ABSTRACT. A growing number of sociologists believe that Srole's Anomia Scale, whether modified or not, is too inclusive to measure anomie in any meaningful way when using survey research techniques among subcultures. Evidence from the National Opinion Research Center's annual General Social Survey, which is a cross-sectional sample of adults in the United States, tends to give credence to this criticism — that is, although Srole's Anomia Scale displays a modest degree of internal reliability, it nevertheless lacks external validity in surveys on national subpopulations. This study illustrates the relative superiority of the Margins of Society (MOS) Alienation Scale, which comprises operations from theories on anomie and social isolation. A subculture of homeless Alaska Natives were personally interviewed to document the attributes of this new alienation scale and the results from this exploratory study suggest that further analysis should prove useful for studying alienation within other ethnic groups.

Over the last several decades social researchers have attempted to measure alienation in ethnic or small outgroups (Middleton, 1963; Ransford, 1968; Caplan and Paige, 1968; Flacks, 1967; Bolton, 1972; Holmgren et al., 1983; Trimble 1987) and in large-scale survey populations (Srole, 1956; Bell, 1957; Yankelovich, 1972; Seeman, 1972; Pope and Ferguson, 1982; and Davis and Smith, 1988). Since 1973, for instance, the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) has included in its General Social Survey (GSS) either a modified version or the original Srole Anomia Scale in its cumulative national surveys.

Given the tendency of NORC to utilized the “modified” Anomia Scale in recent years and the general practice among social researchers to devise their own alienation scales to suit their particular studies, we currently lack reliable and valid alienation scales which tap into a variety of the dominant attitudes, values, and beliefs of the alienated in modern societies. This study seeks to address that methodological gap in survey research and to offer one possible remedy — the Margins of Society (MOS) Alienation Scale.
THEORIES AND RESEARCH ON ANOMIE AND SOCIAL ISOLATION

Durkheim (1951) conceives of anomie in two theoretical respects: first, as a characteristic of societies undergoing economic and moral upheavals; and second, as a social psychological attribute of human personality. Most sociologists would agree that Durkheim sought to supply us with a systemic theory of anomie, but far less would concur that he also sought to supply us with a theory of individual anomie. For instance, in his classic study of suicide Durkheim often would allow himself to be carried away by what he intuited to be the social psychological mind-set of anomic suicides, as if he fully intended to provide us with a complementary and incipient social psychology to accompany his largely systemic view of the social order. It is with this unfinished aspect of Durkheim's work that we are most interested in.

To be sure, Durkheim argues that anomie tends to result from rapid economic change; or it may exist in a more chronic state in some sectors of the occupational structure. In both cases, however, social norms exercise only a low degree of social control over behavior. Giddens (1971) illuminates, moreover, that these social norms govern the motivations and actions of social actors in two ways: “they influence the actual setting of goals, defining what is appropriate and legitimate; but as Durkheim emphasized above all, they limit and restrict aspirations” (Giddens, 1971, p. 99). When there is little chance for the social actor to use widely-shared norms, or when norms are torn asunder, conflict with one another, or produce disjunctions between aspirations and their attainment, a state of anomie exists on the social psychological level of analysis. Thus, Durkheim’s conception of anomie is essentially a social psychology of aspirations, which, if left unfulfilled, induce social disaffiliation, or alienation in the modern sense.

Still, Olsen (1965) insists that anomie can only be a property of the social system and, it appears, many other sociologists believe likewise. He claims, quite rightly we think, that Durkheim used the term “anomic” in two distinct ways: first, to reflect breakdowns in normative integration; and, second, to reflect breakdowns in functional integration. The former refers to inadequate moral norms, while the later refers to inadequate procedural rules. Nonetheless, Olsen’s attempt at clarifica-