrees or disagrees. Often times she seems cut away from the rest of the world. She does
not like to be considered as one of the same old boring lot. She tries to strive for originality and because she is herself: often people do not understand her. She seems not to be of a warm nature. She seems aloof and cold at times -- but I question whether she is revealing all? She is impatient and often times an intolerant person. She does not break down tasks or situations into smaller units but attacks things in the "whole" so she finishes quickly.

She is a responsible and trustworthy person. She is also very lazy, she finds it hard to start work on a project etc. She usually leaves things to the last minute and so does not dwell on them but accomplishes the task in the minimum of time and effort. She is a great lover of music. She loves beautiful things and has traditional, more conservative tastes in clothes etc. She wishes at all times to present a picture of composure, organisation. She is proud of her heritage and of her people and she defends them emphatically.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

On reading a dozen or so sketches by lonely subjects, one finds that the roots of loneliness, however complicated, often branch from simple personal facts, the sort of information contained on a passport, tax return or census sheet. ANOVA by SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) was carried out to determine whether groups based on demographic variables such as marital status and nationality differed significantly on loneliness.

The null hypothesis of no difference among groups on loneliness was rejected at α=.05 level for six group variables:

(1) Nationality:
Australian, Asian, European or Other
( F(3, 613)=6.02 )
Follow-up tests in the form of protected t-tests yielded some interesting findings which replicate and extend those of a similar, older survey (Powling, 1982).

The test value is given by: 
\[ t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{MS_w}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2}}} \] 
where \( k \) = number of groups, \( N = N_1 + N_2 + \ldots + N_k \)

A few examples:

* Asian but not European students were significantly more lonely than Australian students ( \( t(612) = 3.77, p < .05 \) vs \( t(312) = 1.02, p > .05 \) )

* Those who spoke only English were significantly less lonely than those who could speak another fluently ( \( t(582) = 2.48, p > .05 \) )

* Students who had lived in a foreign country for more than a year were lonelier than those who had not lived outside of Australia ( \( t(540) = 3.77, p > .05 \) )

* The unemployed were lonelier than those who had jobs ( \( t(592) = 4.15, p > .05 \) )

* Students living with parents were less lonely than those sharing off-campus ( \( t(481) = 2.39, p > .05 \) ) and those living alone ( \( t(348) = 3.98, p > .05 \) ).
Effects due to any one demographic variable, though significant, are quite weak and were detected only by virtue of the survey's size. This can be shown by converting a couple of the above t values to point biserial correlations. For example, Asian and Australian groups with loneliness gives:

\[ r = \frac{t}{\sqrt{t^2 + df}} = \frac{(3.77)^2}{(3.77)^2 + 612} = .15 \]

or work status (working and not working) with loneliness:

\[ r = \frac{(4.15)^2}{(4.15)^2 + 592} = .17 \]

In effect, each group membership variable accounts at most for a paltry 2 to 3 percent of the variance in loneliness scores. The predictive power of the variables when combined, however, is likely to be a good deal stronger. A rough way of showing this is to ask dBase II (the survey data was stored on a dBase file) to display the scores of subjects who belonged to two or more of the lonelier groups. The mean of unemployed respondents was 38.74, or only 1.5 points above the mean of the entire sample. The mean for respondents who were both unemployed and living alone (n=16) was 46.876 points above the sample mean. Those unemployed, living alone and not Australian (n=7) averaged a loneliness score of 50.29, more than one standard deviation above the sample mean.

Looking at the means of different subgroups with the help of dBase suggests some strong interactions between variables (unfortunately, variances are not readily
provided by dBase II). Age and marital status are a good illustration. Mean loneliness for respondents over 30 years old (n=17) was 37.46, practically the same as for the whole sample. The same could be said for the large subset (n=565) of the single who averaged an unremarkable 37.34. Students, however, who were both single and over 30, "over the hill" (n=17), had a considerably higher mean of 42.7.
DISCUSSION

Subjects expressed less interest in acquainting themselves with lonely peers (r=-.39, df=28, p<.05). In other words, lonelier targets describing themselves on video attracted significantly lower ratings. The Type 1 explanation of loneliness is therefore supported, with the lonely seemingly prone to rejection. This finding is particularly convincing because the method used to measure the two variables precluded a spurious correlation. A subject's self-reported loneliness was surveyed several months before s/he video-recorded a character sketch, this becoming the stimulus material for subjects of a different group to rate him or her as a prospective acquaintance. It is also noteworthy that the ratings were influenced by short exposures, no more than five minutes of video per subject. Impressions are formed quickly and, outside of the laboratory, sway the course of the acquaintance at an early stage. In contrast, no evidence suggested that lonely raters were less interested in making the acquaintance of those on video (r=.16, df=28, p>.05).

The correlation between ratings given ("sociability") and ratings received ("attractiveness"), though non-significant (r=.29, df=26, p>.05), could obscure the relationship between loneliness and ratings received. The partial correlation between these two variables, holding ratings given constant, was therefore calculated and found to be stronger (r=-.46) than the simple correlation.
The correlation between loneliness and ratings given, when ratings received is held constant, while also strengthened, remains non-significant ($r=.314$, $df=28$, $p>.05$). In short, the pattern of results which favour a Type J, rather than a Type L, explanation of loneliness, is retained after partial correlations are calculated.

The results appear to be the converse of findings by Jones et al. (1981). They reported that, while loneliness was clearly associated with negative evaluation of self and others, the lonely were, on the whole, not differentially rated by others. Rather than choose between the seemingly contradictory results of the two studies, differences in outcome can be explained in terms of differences in method. Jones et al. (1981) gave subjects a test booklet which contained both loneliness scale and rating scales, including one each for perceived intelligence, friendliness and attractiveness. Their subjects, sophisticated college undergraduates, could have guessed the research hypotheses from these tests. Good hunches polarise responses in the plane of the hypotheses. In the present study, students would not have associated their response to the loneliness measure with their participation in the rating of targets on video. The illustration shows how two studies with similar aims and different methods can generate results which oppose but do not dismiss each other.

In reference to results obtained from dyads, Jones et
al. (1981) found no main effects for lonely actors but they did mention that lonely women had a poorer opinion of lonely men than of nonlonely men. This result prompts an analysis of interaction between sex and loneliness of rater and sex and loneliness of target with respect to desirability of subjects as acquaintances. Such an analysis, however, was not performed on data from the present study due to the small, unbalanced (5 males, 25 females) sample.

The introduction described a class of explanations which have in common their identification of the lonely person as someone who is rejected by others. "Rejection", with the data at hand, is probably a word more dramatic than appropriate. What can be inferred from the result -- lonelier subjects receiving lower ratings -- is not that they are outcasts, openly shunned by others (after all, item 1 of the rating scale was hardly ever chosen) but that in a variety of social settings they are less regarded as "good company".

Assuming a modest degree of "ecological validity", and remembering that the sample is representative of the large body of students who completed the survey as regards the degree and spread of loneliness, the finding can be generalised to a number of social situations. One such situation is a party where the young people invited are strangers to each other. As is common at parties, groups
of people stand and talk, disband and regroup, so that as the evening progresses each learns something about every one of the other guests. Of course, meeting someone at a party is not the same as spending a few minutes watching that person talk about themselves on video. What is important to realise is that the information communicated or conveyed from one person to another is much the same for subjects in a study of this kind as it is for people attending our imaginary party or engaged in various other social events. At a party, as on video, we can be swayed by physical appearance as well as by what the person says and the way he or she says it. The result not only shows that the lonely are socially discriminated against but suggests also that they transmit information which allows others to make this discrimination. Some of that information is likely to be contained in their self-characterizations.

SELF-CHARACTERIZATION

From a reading of the character-sketches, it is apparent that lonelier subjects self-disclosed more negatively-valued characteristics. This may reflect actual defects in character or more their tendency to carry a poor self-image. Either way, the net effect of negative disclosure is to make the sender less attractive to the recipient (Gilbert & Horenstein, 1975) and so harm his or her standing as someone worth knowing (despite the occasional sympathy won of negative disclosure). Where
subjects were separated by 20 or more points on the loneliness scale, the difference in the valence of the sketches is quite detectable, a not-so-surprising observation which can be tested (see p.64).

"Leanne" (LS(loneliness score)=22) and "Natale" (LS=65), whose sketches were presented (see Results, p. 50), and who come from opposite ends of the scale are a striking pair. Leanne, in her opening line, displays an exuberance, a joie de vivre, uncharacteristic of the lonely. She really tells us that there is nothing important in her life that she does not "enjoy" or "love", verbs she sprinkles through her writing. The city and country, her sister, her university course, sport, animals, travelling, music -- all these are great fun. In her group, she was the most popular target and 4 out of the 6 raters chose item 4, indicating they would "... like the chance to get to know [her] better". Natale, on the other hand, shows herself as "a mixed bundle of characteristics". Admirable qualities, though perhaps not socially advantageous one, such as being "forthright and honest", "responsible and trustworthy" are weighed down by others such as impatience, intolerance and an ability to hurt others. She sketches herself in a harsh light as if to prove her honesty. Loneliness is expressed in feeling misunderstood and "cut away from the rest of the world". Natale was the least popular as a potential acquaintance in her group and 5 out of the 6 raters chose
item 2, indicating they "wouldn't particularly care whether or not [they] had the opportunity to get to know [her] better".

Nelson-Jones (1976) asked students to rate 120 self-referent items in terms of their valence and the risk their disclosure to various recipients would entail. The most positive statements included being happy, healthy, intelligent, heterosexual, having a sense of humour and getting on well with family and friends. Comparing the character-sketches of the most lonely and the least lonely persons in groups suggests that the lonely do not make so many of these positive statements and, in some cases, express the opposite. The least lonely show they draw support and pleasure from people around them: "The best thing about her life now are her friends and the fun they have together" (LS=29); she has "a large group of friends" and "a best friend with whom she shares almost everything" (LS=23); "She loves being with friends either playing sport, talking or working together" (LS=25); he is "happy with his girlfriend" (LS=23).

The most lonely did not say much about friendship. The two loneliest subjects in the single male group did not claim friendship at all. Instead they spoke of pursuits which could alienate them from others and discourage peers from taking initiatives towards friendship. Michael (LS=55) wrote: "One of his ambitions..."
is to help others to know God", a noble purpose but one unlikely to win the friendship of the vast majority of unbelievers. Deep religious conviction, disclosed in the early stages of acquaintance, before other serious aspects of the person become known and appreciated, is probably a bad move for someone looking for friendship: genuine displays of liking become interpretable as thinly disguised attempts at conversion. He was the least popular in his group. Peter was also a lonely male (LS=51) whose system of values, humanist rather than religious, is a likely obstacle to a straightforward social life. He "regards acquisition of knowledge as one of the most important things in his life", more important, one gathers, than friendship since he "likes being on his own a lot of the time and probably values these times most of all". Like Michael, he writes of a lofty purpose, hoping "he can contribute to correcting some of the major injustices of society". That his precious inner-life carries the side effect of loneliness is indicated in a statement he chose not to read to the group: "He finds it increasingly difficult to tolerate those people outside his ideals". Disappointingly, the ratings he gave and received are almost dead-on average. His interesting case did not bolster support for either of the hypotheses.

Nelson-Jones (1976) found a strong correlation between the self-disclosure of negatively-valued characteristics and the risk of both damaging self-esteem
and lowering oneself in the estimation of others. It should be added that lonely subjects may take this risk when they do not affirm the better side of their nature. Unfortunately for the lonely to advertise happiness and a fulfilling social life would be to lie. Whatever the morality of putting on false appearances, it is doubtful whether such things can be feigned convincingly or for any length of time. The lonely might show positive qualities but these will not be close relations of, or assets leading to, social success. Being virtuous, speaking three languages fluently or having a keen aesthetic sense are examples of such qualities. Natale's originality, her love of tradition and beautiful things, her pride for her heritage are also examples. One gained the impression that she prized her "originality", a quality which, in her eyes, put her a cut above "the same old boring lot". Her case supports a point made in the Introduction: Valued personal characteristics, which are somehow dependent on loneliness, help make the condition tolerable or even worthwhile. Of course, the therapist from his perspective might argue that "originality" and "popularity" can, and do, comfortably co-exist in many cases and that the contrary belief stems from the fallacy that good things can only be attained or preserved through suffering.

The danger in laying stress on the self-disclosure behaviour of the lonely is that a false impression can be created: that by simply teaching the lonely to say more
attractive things about themselves all would be well. One problem is that the individual who regularly says one thing while thinking or feeling another is under strain, a state of incongruence which, Rogers (1973) argues, is itself a contributor towards loneliness. Another problem is that characteristics of people which weigh against them being seen as attractive acquaintances are often immutable "facts" which cannot be hidden behind a facade of carefully chosen words. I either am, or am not, an Australian. I am either employed or not. Nationality and work status are two demographic factors identified by the survey as predictors of loneliness. One explanation for the link is that being unemployed or of foreign nationality usually counts against a person socially, making him or her less popular company.

With Asian, but not European students, significantly lonelier than Australians, part of an explanation might focus on the racism exposed by the debate on immigration recently rekindled by Professor Geoffrey Blainey. A better explanation might mention that most Australians, with European ancestry, find European culture more familiar and easier to assimilate than that of the Orient, and so prefer to mix with Europeans with whom they have more to share. The unemployed are less welcome for a different set of reasons. In our sample of students, the admission of being unemployed would not lower social standing among peers as it would for someone who had completed their
education and would be expected to have a job. It is, however, part of the stigma of being jobless that others are more likely to find in that condition personal faults (laziness, incompetence) rather than a social problem (there are simply not enough jobs to go round). Apart from damaging inferences made about the character of the unemployed person is the damaging assessment of their financial state. When people have a "good time" they tend to go out and spend money on transport, food, entertainment, and so on. One reason the jobless are less socially attractive is because they lack the financial prerequisites of having a "good time" and sharing it around.

THREE CLAIMS ABOUT CONTENT TESTED

In the previous section, I examined the written material simply by reading the self-descriptions of lonely and not-so-lonely authors, set down side-by-side. Quotes illustrated the ways in which loneliness was expressed in the content. From this reading emerged claims that the lonely:

(A) Wrote about themselves in a negative light,
(B) Tended not to mention friendship/benefits of friendship & (C) Expressed values deviant from the peer group norm

As they stand, these generalizations could—be, at worst, the biased or idiosyncratic interpretations of one person. To remove this risk, a rating scale was constructed for
each claim (Appendix H) so that it could be tested by independent judges who, blind to the purpose of the study and subjects' loneliness scores, would rate a selection of sketches on (A) valence, (B) friendship mentions, and (C) deviancy of values.

Ten sketches were selected for rating -- 5 by high-lonely subjects (loneliness scores of 50 or more) and 5 by low-lonely subjects (loneliness scores less than 30). To make their task manageable, each of ten 18-24 year-olds rated only 6 randomly ordered sketches -- 3 by high-lonely and 3 by low-lonely writers. The data therefore consisted of 60 ratings: 10 raters X 6 sketches X 3 scales (Appendix I).

T-tests between mean ratings of sketches by the lonely and non-lonely authors supported all three claims:

(A) Sketches by the lonely were rated as having a more negative content (t(58)=3.85, p<.05)

(B) Raters were less likely to agree that lonely writers enjoyed friendship (t(58)=6.52, p<.05)

(C) The thinking/values of the lonely were rated as being less "typical of the young Australian today" (t(58)=3.64, p<.05).

Scores from any one of the three scales may be used to predict whether a sketch was penned by someone lonely or not. But it is by combining the three scales, and adding ratings A, B and C together, that their predictive power becomes exceptionally high. Scale A is a five-
pointer, and scales B and C are four-pointers. Composite scores (A+B+C), can therefore range from 3 to 13. These scores were calculated for the "lonely" and "nonlonely" sketches and their frequencies graphed. The resulting histogram (Fig. 2) makes visible the considerable power of the combined scales in predicting the loneliness of a sketch's author. As can be readily seen, most of the scores above 6 are derived from ratings made of sketches by the lonely. The point biserial correlation between the composite scores and whether or not the sketch was drawn by a lonely subject is .77.

![Histogram showing frequencies of composite scores (scales A, B and C combined) derived from ratings of sketches by high-lonely and low-lonely authors.](image)
In summary, these substantiated claims show that subjects' loneliness can be detected in the content of their self-characterizations. Moreover, these characteristic identifiers of loneliness — the overall negative tone, indications about the lack of friendship, atypical thinking/values — help explain why the lonely are less attractive as acquaintances.

THERAPY

"This is just like Perfect Match", was a comparison several students made between the study and a light-hearted T.V. dating-game where a contestant is matched with one of three others. The idea that people who have much in common will like each other and therefore become better acquainted is not new (e.g. Byrne, 1971). It lends itself to the picture of the lonely as people who are, in various socially undesirable ways, unlike others: square pegs in a game where most of the holes are round. So, on the face of it, the finding that lonely students are less popular as acquaintances, and that certain behaviours such as self-disclosure are responsible for the handicap, leads to the following 2-stage prescription for therapy:

1/ Identification of behaviours best deleted or added to a person's behavioural repertoire, and 2/ Modification of behaviours according to 1/.

But there are problems with so naive a plan. As for (1) above, a great deal of attention has been drawn to a
wide spectrum of behaviours known as social skills. From what is a popular perspective, the lonely are assumed to be deficient in these skills, skills which have, in some cases, deteriorated through lack of use or were simply never acquired. The lonely, it is reasoned, if given the opportunity to learn and practise these skills would have as good a chance as any of fulfilling social goals like making good friends more easily. Argyle (1981) argues that the socially inadequate tend not to exhibit rewarding behaviours to those with whom they interact; for example, they smile less, give fewer compliments, seem unfriendly or uninterested by the tone of their voice, their posture, eye-movements and other subtle and varied non-verbal behaviours. The premise of the social skills approach to therapy is that behaviours which show oneself as a friendly, warm, good-to-know person can be learned just as motor skills (e.g. replacing a worn tap washer) are learned: a task is broken into bits and practised until each part in a complicated sequence is mastered. The relevance of the social skills model to loneliness is supported by Jones et al. (1982) who showed that lonely students in dyadic interaction gave their partners less attention, i.e. made fewer statements or questions about their partner, and that lonely males, instructed to increase their partner-attention, reported feeling less lonely. Gallup (1981) trained groups of socially isolated subjects in skills such as paraphrasing and offering
feedback so that, outside of the group, they would feel socially competent and increase their level of social activity. Scores on post-treatment measures suggested that this goal was achieved, though how long after the last group session this increased level of activity persisted is unknown.

Argyle (1981) clearly believes social skills training programs hold much promise, if only they could be more widely conducted: "It is no longer necessary for a sizeable proportion of the human race to be lonely, isolated, miserable or mentally ill through lack of social skills" (p. 284). What Argyle does not ask is what part of this "sizeable proportion" of mankind are lonely and isolated for reasons other than, or additional to, the lack of social skills. In our sample, lonely students did not display behaviours which could be unquestionably labelled "deficient" or "inappropriate" in a way that, say, communication skills in a group of mental patients can be called, without hesitation, disordered or lacking. The task of identifying specific problems is complex and controversial. With the exception of two non-Australian students (one lonely, the other not) whose command of English was poor, all participants were articulate. The main social handicap of lonely students is not just a failure to communicate.

The problem of identification is familiar in the task of having to explain why, of two faces in a photograph,
one is beautiful and the other is plain. A number of people may unanimously proclaim the beauty of the one over the other and not be able to express or agree upon those features which led them to consensus. Part of the problem lies in the inability to localise and amputate unbeauty (a Newspeak euphemism) in one part of the whole as well as the inability to add beauty to the plain by transferring to it a part of the beautiful. Social skills therapy escapes this particular problem by seeking to inculcate describable, "packageable" behaviours which would enhance the social desirability of anyone using them. One trouble, returning to the photograph, is that a smile and dilated pupils can be added to both faces and the one will -- invariably -- still be more attractive than the other. By the same token, raising everyone's social skills to a uniformly high level will not wipe out isolating differences, some of which emerge in self-disclosures appropriate even during the early stages of acquaintanceship. Just as one can be a "smiling, damned villain", so one can be socially skillful and still damned lonely.

Suppose that some feature or behaviour of a person, present or absent, is deemed responsible for hindering the attainment of a social goal: it may not be possible or desirable to effect the change indicated. It may not be possible to enhance physical attractiveness beyond the limit set by impeccable grooming and the best clothes. It
may not be desirable to attempt to change the core of a personality so that surface characteristics become more acceptable, though this may be possible through psychotherapy. The lonely may keep values not typical of their generation, but suited more to the culture of another time, another country; ideals or ideology unconsidered or voted unimportant by their peers, they might prize. Natale's conservative tastes and concern for "her people", an ethnic minority in Australia, are a too vital a part of her life to be cut away as contributors to her loneliness. Similarly, Michael's religious faith and Peter's high ideals and pursuit of knowledge may be asocial but their removal would undermine their raison d'être. Conformity can be the price of popularity; those unwilling to pay it may find they must come to terms with loneliness.

Concealment of those aspects of self likely to be unfavourably regarded is a risky alternative. Once hidden, the prospect of embarrassment arises should they later be discovered. Persons holding back matters they consider important may feel they have little to say to others, so-much-so that finding themselves unable to match the depth of other's disclosures, they arouse their suspicion. The lonely are credited with being less effective in making themselves known through conversation (Solano et al., 1982). Therapy which concentrates on the content of self-disclosure may, for a period, increase reticence by
heightening self-consciousness. One advantage of group counselling for the lonely over other forms of therapy is that, after a number of sessions, members become familiar with others in the group and learn to trust them so that self-consciousness is gradually eaten away. Pittman (1977) found that of 3 types of group therapy, one based on "interpersonal interaction" rather than insight or techniques such as role-playing or psychodrama was the most effective. Since this conclusion was based on data from 3 groups, each composed of no more than 8 members, he rightly advises of the need to replicate the study with larger numbers, a recommendation equally applicable to the present study.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Data derived from a poor sample limits the number of questions we can expect answered. Perhaps the major weakness of the present study is the size and composition of the sample. That only 30 subjects recorded character-sketches stems from the method of recruitment which placed a premium on ensuring that participants would be unaware of the research hypotheses. Given that volunteers are motivated to verify the experimenter's hypotheses (Schultz, 1969, citing Rosnow & Rosenthal) this is a sensible precaution, worth taking in a future study of this kind, provided it allows the creation of a large enough sample. With n=30 giving a low power, a no better
than 2 in 3 chance of detecting a moderate correlation, the fact that the first null hypothesis was rejected is rather fortunate and the failure to reject the second null hypothesis could easily be a type 2 error. A replication with larger numbers would therefore increase the confidence with which the results could be held. It would also enable the disentanglement of gender differences and interaction effects, which, in the light of findings by Jones et al. (1981), are to be expected. Lonely males may be less interested in mixing with other members of their sex because they might see the alleviation of their loneliness solely in the development of heterosexual relationships. Since males were under-represented in our sample, such a possibility went untested.

A more general criticism of the sample would be that here is, yet again, a study of loneliness in students. The replication of this study on a non-student sample is highly recommended. In a less homogeneous group of young people -- with marital and job status, parental and educational background, all left unrestricted -- the relationship between loneliness and ratings received would probably become more pronounced. It is, however, impossible to write this without feeling a little hypocritical -- why, in the first place, was a non-student sample not used? The answer is, of course, convenience. The bulk of loneliness research derives from work with students because they are well-motivated and usually
compliant subjects who are "on tap" and on campus. Placing imagination over convenience, it would be nice to video-record a sample of young people from many different walks of life who seek companionship from an introduction agency along with an age-matched sample who are not interested in such a service. If, as might be expected, the former group are significantly lonelier than the latter, one might ask how the groups differ on acquaintanceship ratings, given and received. Data from this study would indicate that members seeking companionship as a cure for loneliness would, overall, be less highly regarded as acquaintances. Having friends, it would seem, is a powerful lure for attracting new friends. This, of course, is bad news for the lonely who see themselves as friendless and who give away self-disclosure to that effect.

This proposal, a variation on the present study might, draw subjects from an established "loneliness business" or it might run its own advertising campaign posing as a dating service. The problem with the first option is that management of such a business would have nothing to gain by providing a list of clients for the purpose of research. On the contrary, the research could be viewed as an invasion of privacy and the results of that research a potential threat to business. The second option is not without its problems, though they are surmountable. If a dating service is promised then one
must be offered. Unlike a commercial venture, the project would obviously need to be of a smaller scale. But reducing the number of subjects decreases the degree to which they can be matched with each other. To guarantee some compatibility between subjects, a fairly homogeneous sample would need to be arranged by either advertising the service to a narrow slice of the public or selecting heavily from the respondents to a more general advertising program. For the latter plan to be successful, a large initial response would be essential. Assuming that a satisfactory sample could be recruited, data could be collected which would help determine how helpful introduction services are in alleviating the loneliness of their clients and what problems are encountered by those seeking to meet people in this increasingly popular way. In the current study, subjects reacted to an image on a monitor. In the proposed study, the subjects would indicate, from their experience of several arranged dates, whether or not for them this was a good way of making friends and keeping loneliness at bay.

Finally, one shortcoming of the present study, a failing of many studies like it, is that from a single correlation the researcher can only name possible causal pathways linking variables: He cannot choose between them. "Correlation is not causality". The correlation between loneliness and ratings received is open to various interpretations: People become increasingly lonely because
they sense they are "rejected". Alternatively, a loneliness born of other causes, may display symptoms which discourage others from taking up the threads of friendship. Another possibility is that a third variable causes both loneliness and "rejection". A person deserted by a loved one may feel lonely because of the loss and others may withdraw their friendship precisely because of the desertion and the meaning it holds for them. Also, there is no reason why causality between these variables must be unidirectional. Loneliness and rejection may feed off each other, describing a feedback loop where loneliness leads to rejection which, in turn, worsens loneliness, and so on. Longitudinal studies of loneliness can help identify models of causality which best approximate reality. Causal pathways may be inferred from sets of correlations calculated from measurements of variables taken at suitable intervals. Such studies, though time-consuming and difficult to carry out, still need to be undertaken.

CONCLUSION

One paradox of social psychology is that while it gladly takes the gamut of social problems under its wing, its theories and methods seem impotent in bringing forward their solution, at least on a widespread scale (Blakar, 1981). This seems true of loneliness, especially if it is regarded as an in-built mechanism, the genetic legacy of evolution, and inseparable from its opponent states, just
as pain and pleasure seem inseparably linked (Solomon, 1980). A lonely person will yearn for the time when s/he will be lonesome no more and, indeed, for the students in the sample, the day is likely to come as it is likely to pass. But a society, in which lonely people are many, is unlikely to see the day where its members are lonesome no more.

In an address to a graduating class in New York, Kurt Vonnegut (1981) delivered an anecdote with this message: a politician, carrying the slogan "Lonesome No More!" who could convince voters he had a cure for loneliness, would swamp all opposition. From this study, it can be appreciated why "Lonesome No More!" is a slogan even the psychologist cannot convincingly proclaim. The lonelier a person, the less likely it is that others will cultivate his or her acquaintance. It is clear that what the lonely communicate about themselves hinders the fulfilment of social goals. It is also clear, however, that in a good proportion of cases, the harmful information being communicated does not lend itself to manipulation through therapy. Shyness clinics may reduce communication apprehension; social skills training programs can help people become better listeners or give them a better idea of "what to say after they've said 'Hello'"; human relations groups can be run which allow members to unload themselves of pent up thought and emotion in a "safe" atmosphere. The trouble is, where people go in search of
people, discriminations are made from personal characteristics which cannot be changed or changed only at great sacrifice or expense. From the survey data, it is arguable that some demographic characteristics, immutable "facts" about a person, are associated with loneliness partly because they are socially undesirable. From the content of the character-sketches, it is arguable that "core characteristics" of a person, as Altman and Taylor (1973) might call them, invariably make themselves known to others, and in so doing often become social liabilities. Religious belief, morality, ideals, cultural values, what one considers important in life, all these "deep structures" within the person are virtually impossible to isolate from the "surface structure", that part of the person which is open to the view and judgement of others. If they are "uncommon" or "unacceptable", the two often going together, they inevitably become advertisements, sometimes reluctantly displayed, which draw few votes in the election of friends and confidants, but which, because they are valuable to the person and valuable to society at large, are worth preserving.
APPENDIX A (reduced copy of original)

SOCIAL SATISFACTION SURVEY

NAME __________________________ STUDENT NUMBER _______________________

SEX

1 - Male 2 - Female

MARITAL STATUS

1 - SINGLE 2 - MARRIED 3 - DIVORCED 4 - WIDOWED

HSC AGGREGATE

YEAR OF COURSE 1, 2, 3 or 4

YOUR NATIONALITY

1 - AUSTRALIAN 2 - ASIAN 3 - EUROPEAN 4 - OTHER

NATIONALITY OF MOTHER

NATIONALITY OF FATHER

ARE YOU FLUENT IN A LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH?

1 - No 2 - Yes, in one other language 3 - Yes, in more than one language

HAVE YOU LIVED IN A COUNTRY OTHER THAN AUSTRALIA?

1 - No 2 - Yes, for less than a year 3 - Yes, for more than a year

DO YOU HAVE A JOB?

1 - No 2 - Yes, part time 3 - Yes, full time

WHERE DO YOU LIVE?

1 - With parents 2 - With spouse or de facto 3 - On campus 4 - Off campus, sharing 5 - Off campus, alone
DIRECTIONS: INDICATE HOW OFTEN YOU FEEL THE WAY DESCRIBED IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS. CIRCLE ONE LETTER FOR EACH:

0 indicates "I OFTEN feel this way"
S indicates "I SOMETIMES feel this way"
R indicates "I RARELY feel this way"
N indicates "I NEVER feel this way"

I feel in tune with the people around me O S R N
I lack companionship O S R N
There is no one I can turn to O S R N
I feel alone O S R N
I feel part of a group of friends O S R N
I have a lot in common with the people around me O S R N
I am no longer close to anyone O S R N
My interests and ideas are not shared by those around me O S R N
I am an outgoing person O S R N
There are people I feel close to O S R N
I feel left out O S R N
My social relationships are superficial O S R N
No one really knows me well O S R N
I feel isolated from others O S R N
I can find companionship when I want it O S R N
There are people who really understand me O S R N
I am unhappy being so withdrawn O S R N
People are around me but not with me O S R N
There are people I can talk to O S R N
There are people I can turn to O S R N
APPENDIX B

RESEARCH PARTICIPANT REQUEST

Experimenter: MARKUS POWLING

Supervisor's signature: 

Project Title: ACQUAINTANCE IN GROUPS

No. 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much time per participant</th>
<th>Total number of participants</th>
<th>Total number of participant hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 HOURS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe what the participants will be asked to do: I'm interested in studying the influence of what people say about themselves on the development of acquaintance. Students in a group, of which you'll be a member, will have the opportunity to get to know a bit about each other and explore their interest in others' self-descriptions. Information collected is strictly confidential and your contribution to the research is kept anonymous.

What measures will be taken to brief and debrief the participants?

Subjects will be briefed at each phase of the study, allowing them to become co-experimenters.

Groups are likely to be run at the commencement of second session.

Supplementary Requests (date, time/participant, number of participants, and total hours.

If you're interested in taking part, simply fill in the details below and not forgetting to include your telephone number. In this way, I can place you in a group which will meet at a time convenient for you.
Dear

I need your help!

In 3 months I have to write a thesis — I'm a post-graduate student in Psychology. My study is called 'Acquaintance in Groups'. Although I've had a very good response from Psychology I students, with over 50 volunteers, I need one dozen more participants in the next fortnight.

If you can spare a couple of hours (you'll earn credits) getting to know a bit about some other students then either:

(1) Put your name down for my study, 'Acquaintance in Groups', on the Psychology 1 notice-board.

OR

(2) Ring me on 599-4577 (evenings).

Your cooperation would be much appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Markus Powling.
Markus is someone I don't see very often, a young man in his early twenties who, by appearance, could still pass as a teenager. When we accidentally meet, he is happy enough to stop and talk a little but seems anxious to get away. It is true he is busy: he works full time in the Public Service and undertakes post-graduate study part-time. What drives him away from others, especially from the company of the few he likes, is not his busyness but his shyness. We met last week and he seemed unhappy, complaining that he still hadn't found his place in the world. He is successful and proud of this but expects too much from life. He is little comforted, and all the more impatient, when his parents tell him that at his age he has plenty of time to decide his future. I hope this complicated person stays on the difficult path he has chosen and finds enough contentment there to survive.
APPENDIX E

NAME: .................................

DATE: ............

RATING SCALE : DESIRED ACQUAINTANCE WITH X

From my experience here today:

1. It would be best, on the whole, if X and I didn't meet.

2. I don't particularly care whether or not I have the opportunity to get to know X better.

3. I'd be quite happy to get to know X better without particularly wanting to pursue the acquaintance.

4. I can't see any reason why X and I wouldn't get along and I'd like the chance to get to know X better.

5. I'm sure I'd get along well with X and I'd welcome the chance to get to know X better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX F

**SUMMARY OF DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBNO</th>
<th>LONELINESS</th>
<th>GROUPING</th>
<th>RATINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LO ADJ.LO</td>
<td>GRP TGRP</td>
<td>AS RATER AS TARGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>2.3 - .37 2.75 - .325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.8 .13 3.5 .425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-6.83</td>
<td>3.2 .53 3.3 .225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
<td>2.7 .03 2.7 - .375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-11.83</td>
<td>2.5 - .17 3.0 - .075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>2.5 - .17 3.2 .125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-16.00</td>
<td>3.0 - .09 3.2 .53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>3.2 .11 2.2 - .47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>3.3 .21 2.5 - .17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-4.00</td>
<td>2.7 - .39 2.8 .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
<td>3.3 .21 3.0 .33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
<td>3.0 - .09 2.3 - .37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>3.2 .11 3.43 .6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>2.8 - .11 2.43 - .4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>. . 2.57 - .26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-14.86</td>
<td>3.4 .31 2.86 .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-3.86</td>
<td>2.83 - .26 2.8 - .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-9.86</td>
<td>3.2 .29 2.71 - .12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15.14</td>
<td>3.0 - .09 3.0 .17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>. . 3.0 .16 . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>. . 2.0 - .84 . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-17.6</td>
<td>2.71 - .13 3.0 .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.83 - .01 2.87 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>3.43 .59 2.63 - .24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>2.43 - .41 2.75 - .12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.5 .66 3.14 .27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>3.0 .09 3.17 - .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-2.17</td>
<td>3.8 .89 3.83 .62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-6.17</td>
<td>2.4 - .51 3.17 - .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-13.17</td>
<td>2.6 - .31 3.67 .46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.6 - .31 2.83 - .38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>. . 2.6 - .61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>6 5</td>
<td>3.33 .12 . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>6 5</td>
<td>3.16 - .05 . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>6 5</td>
<td>3.0 - .21 . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>6 5</td>
<td>2.6 - .61 . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>6 5</td>
<td>3.0 - .21 . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>6 5</td>
<td>4.16 .95 . . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY: HOW TO READ THE FIRST LINE OF DATA**

Subject Number 1 scored 49 on the UCLA Loneliness Scale which is 8.17 units above the mean for Group 1, the group whose members she appeared with on video. Her average rating of the members in Target Group 2 was 2.3 or -.37 units less than the mean of Group 1's ratings of Group 2. The members in Group 2 gave her a mean rating of 2.75 which is -.325 units below the average ratings of Group 1 by Group 2.
POINTS TO NOTE

All subjects, except those in Group 4, are female.

Missing data for subjects 8, 16, 21, 22 & 33 is indicated by a decimal point in place of a number. Many such points are evident in the data for subjects 34 to 39 simply because they were only recruited to rate Group 5.
APPENDIX G

SIMPLE CORRELATIONS

RATINGS GIVEN
\[ \rho_{1.23}^{2} = \frac{\rho_{12} - \rho_{23} \cdot \rho_{13}}{\sqrt{1 - \rho_{13}^{2}} \cdot \sqrt{1 - \rho_{23}^{2}}} \]
\[ \rho_{1.23}^{2} = \frac{.164 - (-.391 \times .288)}{\sqrt{1 - (-.391)^2} \cdot \sqrt{1 - (.288)^2}} \]
\[ \rho_{1.23}^{2} = .314 \]

RATINGS RECEIVED
\[ \rho_{1.23}^{3} = -.391 \]

PARTIAL CORRELATIONS

LONELINESS & RATINGS GIVEN (HOLDING RATINGS RECEIVED CONSTANT)
\[ \rho_{13.2} = \frac{-\rho_{12} - (\rho_{12} \times \rho_{13})}{\sqrt{1 - (-\rho_{12} \times \rho_{13})^2} \cdot \sqrt{1 - \rho_{13}^2}} \]
\[ \rho_{13.2} = \frac{-\rho_{12} - (\rho_{12} \times \rho_{13})}{\sqrt{1 - \rho_{13}^2} \cdot \sqrt{1 - \rho_{13}^2}} \]
\[ \rho_{13.2} = -.464 \]

LONELINESS & RATINGS RECEIVED (HOLDING RATINGS GIVEN CONSTANT)
\[ \rho_{23.1} = \frac{\rho_{23} - (\rho_{23} \times \rho_{21})}{\sqrt{1 - (-\rho_{23} \times \rho_{21})^2} \cdot \sqrt{1 - \rho_{23}^2}} \]
\[ \rho_{23.1} = \frac{\rho_{23} - (\rho_{23} \times \rho_{21})}{\sqrt{1 - \rho_{23}^2} \cdot \sqrt{1 - \rho_{23}^2}} \]
\[ \rho_{23.1} = .388 \]

\[ R^2_{1.23} = \rho_{13.2}^2 (1 - \rho_{12}^2) + \rho_{12}^2 = (-.464)^2 (1 - (.164)^2) + (.164)^2 \]
\[ R^2_{1.23} = .236 \]
Young people between the ages of 17 and 24 were asked to write about themselves in the third person. You are given six pages, each of which will have one person’s self-description, followed by 3 multiple-choice items.

Spend a couple of minutes browsing through them.

Now, read each one carefully. After you have examined one, select the option for each of the 3 items which best fits from your reading.
She is a not too keen student at the university of N.S.W. but plans to keep going with the course hoping that 2nd year will get better. She enjoys seeing her uni friends at lunch-times and these are now becoming her weekend friends as well. This means she is slightly losing contact with old friends but still sees them as much as possible. She enjoys having a good time at parties, seeing bands, going to the pub, and going away for weekends to friends' beach houses and farms. She also loves going skiing and meeting new people. She is always joking and often finds it hard to be really serious except when best friends confide in her about their problems. Thus most of the time she is either smiling, about to laugh (often holding it in) or actually laughing. She still lives at home but spends little time there which means she gets on well with her parents. She has recently got a waitressing job but will probably soon quit as the owner is making her work on Saturday nights.

The best thing about her life now are her friends and the fun they have together especially at parties and then the laughing back at old memories. Although she has few strict plans for the future (due to her often called "happy-go-lucky attitude") the one aim she is determined to keep is that she will travel overseas and possibly live and work there for a few years. She would not mind going by herself but is planning to meet up with people over there and originally leave with her older sister.

She likes new things and having new experiences to laugh about and add a bit of interest and excitement to her life. She always seems to see the funny side of situations even when many others cannot at all. This can get her into trouble. She hates fake people, bores and vanity. Although she is meant to be smart (according to her parents) she often makes stupid comments and is highly gullible but can take a joke against herself well (she's had lots of practice). Her only regret in life is not doing drama and music at school as she enjoys seeing plays and good movies and most forms of music.

(A) OVERALL, WHAT THIS PERSON WROTE ABOUT HERSELF ARE:

MAINLY GOOD THINGS
MORE GOOD THINGS THAN BAD
A BALANCE OF GOOD & BAD THINGS
MORE BAD THINGS THAN GOOD
MAINLY BAD THINGS

(B) ON THE EVIDENCE, WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THIS PERSON IS ENJOYING THE COMPANY OF FRIENDS OR ONE SPECIAL FRIEND:

DEFINITELY AGREE
PROBABLY AGREE
PROBABLY DISAGREE
DEFINITELY DISAGREE

(C) WOULD YOU SAY THAT THIS IS THE SORT OF PERSON WHOSE THINKING OR VALUES ARE TYPICAL OF THE YOUNG AUSTRALIAN TODAY:

DEFINITELY
PROBABLY
UNLIKELY
DEFINITELY NOT
He's about 6ft and of reasonable build, was thin but has become a bit podgy in the face of late. He's a reasonably well-educated person who regards acquisition of knowledge as one of the most important things in his life. He has started a course in social work and feels that his education is the key to making him a good worker (education not in the academic sense). After a year overseas he thought he had fairly definite ideas on what he wanted to achieve but the confronting attitudes and ideas encountered in social work have changed a lot of that.

He's a person with a sense of justice and fairness which prompted him to decide on a service occupation and hopes that he can contribute to correcting some of the major injustices in society. He thinks a lot about his ideals, politics, religion and society and this has probably contributed to a touch of unsociability. He finds it increasingly difficult to tolerate those people outside of his own ideals. By nature he is a fairly cheerful person though not overtly so, he gets on reasonably well with those around him though finds it hard to approach people and initiate friendships or conversations. He likes being on his own a lot of the time and probably values these times most of all.

***

(A) OVERALL, WHAT THIS PERSON WROTE ABOUT HIMSELF ARE:

MAINLY GOOD THINGS 1
MORE GOOD THINGS THAN BAD 2
A BALANCE OF GOOD & BAD THINGS 3
MORE BAD THINGS THAN GOOD 4
MAINLY BAD THINGS 5

(B) ON THE EVIDENCE, WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THIS PERSON IS ENJOYING THE COMPANY OF FRIENDS OR ONE SPECIAL FRIEND:

DEFINITELY AGREE 1
PROBABLY AGREE 2
PROBABLY DISAGREE 3
DEFINITELY DISAGREE 4

(C) WOULD YOU SAY THAT THIS IS THE SORT OF PERSON Whose THINKING OR VALUES ARE TYPICAL OF THE YOUNG AUSTRALIAN TODAY:

DEFINITELY 1
PROBABLY 2
UNLIKELY 3
DEFINITELY NOT 4
SKETCH NO. 2

She is a funloving, energetic girl who loves the country life, but also enjoys Sydney life. She enjoys social work and the different avenues it allows her to explore. She loves swimming, tennis, anything outdoors. She loves animals, especially dogs. If she could she would travel every year and ski if she could afford it. At the moment she lives with her younger sister -- which is great fun. She enjoys playing the piano and [she has] begun guitar lessons. After university she hopes to work in a hospital, focusing mainly on helping quadripelegics (sic:her own words).

After leaving school, she did one year of Arts and one year of education at Sydney University, then deferred, going to N.S.W. uni last year. At Christmas, she spent 3 months overseas visiting friends and relatives in England, Switzerland, Italy, Monaco and New York. She really loved it, being her first trip overseas.

***

(A) OVERALL, WHAT THIS PERSON WROTE ABOUT HERSELF ARE:

MAINLY GOOD THINGS 1
MORE GOOD THINGS THAN BAD 2
A BALANCE OF GOOD & BAD THINGS 3
MORE BAD THINGS THAN GOOD 4
MAINLY BAD THINGS 5

(B) ON THE EVIDENCE, WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THIS PERSON IS ENJOYING THE COMPANY OF FRIENDS OR ONE SPECIAL FRIEND:

DEFINITELY AGREE 1
PROBABLY AGREE 2
PROBABLY DISAGREE 3
DEFINITELY DISAGREE 4

(C) WOULD YOU SAY THAT THIS IS THE SORT OF PERSON WHOSE THINKING OR VALUES ARE TYPICAL OF THE YOUNG AUSTRALIAN TODAY:

DEFINITELY 1
PROBABLY 2
UNLIKELY 3
DEFINITELY NOT 4
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He is a 2nd year architecture student. He is staying near the university whereas his family is staying in Waterloo. He is a very independent person. He's quite an open person, easy to get to know. He has a strong personality, ambition, quite egoistic. At times, he is selfish.

He loves any type of outdoor activities and is anxious to try anything new. He is a religious person and is quite strong in what he is believing. He calls himself a Mormon, that comes from the original name -- the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. He goes to church every Sunday since he has been converted to the belief.

He loves to learn all kinds of things such as sports, architecture, scripture, art, science, politics and so on. He likes to help others and get a lot of enjoyment out of doing that. One of his ambitions is to help others get to know God. He would like to travel around the world.

***

(A) OVERALL, WHAT THIS PERSON WROTE ABOUT HIMSELF ARE:

MAINLY GOOD THINGS  
MORE GOOD THINGS THAN BAD  
A BALANCE OF GOOD & BAD THINGS  
MORE BAD THINGS THAN GOOD  
MAINLY BAD THINGS

(B) ON THE EVIDENCE, WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THIS PERSON IS ENJOYING THE COMPANY OF FRIENDS OR ONE SPECIAL FRIEND:

DEFINITELY AGREE  
PROBABLY AGREE  
PROBABLY DISAGREE  
DEFINITELY DISAGREE

(C) WOULD YOU SAY THAT THIS IS THE SORT OF PERSON WHOSE THINKING OR VALUES ARE TYPICAL OF THE YOUNG AUSTRALIAN TODAY:

DEFINITELY  
PROBABLY  
UNLIKELY  
DEFINITELY NOT
He is left handed but not superstitious. He's a fairly pleasant, outgoing type of person. Also, while he can display aggressive attitudes he is unlikely to hurt a fly. He seems to be a versatile person in his activities and tastes -- he enjoys sport, adventure, travel, exciting things both tried and new. At the other end of the scale, he enjoys intellectual pursuits, drama, art and craft oriented activities too.

Digressing a little, he is a romantic and thinks if a relationship is nowhere, it's useless for both parties. For sure he is culturally aware and reckons he is less prejudiced than many other people believing that people should accept each other and accept others as people, not as separate objects according to race, colour, creed, beliefs. While liking people who are good natured, fun-loving or humorous and fair dinkum, he dislikes bitchiness, vengeful people or prima donnas or atmosphere dampening shits.

Oh -- he hates cricket. But athletic pursuits including football are great too, so are water sports. Some other assorted details: Lately he's been getting more aggro. He likes comedy a lot. Hates braggarts. Likes simple pleasures, is happy with his girlfriend, likes good rock 'n' roll.

***

(A) OVERALL, WHAT THIS PERSON WROTE ABOUT HIMSELF ARE:

- MAINLY GOOD THINGS
- MORE GOOD THINGS THAN BAD
- A BALANCE OF GOOD & BAD THINGS
- MORE BAD THINGS THAN GOOD
- MAINLY BAD THINGS

(B) ON THE EVIDENCE, WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THIS PERSON IS ENJOYING THE COMPANY OF FRIENDS OR ONE SPECIAL FRIEND:

- DEFINITELY AGREE
- PROBABLY AGREE
- PROBABLY DISAGREE
- DEFINITELY DISAGREE

(C) WOULD YOU SAY THAT THIS IS THE SORT OF PERSON WHOSE THINKING OR VALUES ARE TYPICAL OF THE YOUNG AUSTRALIAN TODAY:

- DEFINITELY
- PROBABLY
- UNLIKELY
- DEFINITELY NOT
SKETCH NO. 5

She worries too much about everything. She wants everything to turn out as best as can be thus burdening herself with lots of worries and problems (i.e. having to weigh all the pros and cons of a decision -- probably good in some ways?).

She has problems of enjoying herself without feeling guilty. She shows too much of her emotions, but basically she's a friendly (when she chooses to be) and understanding person. She's also sensitive towards other peoples' feelings, that's why perhaps, when the others do not display their sensitivity or consideration it frustrates her a lot.

She wants to achieve her goals, she's quite ambitious, but unfortunately, she has trouble doing -- she's getting lazy.

A feminist she is, I think. Not radical, but she is one. You should have seen how angry she got after watching Indiana Jones! Degrading women she said! Who's the chauvinist who wrote that script?

***

(A) OVERALL, WHAT THIS PERSON WROTE ABOUT HERSELF ARE:

MAINLY GOOD THINGS 1
MORE GOOD THINGS THAN BAD 2
A BALANCE OF GOOD & BAD THINGS 3
MORE BAD THINGS THAN GOOD 4
MAINLY BAD THINGS 5

(B) ON THE EVIDENCE, WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THIS PERSON IS ENJOYING THE COMPANY OF FRIENDS OR ONE SPECIAL FRIEND:

DEFINITELY AGREE 1
PROBABLY AGREE 2
PROBABLY DISAGREE 3
DEFINITELY DISAGREE 4

(C) WOULD YOU SAY THAT THIS IS THE SORT OF PERSON WHOSE THINKING OR VALUES ARE TYPICAL OF THE YOUNG AUSTRALIAN TODAY:

DEFINITELY 1
PROBABLY 2
UNLIKELY 3
DEFINITELY NOT 4
She is doing 1st year arts/law and is staying at a college on campus. She is generally a shy person but since coming to college has become a lot more outgoing and mature in her outlook towards life and other people. She is interested in meeting as many people as possible and getting to know as varied a range of people as she can. She is nearly 19 years old and is fairly average for a girl of her age. She is a good listener and although she becomes annoyed or depressed as easily as any other 19 year-old female, she avoids as far as possible exhibiting visibly these emotions. Since coming to college she has learned how to become a lot more tolerant of others and has become better equipped to cope with a wider range of situations than she was faced with at high school in Grafton. She finds that her knowledge of some situations in college and uni life may not be as vast as that of others more used to the situation but she is learning rapidly!

Sydney life, especially the college atmosphere, is a whole new experience for her but she loves every minute of it and delights in the whole new range of people and experiences she is facing. At times she finds herself becoming depressed or worn down by the fast pace of both the life at uni and at college, but a few very firm friends that she has formed already at college have helped her to come through these times.

She loves to play sport both socially and competitively although the social side of it is by far the more appealing. She would much rather get up at 7:00 a.m. every morning and play a game of tennis or squash than sleep in and feel as though she had wasted valuable time. She loves being with friends either playing sport, talking or working together. When she is alone she likes to think, read and listen to music when not working for her degree. However she much rather prefers the company of others to being alone and college life appeals to her for that reason; it makes living away from home much easier and enables a standard of life which is close to that of her home life and is above everything friendly.

(A) OVERALL, WHAT THIS PERSON WROTE ABOUT HERSELF ARE:

MAINLY GOOD THINGS 1
MORE GOOD THINGS THAN BAD 2
A BALANCE OF GOOD & BAD THINGS 3
MORE BAD THINGS THAN GOOD 4
MAINLY BAD THINGS 5

(B) ON THE EVIDENCE, WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THIS PERSON IS ENJOYING THE COMPANY OF FRIENDS OR ONE SPECIAL FRIEND:

DEFINITELY AGREE 1
PROBABLY AGREE 2
PROBABLY DISAGREE 3
DEFINITELY DISAGREE 4

(C) WOULD YOU SAY THAT THIS IS THE SORT OF PERSON WHOSE THINKING OR VALUES ARE TYPICAL OF THE YOUNG AUSTRALIAN TODAY:

DEFINITELY 1
PROBABLY 2
UNLIKELY 3
DEFINITELY NOT 4
She is a mixed bundle of characteristics and can be both serious and outrageously funny. She has a dry sense of humour. She is very brittle when she talks and she can "cut" into people and hurt them brutally with her words. She is forthright and honest -- she speaks her mind to her friends when she agrees or disagrees. Often times she seems cut away from the rest of the world. She does not like to be considered as one of the same old boring lot. She tries to strive for originality and because she is herself often people do not understand her. She seems not to be of a warm nature. She seems aloof and cold at times -- but I question whether she is revealing all? She is an impatient and often times intolerant person. She does not break down tasks or situations into smaller units but attacks things in the "whole" so she finishes quickly.

She is a responsible and trustworthy person. She is also very lazy, she finds it hard to start work on a project. She usually leaves things to the last minute and so does not dwell on them but accomplishes the task in the minimum time and effort.

She is a great lover of music. She loves beautiful things and traditional, more conservative tastes in clothes etc.. She wishes at all times to present a picture of composure, organisation and aloofness but I believe she is very passionate and this interferes with her seeking the above image. She is proud of her heritage and of her people and defends them emphatically.

***

(A) OVERALL, WHAT THIS PERSON WROTE ABOUT HERSELF ARE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAINLY GOOD THINGS</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MORE GOOD THINGS THAN BAD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A BALANCE OF GOOD &amp; BAD THINGS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE BAD THINGS THAN GOOD</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINLY BAD THINGS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) ON THE EVIDENCE, WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THIS PERSON IS ENJOYING THE COMPANY OF FRIENDS OR ONE SPECIAL FRIEND:

| DEFINITELY AGREE | 1 |
| PROBABLY AGREE | 2 |
| PROBABLY DISAGREE | 3 |
| DEFINITELY DISAGREE | 4 |

(C) WOULD YOU SAY THAT THIS IS THE SORT OF PERSON WHOSE THINKING OR VALUES ARE TYPICAL OF THE YOUNG AUSTRALIAN TODAY:

| DEFINITELY | 1 |
| PROBABLY | 2 |
| UNLIKELY | 3 |
| DEFINITELY NOT | 4 |
SKETCH NO. 8

She is 18 years old and a social science student at N.S.W. Uni. She is studying French, Economics, Psychology and Sociology and enjoys all but the last. She still prefers school life to university but is slowly becoming more assimilated with campus life.

She is very loquacious and excels at long telephone conversations. She has a large group of friends out of which a significant proportion are medical students. She has a best friend with whom she shares almost everything and to whom she can talk about everything.

She is usually in a good mood and not easily depressed. She loves reading, theatre, music and good soppy movies. She enjoys skiing (snow and water), swimming and ice skating.

She is fairly conservative, doesn’t drink or smoke. She is Jewish and although not very religious still sticks with many of the old traditions. She loves travelling and would ultimately love to live in Paris for 6 months.

She lives at home (and enjoys it) and has a younger brother who is fantastic. She gets on very well with her parents and her grandmother who also lives with them. She is spoilt (not rotten) and has a number of part-time jobs paying her way to the States.

***

(A) OVERALL, WHAT THIS PERSON WROTE ABOUT HERSELF ARE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAINLY GOOD THINGS</th>
<th>MORE GOOD THINGS THAN BAD</th>
<th>A BALANCE OF GOOD &amp; BAD THINGS</th>
<th>MORE BAD THINGS THAN GOOD</th>
<th>MAINLY BAD THINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) ON THE EVIDENCE, WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THIS PERSON IS ENJOYING THE COMPANY OF FRIENDS OR ONE SPECIAL FRIEND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITELY AGREE</th>
<th>PROBABLY AGREE</th>
<th>PROBABLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>DEFINITELY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C) WOULD YOU SAY THAT THIS IS THE SORT OF PERSON WHOSE THINKING OR VALUES ARE TYPICAL OF THE YOUNG AUSTRALIAN TODAY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITELY</th>
<th>PROBABLY</th>
<th>UNLIKELY</th>
<th>DEFINITELY NOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
She is a 2nd year arts student, quite outgoing but not boisterous. She sees herself as a type of Henry Higgins who enjoys simply listening to peoples' accents and the way they use their voices. She also likes to spend time reading all types of magazines as well as more classic novels. She is friendly and usually tactful and despises conceited, arrogant scene people. She loves dancing and doesn't mind the gay crowd on Oxford St where it's impossible for a female not to feel safe. She dislikes most American music and prefers creative music like that of The Models, Japan and Bowie. She would rather see a play (especially when her flatmate provides the free tickets) than attend shallow types of parties. She is not a very conscientious student and could do a lot better in exams if she didn't leave all the work to the last 2 weeks. Her family reside in Canberra which is quite cold at this time of the year. She prefers the independence that flatting allows and is fortunate that her parents can finance this independence. She has an excruciatingly boring job in a hardware department where people ask her how drills work, which sandpaper is preferable and which car seat covers look the nicest. It does have its perks -- the money is quite good and one is privileged to free batteries every now and then. She is quite satisfied with her life at the moment and is eagerly awaiting a future full of money and luxury which her university degree will naturally help obtain.

***

(A) OVERALL, WHAT THIS PERSON WROTE ABOUT HERSELF ARE:

1 MAINLY GOOD THINGS
2 MORE GOOD THINGS THAN BAD
3 A BALANCE OF GOOD & BAD THINGS
4 MORE BAD THINGS THAN GOOD
5 MAINLY BAD THINGS

(B) ON THE EVIDENCE, WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THIS PERSON IS ENJOYING THE COMPANY OF FRIENDS OR ONE SPECIAL FRIEND:

1 DEFINITELY AGREE
2 PROBABLY AGREE
3 PROBABLY DISAGREE
4 DEFINITELY DISAGREE

(C) WOULD YOU SAY THAT THIS IS THE SORT OF PERSON WHOSE THINKING OR VALUES ARE TYPICAL OF THE YOUNG AUSTRALIAN TODAY:

1 DEFINITELY
2 PROBABLY
3 UNLIKELY
4 DEFINITELY NOT
## APPENDIX I

### LONELY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKETCH NO:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LO SCORE:</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE:</td>
<td>A B C A B C A B C A B C A B C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATER NO</td>
<td>1 3 2 3 1 3 3 4 4 4 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 5 3 4 4 2 4 2 2 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 3 3 2 1 4 4 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 3 2 3 2 3 1 2 3 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 3 3 3 1 2 3 4 3 3 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 4 3 3 1 2 2 3 3 3 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 3 3 3 3 4 2 2 3 3 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 3 4 3 1 4 3 4 3 3 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 3 3 2 2 2 3 2 2 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 2 4 4 4 4 4 4 2 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NON-LONELY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKETCH NO:</th>
<th>Ø</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LO SCORE:</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE:</td>
<td>A B C A B C A B C A B C A B C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATER NO</td>
<td>1 1 1 2 2 1 2 2 1 2 2 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 3 1 2 1 1 3 1 1 3 1 1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 1 1 4 2 3 3 1 2 2 3 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 1 1 2 1 2 2 3 1 2 2 3 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 2 1 2 3 3 3 1 2 3 3 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 1 1 3 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 1 1 3 1 1 2 2 1 2 1 2 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 3 1 2 4 1 3 1 2 2 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 2 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 2 1 2 2 1 3 1 2 2 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale:</th>
<th>LONELY</th>
<th>NON-LONELY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. RATINGS</td>
<td>30 30 30</td>
<td>30 30 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN RATING</td>
<td>2.77 2.70 3.0</td>
<td>1.73 1.33 2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDEV.</td>
<td>1.14 .79 .77</td>
<td>.98 .55 .61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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