Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

8-31-1992

Psychological Models and the Stock of Knowledge

David L. Sones

Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Sones, David L., "Psychological Models and the Stock of Knowledge" (1992). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 4743.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.6627>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF David L. Sones for the Master
of Science in sociology presented August 31, 1992.

Title: Psychological Models and the Stock of Knowledge.

APPROVED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

Jan Hajda, Chair

Charles D. Bolton

Grant M. Farr

Barry F. Anderson

The research sought to ascertain whether or not
psychological ideas and notions ("psychological models") are
used to explain human behavior and human characteristics in
everyday life, and if so, are these psychological models
similar to the schools of thought within the field of
psychology? Also of interest was whether or not
"statistical categories" use psychological models as a

"style of thought," and if so, are psychological models part of the current American *Weltanschauungen*?

The convenience sample consisted of 34 respondents who were taking an introductory sociology course, and 39 respondents from non-college settings.

An open-ended questionnaire containing 13 questions asking for causal explanations of human behaviors and characteristics was used. Students filled out the questionnaire during a class and returned the questionnaires at the end of the class. The questionnaires that were administered in non-college settings were distributed by research assistants at their places of employment and collected within 24 hours.

Over 900 causal explanations of human behaviors and human characteristics were collected. Each causal explanation was coded in terms of the basic cause or causes given in the causal explanation of the respondent. The causes given in the respondents' causal explanations were analyzed and it was determined what "kinds of causal explanations" respondents used. Five kinds of causal explanations were found to be used by the respondents. These were: 1) psychological explanations; 2) interpersonal explanations; 3) physiological explanations; 4) social structural explanations; and 5) cultural explanations. Also, there were multi-causal explanations which consisted of combinations of the 5 kinds of mono-causal explanations.

From the kinds of causal explanations given by respondents a typology of the kinds of models respondents used to explain human behavior was developed. Each causal explanation given by a respondent was classified in terms of the models typology. It was the "models" variable which was derived from the kinds of causal explanations that respondents gave that was the main variable in the research.

The first part of the analysis assigned each respondent a "dominant model." The dominant model used by a respondent was determined by assessing what kind of model a respondent used more frequently than any other kind of model in the 13 causal explanations the respondent gave. The second part of the analysis assigned a dominant model to various statistical "categories" which were based on age, sex, or education. The dominant model of a category was determined by assessing the dominant model used for each question, then determining what kind of dominant model was used most frequently for explaining the 13 behaviors or characteristics.

When examining the dominant model used by each respondent it was found that individuals in the sample tended to use a psychological model more frequently than any other kind of model when explaining human behaviors and characteristics. Additionally, when the age, or sex, or education of the respondent was considered in the analysis of the dominant model used by an individual it was found

that only the individuals between 25 and 40 years of age tended not to use a psychological model as their dominant model.

When examining the dominant model used by statistical categories, categories whose membership was based on age, sex, or education, it was found that categories tended to use a psychological model as their dominant model. However, the category "25 to 40 years of age" did not use a psychological model as the dominant model. Also, when the category whose membership was based on having taken psychology courses was compared in detail to the category whose membership was based on having not taken psychology courses it was found that these two categories used dominant and other models similarly.

PSYCHOLOGICAL MODELS AND THE
STOCK OF KNOWLEDGE

by

DAVID L. SONES

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
SOCIOLOGY

Portland State University
1992

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of
David L. Sones presented August 31, 1992.

Jan Hajda, Chair

Charles D. Bolton

Grant M. Farr

Barry F. Anderson

APPROVED:

Grant M. Farr, Chair, Department of Sociology

Roy W. Koch, Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
 I INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW.....	 1
Introduction.....	1
Research Questions and Research Design.....	5
Organization of the Thesis.....	7
Review of the Literature.....	7
Introduction.....	7
The Freudian Ethic.....	8
The Analytic Attitude.....	13
Psychological Society.....	15
Psychological Information.....	18
Psychological Models and Everyday Knowledge....	22
Lay Theories.....	23
The Cultural Component in Explanations of Human Behavior.....	24
Summary.....	28
 II THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND, AND HYPOTHESES.....	 32
Introduction.....	32
Everyday Life, Social Interaction, and Language.....	38
Everyday Life.....	38
Social Interaction.....	40
Language.....	41
Psychological Models and Everyday Life.....	43
The Social Stock of Knowledge.....	45
The Origins of the Social Stock of Knowledge....	47
The Social Stock of Knowledge and Institutions..	51
Psychological Models.....	53

Internalization of the Social Stock of Knowledge.....	56
Identity.....	60
Psychological Models.....	63
Psychological Models, Legitimation, and Symbolic Universes.....	64
Social Distribution of Knowledge.....	66
<i>Weltanschauung</i> and Styles of Thought.....	67
<i>Weltanschauung</i>	67
Styles of Thought.....	72
Existential Factors.....	75
<i>Weltanschauung</i> , Styles of Thought, and Psychological Models.....	77
Berger, Luckmann, Schutz, and Mannheim.....	78
Methods, Units of Analysis, and Hypotheses.....	80
Methods.....	80
The Two Kinds of Analysis.....	82
Hypotheses.....	86
 III RESEARCH METHODS	
Sampling, Subjects, Measurement, Collection, and Processing.....	89
Sampling.....	89
Subjects.....	89
Measurement.....	94
Data Collection.....	99
Data Analysis.....	102
 IV RESEARCH FINDINGS.....	107
Introduction.....	107
Analysis of the Dominant Model Used By Each Individual.....	109
The Overall Sample.....	109
Education.....	110
Age.....	115
Sex.....	116
Analysis of the Dominant Model Used By Categories...	121
Dominant Model.....	122

The Relationship Between a Category's Dominant Model and Other Models.....	129
The Sample.....	129
Other Categories.....	135
Hypothesis II.....	155
Summary of Findings.....	157
The Individual and His Dominant Model.....	157
A Category's Dominant Model.....	159
Hypothesis II.....	161
V DISCUSSION, RESEARCH WEAKNESSES, AND CONCLUSION.....	162
Introduction.....	162
The Hypotheses.....	163
Hypothesis I.....	165
Hypothesis II.....	179
Hypothesis III.....	181
Methodological Issues and Research Weaknesses.....	189
Conclusion.....	195
REFERENCES.....	200
APPENDICES	
A LAPIERE'S ANALYSIS.....	204
B THE QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO P. S. U. UNDERGRADUATES.....	205
C THE INTRODUCTION TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO NON-COLLEGE RESPONDENTS...	215

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I Age Distribution for All Respondents.....	90
II Sex Distribution for All Respondents.....	91
III Distribution for Years of Education Completed.....	91
IV Number of Psychology and Sociology Courses Taken.....	92
V Religious Preference of Respondents.....	93
VI The Questions Used in the Questionnaire.....	95
VII Types of Models, and the Causal Attributions Within Each Model.....	100
VIII Percentages and Frequencies for the Dominant Model Used by an Individual in the Sample.....	110
IX Years of Education Completed and the Dominant Model an Individual Used.....	111
X Number of Psychology Courses Taken and the Dominant Model an Individual Used.....	113
XI Age and the Dominant Model an Individual Used.....	117
XII Sex and the Dominant Model an Individual Used.....	118
XIII Summary of Dominant Model Used by an Individual.....	119
XIV Percentages for the Dominant Model Used by an Individual in Summary.....	120
XV Percentages and Frequencies for the Dominant Model Used by the Sample for Each Question.....	123
XVI Percentages for the Dominant Model Used by the NPC and the PC Category for Each Question.....	124
XVII Percentages for the Dominant Model Used by Categories for Each Question in Summary.....	128

XVIII	The Models Used for Each Question by the Sample....	131
XIX	The Models Used by the NPC Category (n = 32) and the PC Category (n = 39).....	136
XX	Similarities and Differences Between the NPC and the PC Categories in Their Use of Models.....	153
XXI	Similarities and Differences Between the NPC Category and the PC Category in Their Use of Models When All the Data is Considered.....	155
XXII	Percentages for the Dominant Model Used by an Individual in Summary.....	173
XXIII	Percentages for the Dominant Model Used by Categories for Each Question in Summary.....	184

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

All societies have models for explaining human behavior and human nature. Some of these models are theoretical while some are at the level of "common sense" in "everyday life." In the United States it is the field of psychology that contains the experts who are the major producers and transmitters of the theoretical and official explanations for human behavior. Some of this knowledge, although in a modified and distorted form, may be part of the everyday common sense explanations of, and understandings of, human behavior.

The everyday, taken-for-granted understanding of human behavior may be quite different than the theoretical and empirical understanding as outlined in the field of psychology. At the everyday level the ideas and theories of psychology may be modified, distorted, and reified.

Additionally, in everyday life, it may be that modified, distorted, and reified concepts which are derived indirectly from psychology, are being used to understand areas of life that are not psychological in nature. These

may be areas of life where the theories and ideas of psychology are not meant to be applied. In other words, the ideas and notions derived from the field of psychology which may be part of everyday knowledge may form a "style of thought" which is used for understanding in general. This style of thought may express an underlying *Weltanschauung*, as well as contribute to a *Weltanschauung*.

Societies, groups, and individuals, can be described or characterized by the overall *Weltanschauung*, that is, by the overall global outlook of specific socio-historical times (Mannheim 1921). The *Weltanschauung*, or more precisely, the *Weltanschauungen*, are part of the "relative-natural world view" (Schutz & Luckmann 1973), that is, part of the "natural attitude." Since *Weltanschauungen* influence interpretations in many diverse areas of life (Mannheim 1921), it is of particular importance to examine expressions of *Weltanschauungen*.

One expression of a *Weltanschauung* is styles of thought (Mannheim 1927). For example, "conservatism," as a style of thought and an expression of a *Weltanschauung*, has been shown to have an overall influence on thought and actions in diverse areas of social life (Mannheim 1927; Furnham 1988, p. 38-40). In current times it may be that ideas and notions derived from psychology are a major expression of the current American *Weltanschauungen*.

The theories and ideas in the field of psychology may have a profound effect on one's understanding of human behavior. Psychology attempts to explain and provide an understanding of human behavior and human nature. It could be argued that in doing so, psychology shapes the very human behavior and human nature it is trying to understand and explain. First, by stating how things are, psychology is also stating how things "should" be. Second, the understanding and explanation of human behavior supplied by psychology can come to be seen as "natural." And, third, the descriptions and explanations of human behavior and human nature provided by psychology turn around and shape the human behavior and human nature that is being described and explained, or put another way, the "psychological reality" as described and explained by the field of psychology shapes that very same psychological reality (Berger 1965; Berger and Luckmann 1967).

The concerns expressed above have lead to the research questions of the present thesis.

At this point the term "psychological models" needs to be briefly defined, since this term will be used throughout this paper and is central to the research. There are two different but related definitions of the term "psychological models." First, psychological models can be defined as ideas and notions derived indirectly from the field of psychology. These ideas and notions are no longer directly

connected to the field of psychology but are part of everyday common sense knowledge. The ideas and notions within a psychological model may correspond to some of the ideas and notions within a "school of thought" within the field of psychology, but will be modified, distorted, and incomplete. For example there could be a psychological model that contains the ideas of subconscious motivations, repressed childhood experiences, sexual forces and childhood as the primary motivators for human behavior, etc., that could be indirectly derived from psychoanalytic psychology. Second, "psychological models" can be defined as ideas and notions that are psychological in nature which are used to explain human behavior and human nature. This definition does not explicitly state the source of psychological ideas and notions.

Both these definitions can be used. The first definition can be applied to the theoretical and conceptual background. The second definition can be applied to the methods and findings of the present research. Although I believe that many psychological ideas and notions are derived from the field of psychology, and there is theoretical as well as empirical support for this belief, the present research can't establish empirically that many psychological ideas and notions are specifically derived from the field of psychology. So, the second definition of psychological models should be used for the empirical part

of the present research, although the first definition is implied also.

Research Questions And Research Design

The present research is basically concerned with the relationship between psychological models and everyday knowledge. An additional concern is whether psychological models can be considered a style of thought, and are part of, or contribute to, the current American *Weltanschauungen*.

The questions the present research attempts to address are: 1) Are psychological models part of an individual's subjective reality in everyday life? 2) If so, what kinds of psychological models are part of the individual's subjective reality, that is, are the kinds of psychological models that are part of the individual's subjective reality similar to the schools of thought in psychology (cognitive, behaviorist, existential, psychoanalytic, etc.)? 3) Do "categories" based on age, education, or sex use psychological models as a style of thought? and, 4) Are psychological models part of the current American *Weltanschauung*? In other words, do psychological models influence one's view of the world? Put differently, do psychological models act as a filter through which reality is interpreted? Although the present research can't answer the question concerning the American *Weltanschauung* it can perhaps suggest an answer.

The research questions will be addressed by administering a questionnaire with open-ended questions to a variety of respondents. The respondents are going to be asked to give explanations for 13 human behaviors or characteristics. The causal explanations given by respondents will be analyzed so as to: 1) ascertain whether in everyday life the individual in American society uses a psychological kind of explanation more than any other kind of explanation for explaining human behavior and human characteristics; 2) ascertain whether individuals use different kinds of psychological explanations similar to the schools of thought in psychology; and 3) ascertain whether in everyday life "categories" based on sex, age, or education use a psychological kind of explanation more than any other kind of explanation for explaining human behavior and human characteristics.

The present research hypothesizes that in everyday life the individual uses a psychological kind of explanation more than any other kind of explanation for explaining human behavior; that is, psychological models are part of the individual's subjective reality. This will be unaffected by characteristics such as age, sex, or education. Also, it is hypothesized that in everyday life "categories" based on age, sex, or education will use a psychological kind of explanation more than any other kind of explanation for explaining human behavior, that is, a category's style of

thought will be psychological in nature. Additionally, the present research speculates that psychological models are part of the current American *Weltanschauung*.

Organization Of The Thesis

First, the literature review will be presented. Second, the theoretical and conceptual background to the present research will be presented. Although hypotheses are generally presented before the literature review, and before the theoretical and conceptual background, presenting the hypotheses after the literature review and theoretical and conceptual background will make the hypotheses clearer, and easier to understand. Also, after the literature review and the theoretical and conceptual background, and prior to the presentation of the hypotheses, a brief outline of the methods used in the present research will be presented. Although methods are generally presented in a separate chapter on methods, it is necessary to briefly discuss the methods and units of analysis so as to make the hypotheses clearer. Third, the hypotheses will be presented. Fourth, the methods used will be presented in detail. Fifth, the findings of the present research will be presented. And, sixth, the conclusions of the research will be presented.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The theories and ideas of psychology are readily

available to the general population. Psychology courses are taught in high schools and virtually all colleges and universities. Also, millions of individuals are exposed to, and influenced by, psychological theories while undergoing therapy. Additionally, psychological theories are prevalent in child-rearing handbooks and hundreds of other self-help books. The general mass media is also a carrier of psychological theories. It is evident that psychological theories, in various forms, abound in our culture.

The literature review will focus on: 1) Studies examining the effects of psychology on culture, groups, or the individual; 2) The distribution of psychological knowledge through self-help books; 3) Studies of "lay theories" of human behavior; and 4) The cultural component in explanations of human behavior. The literature review should make it clear that the field of psychology has indeed influenced our culture.

The Freudian Ethic

LaPiere's analysis of the effects of psychology, more specifically Freudian psychology, on American culture (1959) depicts the decline of the "Protestant ethic" and the rise of the "Freudian ethic" (see Appendix A). "Freudian ethic" refers to sentiments and values that are adopted by those who subscribe to the "Freudian idea" (LaPiere 1959 preface).

LaPiere (1959 p. 28-55) outlines Freud's view of man as follows: 1) Man is non-rational; 2) Man's biological urges

are in conflict with society, with life being a continual struggle between these two forces; 3) Man is weak and can't stand the strains that arise from being pulled in opposite directions by these two forces; 4) Consequently, individuals should be left alone by society, that is, the individual should not be taught social values, goals, etc.; and 5) individuals should concentrate on keeping a balance between their id, ego, superego, and their relationship with the environment.

The Freudian ethic has been extended beyond therapy. Freud's view of man is supported and practiced by many of the workers who deal with social problems (welfare, juvenile delinquency, etc.). Even advertising agencies are trying to appeal to the unconscious motivations of men. In doing so they supply the public with the Freudian picture of man. The Freudian ethic is also put forth in schools, in the home, and many other places (LaPiere 1959 p. 71-78)

There are those who support and push Freudian ideas and the Freudian ethic. They want to change society to fit the Freudian ethic. This is attempted by trying to change the individual so as to change society, an approach that is actually anti-Freudian. This is attempted in various ways.

For example, it was believed a permissive home would allow the child to develop without the interference of society's values, goals, etc.. In the permissive home, the home is centered around the child, that is, "everything for

baby." The mother is to be permissive, so the child can express himself without interruption, the result being a psychologically sound child. There is the assumption that if the child is left to grow "naturally" he will develop normally. The result of the permissive model of child care is that the child is socialized, unintentionally, to focus on his own wants and needs, to expect these fulfilled, and to give nothing to others (LaPiere 1959, p. 81-104).

Another way that the Freudian ethic is advanced is through the progressive school (LaPiere 1959, p. 105-129). Progressive schools view the goal of schools as helping children express themselves, and to help with psychological development of the personality.

Progressive schools promote the Freudian ethic in the class room. In progressive schools it is believed that the classroom structure should be democratic, leaving the child free to develop his own personality. The child should do what he feels like doing. The classroom should not be structured or the teacher be authoritative. It is the students that should decide what to do and when to do it (LaPiere 1959, p. 105-129).

In both the permissive home and the progressive school an attempt is made not to restrain or shape the child, thus allowing the child to develop normally (LaPiere 1959, p. 105-129).

The "Freudian ethic" can also be seen in the cultural theme of "adjustment." The cultural theme of achievement is being displaced by the theme of adjustment. "Adjustment is the *sine qua non* of all those who accept the Freudian doctrine of man" (LaPiere 1959, p. 131).

One of the results of the Freudian ethic is that children learn without experience at living. So as to promote the child's adjustment, the child is protected from mental stress, since stress, or "misadventure," causes psychological harm. In other words, children should be in a social vacuum. This way the child will never have to face failure, so he will not be afraid of failure, and will avoid frustrations. Children are being taught "passive conformity" (LaPiere 1959, p. 132-136).

A correlate of this passive conformity is children being taught to take the easiest road in life. For example, school counselors, whether directive or non-directive, direct the student into the course of least resistance, the proper course for adjustment. Additionally, rather than the student adjusting to college, college adjusts to the student (LaPiere 1959, p. 136-152).

In general it is the middle class who promotes the Freudian ethic. Also, it is middle class children who are taught the Freudian ethic (LaPiere 1959, p. 155).

The advocates of the permissive home, the progressive school, and passive adjustment are mostly members of the middle class....They are, for the most part, professional people-psychiatrist, child psychologist, and educators; and so, too, are the clinician, teachers, and the counselors whom they have trained and sent forth to practice what they preach.

However, the Freudian ethic has penetrated into the working class in several ways. First, through social work. Second, in the court system where the Freudians posit that the criminal can't be accountable for his actions, since they are victims of society (LaPiere 1959 p. 155-179).

The Protestant ethic, as well as the Freudian ethic, reflect and implement changes that are happening in society. Currently, but only partially, the bourgeois class and its Protestant ethic is starting to be replaced with a new bourgeois class and its Freudian ethic. The old bourgeois still exists, but a new bourgeois may be on the rise. It is the members of the "young" bourgeois class that the proponents of the Freudian ethic address. It is their children that go to progressive schools and learn the adjustment motifs (LaPiere 1959, p. 183-210).

So the new *bourgeoisie* has already found the ethic by which it should live, and the means to induct its children into that ethic and its general style of life. (LaPiere 1959, p. 194).

The relationship between men and government also reflects the Freudian ethic. Men are dependent upon "political maternalism," which is similar, *mutandis mutatis*,

to the paternalism that Freud believed was necessary for normal psychic development.

The view that man is weak, can't provide for himself, needs protections, and that it is government that keeps things together, has been supported by the Freudians. This view has been validated politically. Government has taken on maternal responsibility. This political maternalism opposes men who hold a Protestant ethic and is favorable to those who have the characteristics of the Freudian ethic (non-enterprising, conformist, dependent, passive, etc.,) (LaPiere 1959, p. 237-257).

The Analytic Attitude

Rieff's (1966) analysis is somewhat different than the analysis of LaPiere. While LaPiere mainly focuses on the effects of the Freudian ethic, Rieff analyzes the relationship between Freudian analytical theory, the offshoots of analytic theory, and culture. Another difference between the two analyses is that LaPiere focuses only on the negative aspects of the influence of Freud's ideas, while Rieff points out some of the positive effects of Freud's ideas also.

Rieff (1966) views modern man as being adverse to culture. "Psychological man," the individualist, is opposed to committing to a communal purpose. Rieff views culture as changing from a culture based on faith and commitment to

moral codes, to a system of belief based on an analytical attitude.

Individualism prevents commitment therapy (committing to a common communal moral system based on faith) from being effective. A new type of therapeutic effort has arisen: the "analytical."

Freudian analytical therapy arose in response to individualism. In modern industrial societies, commitment therapies no longer work, that is, therapeutic control can not be based on a promise of salvation through following moral codes. The analytic therapeutic is informative. It tries to provide control over inner conflicts. It tries to manage the strains arising from individuals not being attached to a community.

Freud was analytical and did not require the use of faith in his thinking. Freud viewed therapy as being "morally neutral," although it still is a form of self control. An analytic attitude, such as Freud's, can be viewed as an alternative to religious therapies.

Freud's followers, however, reintroduced faith "understood in terms of therapy." Freud's followers, such as Jung, Lawrence, and Reich, "...have tried, in their disparate ways, to go so far beyond psychologizing that it would become a way of life, that culture would be destroyed as a system of controlling consolations and reconstructed as

a system of more immediate releases of impulse" (Rieff 1966 p. 37). Freud would have disagreed with this view of therapy.

Additionally, Freud's followers developed commitment therapies which attempted to provide a world-view, based on faith, for the larger society. These new therapies strive to replace the decayed, and decaying, cultural systems of the past. However, they do not promise salvation through commitment to a "communal purpose." The commitment is to "the therapeutic effort itself."

The therapy of all therapies is not to attach one-self exclusively to any particular therapy, so that no illusion may survive of some end beyond an intensely private sense of well-being to be generated in the living of life itself. That a sense of well-being has become the end, rather than a by-product of striving after some superior communal end, announces a fundamental change of focus in the entire cast of our culture toward a human condition about which there will be nothing further to say in terms of the old style of despair and hope. (Rieff 1966, p. 261)

Psychological Society

Gross (1978) calls modern society the "psychological society." He believes there has been a change in the "mind" of individuals in American society, a change that is more profound than the external changes produced by technology. This change is a result of psychology.

Gross describes the effects of psychology on American culture (p. 1-18).

Americans have been taught to focus on questions about the "self." There is concern over motivations, mental illness, mental health, normality, etc.. Furthermore, it is psychology that not only defines "self" and what is normal, but also how to be normal. The individual can no longer understand or trust himself.

Also, the everyday tensions, anxieties, and troubles in life have been re-labeled as abnormal by the proponents of psychology. Individuals are supposed to try to become normal on the one hand, but on the other, normality is something that is almost unattainable.

Being normal has been defined as being happy. Individuals are no longer allowed to suffer, and yet be considered normal. American culture is like a gigantic therapy clinic where the goal is to make everyone happy, a goal that is not possible.

Also, everyday problems are no longer seen as everyday problems due to life itself, but due to psychological maladjustment. It is believed that men can be made perfect, or at least, better and better, with the help of psychology. Psychology is replacing religion in that it offers a belief system, promises a better future, seems mystical to many, etc..

The "Psychological Idea" presents the notion that men can no longer understand their motivations, emotions, or Self. It is psychology that can explain these things.

Additionally, people's behavior is never due to accident or chance, but results from psychological principles.

Psychology offers "truth," a truth supported by psychological findings. Psychology also offers a cure through techniques purported to eliminate mental problems. Individuals are no longer allowed to try and understand themselves on their own or deal with their own problems, or to decide what is normal for oneself. Psychology states what is normal, what isn't, what one is to do, and why. Psychology is the new philosophy of man and life. The psychological society itself may be producing many of the psychological problems that psychology seeks to cure.

Additionally, Gross (1978, p. 18-54) does not see psychotherapy as the curative mechanism in psychotherapy.

Psychotherapy is a key ritual of our twentieth-century psychological religion. In this ritual, the impressionable patient's hope and faith are coupled with the healer's belief in his own magical powers. The combination creates a persuasive setting of suspended reality. It is industrial society's sophisticated imitation of the witch doctor's primitive healing technique. (Gross 1978, p. 34)

Most of the beliefs in the psychological society, including therapies, are seen as expressing a new spirituality. During therapy, healing based on faith occurs, but under the disguise of rational science. With there being so many varieties of therapy, it is not the method or technique that is important, but faith. It is faith that heals.

Gross (1978, p. 55-92) calls modern day psychologists and psychiatrists "the new seers." Psychologists and psychiatrists are concerned not only with the mental health of individuals. They are also turned to for explanations of events such as hi-jackings, assassinations, political statements, and so on. Additionally they often attempt to analyze public figures and their behavior.

Furthermore, people tend to believe the findings of psychology. People not only need answers to the questions about life that they have, but have been taught that it is psychology that can provide these answers. Psychology can produce the "good" man and the "good" society. Psychology speaks out on how to properly raise children, proper sex behavior, homosexuality, marriage, education, and just about every other facet of life, so as to make society better and people better. Psychologists and psychiatrists are the new priests in the psychological society.

Psychological Information

Starker (1989) focuses on the distribution of psychological information rather than on the general culture. He argues that in the past, for the Greeks, guidance, knowledge, and meaning was provided by the "Delphi Oracle." Today it is provided by self-help books. You can find these at the supermarket. Thus, his title, "Oracle at the Supermarket."

Starker (1989, p. 1-12) discusses the scope and nature of self-help books: Millions of people who are seeking enlightenment seek for it in self-help books. There are self-help books on dozens of different topics, such as health, security, diet, economic success, self-behavior modification, child development, etc.

In one survey over eighty-six self-help books offering behavior modification were found (Starker 1989, p. 3). Some of the problems addressed were child behavior, smoking, over-eating, phobias of various types, sexual problems, etc. A follow up study a year later indicated that this form of self-help books was on the increase.

More specifically, many self-help books address self acceptance, self actualization, self realization, self control, self reliance, self respect, and so on. Millions of books are also sold on child care.

Starker (1989, p. 13-38) describes the birth and growth of self-help books: Self-help books are not new. They have been around for hundreds of years. Their origins are associated with the Puritan religion, and with "New Thought." For the Puritans self-help books offered guidance as how to live a pious life and gain salvation. The books were an extension of the church. These books gave the owner a better change for salvation. It was the church that was the authority and power behind the self-help books.

Self-help books became more secular and the grounds of authority widened during the twenties and thirties. So did the public market for self-help books. Salvation in this world became more important than salvation for the other world.

During the early part of the century self-help books began to focus on self growth and self expression. Also, psychiatry and psychology began to filter into the American culture creating an interest in the psychological aspect of people. Diagnosis and treatment replaced "spiritual reeducation" as the source of healing. Both Freud's work and behaviorism impacted the self-help books.

Psychology addressed most areas of human behavior. There was a "psychology of" for about everything. There were major social changes during this time. Some of the changes were due to World War I, the stock market crash, industrialization, the breakdown of the family, and so on. Psychology was turned to for the answers to the problems that arose. Particularly in the form of self-help books.

During the forties and fifties self-help books on all kinds of topics increased further. Millions of copies of books on child rearing, theology, health, psychology, etc., were sold.

The impact of psychoanalysis on American culture... and general outlook had, by mid-century, been quite profound. Since the 1920's an unceasing stream of psychoanalytically oriented or influenced self-help works had helped to spread the Freudian doctrine well beyond professional circles. Behaviorism, too, had generated its share of pre-scriptive self-help literature. The American public increasingly accepted the notion that the social and behavioral sciences could provide practical guidance in all areas of living. (Starker 1989, p. 111)

Prior to the sixties psychological movements had become well established in mental health institutions, and the psychological expert had been born. During the sixties psychology emphasized the "self." Many of the earlier neo-Freudians emphasized the self, and even though the general public wasn't familiar with these works, these works, although simplified and distorted, were transmitted through the "pop psychology literature."

The new psychology of the sixties and seventies specifically stressed the self. The psychologies of Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers were especially important in spreading the self movement.

Self-help books helped maintain and establish this concern with the self. Books such as, "Psycho-cybernetics," "Games People Play," "The Feminine Mystique," "How to Be Your Own Best Friend," and many others, contributed to promoting the concern with the self. However, one can not say that self-help books caused people's perspectives to change. It is not that simple. Self-help books contributed

to changes in perspectives, but they also were reflecting social changes and the social climate.

However, it can be said that self-help books did play a major role in changes within the culture of the sixties and seventies. Many people had questions about life, and self-help books had answers. Also, during this period, the distribution of self-help books became greater. Even at the supermarket. "The voice of the oracle could now be heard throughout the land" (Starker 1989, p. 126).

Psychological Models And Everyday Knowledge

The works of LaPiere, Rieff, Starker, and Gross, examine the relationship between psychological theories and ideas, and culture. However, they do not directly address the relationship between psychological models and everyday knowledge. I found only one article that addresses this relationship.

Berger's discussion (1965) of psychoanalysis addresses the relationship between psychological models and everyday knowledge. He describes the affects of psychoanalytic theory on everyday knowledge:

Psychoanalysis has a wide-spread "institutional core." In addition to therapy there are the hospitals, training centers, research centers, clinical psychology, and a host of various psychoanalytic organizations. In addition to this core there are agencies which counsel and test individuals from the psychoanalytic perspective. This

"counseling and testing complex" has spread into many areas of the institutional structure, to areas such as welfare, personnel administration, education, casework, and so on.

More importantly, psychoanalysis has become a cultural phenomena, a way of understanding the nature of man and an ordering of human experience on the basis of this understanding. Psychoanalysis has given birth to a psychological model that has influenced society far beyond its own institutional core and the latter's fringe. (Berger 1965, p. 27).

Lay Theories

Although in my literature search I did not find any empirical studies examining the relationship between ideas and notions derived from psychology (psychological models) and everyday knowledge, I found some research examining "lay theories." This literature examines the content or processes, or both, involved in lay beliefs. "Lay theories" are similar to the concept of everyday knowledge.

Studies of "lay theories" (Furnham 1989) show that:

1) there are commonly shared everyday causal attributions for human behavior; 2) human behaviors are explained by various models of human behavior; and 3) "lay theories" are often similar to the various "schools" in psychology.

There have been a number of studies on lay theories of human behavior. Alcoholism, delinquency, poverty, wealth, depression, obesity, intelligence, gambling, smoking, and mental illness are some of the phenomena that have been studied. However, many of these studies are concerned with

the content of lay beliefs. And the studies that are concerned with processes tend to concentrate on cognitive processes at the individual level.

The present research is not primarily concerned with the content of everyday knowledge or cognitive processes at the level of the individual. The concern is the form of knowledge in everyday knowledge, that is, the kind of model used to explain human behavior. Both studies of lay theories and the present research are interested in everyday explanations of human behavior.

The Cultural Component In Explanations Of Human Behavior

Psychology, and social psychology, for the most part ignore the cultural component of causal attributions (Pepitone and Triandis 1987; Ryff 1987). Part of this disregard for the cultural component stems from the emphasis on experimental methods as well as from the use of college students as subjects. Also, the consideration of the cultural component would require cross-cultural research and comparison. Additionally, the avoidance of cross-cultural comparisons helps protect hypotheses from being falsified. It is much easier to purport that findings, as well as "S-R mechanisms," are universal, or the same for everyone, when cross-cultural studies are avoided (Pepitone and Triandis 1987). The use of primarily an experimental method, and the use of primarily college students as subjects, has biased the findings in attribution research (Sears 1986).

Contemporary psychology has...suffered from an over-psychologized conception of human nature that sees individuals primarily as cognitive processors operating independently of their ties to the social world.... These lopsided views must be replaced with conceptions that reveal greater awareness of the complex nature of the individual, social system, and the ties that bind them together.... (Ryff 1987, p. 1201)

An alternative perspective to the "intraindividual" theories is the cultural perspective. This perspective views cultural components such as values, worldviews, norms, etc., as the major components of social cognition. This perspective doesn't eliminate intraindividual components, but is necessary for considering the role and affect of intraindividual components for social cognitions. It is culture that provides meanings, and meanings are involved in causal attributions, not just cognitive mechanisms or processes (Pepitone and Triandis 1987).

Miller (1984), in her cross-cultural study of culture and culture's influence on explanations of everyday social behavior, shows the importance of cultural meanings in causal attributions. Miller compared the dispositional attributions made by Americans and by Hindus. She also included age as a variable. She found that dispositional attributions are different in the two cultures, and different at different ages. These differences can be explained culturally. The differences are partially explained by the differing cultural perspectives of persons, perspectives that develop over time. In the U.S. the person

tends to be viewed as an individual whose action is independent of contexts or other social factors. In India the person tends to be viewed as being interdependent with the social world and the environment. The differences in social attributions at different ages can also be culturally explained. As the child grows he gradually adopts the cultural conceptions of the person from the culture he lives in.

What constitutes objective knowledge of the world...is framed in terms of culturally variable concepts acquired gradually over development. Such knowledge then cannot be acquired through processes of autonomous individual discovery but requires the communication of culturally derived conceptual premises for interpreting experience. (Miller 1984, p. 975)

Guimond, Begin, and Palmer (1989) also point out that most research on causal attributions has focused on cognitive and motivational processes, with little attention paid to cultural and social factors. This study also calls for a cultural interpretation approach, in addition to the information-processing approach, when examining causal attributions. This study shows that culture and social conditions affect causal attributions about social events. More specifically, they examined the effects of professional training and education on causal attributions.

This study shows that students' education affects causal attributions about the causes of poverty and unemployment. Social science students were found to attribute poverty and unemployment to situational factors

more than non-social science students. Attributions were different for different disciplines. Also, social science students were shown to attribute poverty and unemployment to situational factors more than a group of unemployed and poor subjects, a finding that is contradictory to the findings of attribution research.

The model used by Guimond, Begin, and Palmer (1989) stresses that socialization plays a role in causal attributions. Social groups that the individual belongs to affect the individual's cognitive processes. Social groups have a normative influence and a world-view. "To the extent that cognitive processes such as causal attribution are affected, the socialization process can be regarded as prescribing a 'code of cognitive conduct'" (p. 135).

In a literature review on lay explanations of poverty and wealth, Singh (1989) shows that causal attributions about poverty differ among social classes. Gender, ethnicity, age, political party, and culture, were also shown to affect causal attributions. What is of particular interest is that attributions vary from culture to culture.

Furnham's (1989) literature review suggests that individuals who are homogeneous on demographic and social factors would give similar causal explanations for human behavior, while individuals who are heterogeneous on demographic and social factors would give a wide variety of

causal explanations. Forgas, Morris, and Furnham (1982, p. 395), in a study examining causal attributions of wealth, point out why demographic and social factors are important to causal attributions:

Explanations of social reality depend on, and are an organic part of, the consensual "social representations" (Durkheim, 1898; Moscovici, 1981) of the culture in which they originate. It is necessary to take into account the prevailing rules, norms, customs, and values of the surrounding culture if everyday attributions are to be properly understood. Information about a person's social and ethnic background, and the judges' own demographic characteristics play a role in attribution judgements only because they stand as significant symbols of cultural values.

Summary

In this chapter I expressed that I am concerned with the possibility that the theories and ideas of psychology may be part of everyday knowledge, and that these theories and ideas in a modified and distorted form may shape part of the individual's subjective reality. I also stated that since *Weltanschauungen* and styles of thought affect the individual's thought and action, their examination is important. I further stated that the modified and distorted theories and ideas of psychology in everyday life may reflect or contribute to *Weltanschauungen* or be a style of thought. These are the concerns that lead to the present research.

I also presented two definitions of the term "psychological models." The first definition specified the

field of psychology as the source of psychological models. The second definition did not specify the source of psychological models. The first definition is to be applied to the theoretical and conceptual background. The second definitions is applied to the methods and findings of the present research, since the present research can't empirically establish that many of the psychological ideas and notions that respondents may use are derived indirectly from the field of psychology. Furthermore it was stated that there is theoretical and empirical evidence that psychology is probably the source of many of the psychological models respondents may use, a belief that is implied through out the research.

Next I stated the research questions. The first research question asks whether psychological models are part of the subjective reality of the individual. The second question asks what kinds of psychological models are part of an individual's subjective reality. The third question asks whether "categories" use psychological models as a style of thought. And, the fourth question asks whether psychological models are part of the current American *Weltanschauungen*.

Next I outlined the organization of the thesis. I explained that a brief explanation of the methods and kinds of analysis would proceed the introduction of the research hypotheses. Also, I explained that the research hypotheses

would be presented at the end of chapter II after the theoretical and conceptual background was discussed. The order of presentation should make the thesis clearer.

This was followed by LaPiere's (1959), Rieff's (1966), Gross's (1978), and Berger's (1965) analysis of the effects of psychological ideas and theories on culture. They argue that the effect has been profound, not only on culture, but also on the individual.

Additionally, I outlined Starker's (1989) analysis of the distribution of psychological ideas and theories through self-help books. Again, the effect of psychology was shown to be immense.

This was followed by a discussion of lay theories of human behavior. Although the research done on lay theories takes a different approach and has a different theoretical background, lay theories are similar to the concept everyday knowledge. Some of the research done on lay theories was examined and used to help direct and develop the present research.

The cultural component in explanations of human behavior was examined next. It was shown that the cultural component in explanations of human behavior is often ignored. The cultural perspective which is concerned with values, norms, worldviews, etc., can be viewed as an alternative to intra-individual approaches, or more appropriately, as a compliment to the intra-individual

approaches to examining explanations of human behavior. It seems clear that culture plays an important part in individuals explanations of human behaviors.

LaPiere, Rieff, Gross, and Starker show the effects of psychological ideas and theories. However, they do not directly show, or examine, the effects of psychological models on the "individual stock of knowledge." Nor do they directly examine the content of, or existence of, psychological models. Although Berger attempts to do this, his analysis is not empirical.

The discussion of lay theories and the cultural approach to understanding explanations of human behavior relate to the present research. However, these research endeavors were not directly addressing the questions of the present research.

The present research hopes to address the relationship between the "social stock of knowledge" and the "individual stock of knowledge" more directly. Or put another way the present research hopes to address the relationship between objective reality and subjective reality. This is attempted by examining the relationship between psychological models and everyday knowledge.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND, AND HYPOTHESES

INTRODUCTION

David Hume (1748/1955) argued that the basis of "human understanding" in the everyday world was "custom" and "habit," that is, experience. Whether experience is first hand experience or acquired through the experiences of others doesn't really matter. What is important is that it is through experience that individuals gain an understanding--knowledge of the world and how things in the world work. Most of our understandings of the world are derived through the experiences of others. Put another way, it is culture, and the knowledge or experience that is stored in culture, that shapes our understandings and behavior.

Magic, religion, and science are three types of knowledge that are concerned with the nature of the world (Willer 1971). These kinds of knowledge affect human thinking and action by providing a perspective which influences interpretation and action. "A system of knowledge determines how an individual relates himself to and describes himself within his empirical surroundings.

Because it describes man's relation to the world, it determines his perspective" (Willer, 1971, p. 7).

"Systems of knowledge" (Willer 1971) attempt to explain the relationship between X and Y, with different systems of knowledge having different explanations. These systems of knowledge can be differentiated in terms of the presence or combination of abstractive, empirical, or rational thought.

Empirical thought is at the level of observables and observation. Rational thought is theoretical, being concerned only with systems of concepts and the relationships among concepts. Abstractive thought connects empirical and rational thought, that is, observables are connected to non-observables beginning at either the empirical or theoretical level (Willer 1971).

Magical, mystical, religious, and scientific are the four knowledge systems which can be distinguished by the combinations of the three types of thought. Empirical thought characterizes magical systems, where, basically, knowledge is derived from making causal connections between empirical category X and empirical category Y. Combinations of abstractive and rational thought characterize religious systems, where theoretical concept is related to theoretical concept (*theological connections*), as well as theoretical concepts being connected through abstraction to observables (*ethical connections*). Combinations of empirical and abstractive thought characterize mystical systems, where

there is abstraction from empirical thought to an ideal theoretic state. Scientific thought can be characterized by the use of all three types of thought, where, through abstraction, observables are connected to concepts, as well as concepts being connected to observables.

In addition to the above systems of knowledge, another type of knowledge can be distinguished. This is everyday knowledge. Although everyday knowledge contains elements of magic, mysticism, religion, and science, everyday knowledge tends to be pre-theoretical for the most part, leaving out conscious consideration of questions about the nature of the world. It is questions about the nature of the world that characterized the first four systems of knowledge. It is the absence of these questions or problems, and the acceptance of a taken-for-granted reality that characterizes everyday knowledge.

Discussion of the kinds of knowledge and the kinds of knowledge system is important to the present discussion for several reasons. First, in many discussions of types of knowledge, everyday knowledge is not considered as a separate kind of knowledge, or is ignored altogether. Second, mysticism, magic, religion, and science, as systems of knowledge, arise from the everyday world, but turn around and shape the reality of the everyday world. In other words, these systems of knowledge have an impact on

everyday knowledge. Third, the present research hypothesizes that psychological ideas and notions are part of everyday knowledge. The question arises as to how psychological ideas and notions, as objective knowledge, become part of everyday knowledge.

The key to examining this question is culture. But first, definitions of culture and methods of cultural analysis need to be discussed.

Culture has been defined in a variety of ways. Those who study and theorize about culture are not in agreement on definitions of culture, or what aspects of culture should be focused on. Many social scientists have chosen to ignore culture altogether, or at least to ignore it as much as possible. One definition of culture is: culture is "the symbolic-expressive aspect of human behavior" (Wuthnow 1984, p. 3). Another definition is: "culture consists of the totality of man's products" (Berger 1967, p. 6).

Definitions of culture are tied closely to the approach one takes in cultural analysis. Wuthnow (1989 p. 10-17) outlines four general complementary perspectives regarding cultural analysis: "subjective," "structural," "dramaturgic," and "institutional."

The subjective approach to cultural analysis is from the viewpoint of the individual. "Mental constructions" are the primary element of culture. These are produced and

appropriated by the individual. These mental constructions arise from or express subjective states. "The problem of meaning is central in this approach; culture consists of meanings; it represents the individual's interpretations of reality; and it supplies meaning to the individual in the sense of integrative or affirming worldview" (Wuthnow 1989, p. 11). Social structure affects culture through individual experience and subjective states.

The patterns and relationships among elements of culture are the focus for the structural approach. Distinctions between cultural elements (symbolic boundaries), the mechanisms that modify or maintain symbolic boundaries, the rules by which symbolic boundaries are constructed, and "categories of discourse defined by" symbolic boundaries are emphasized. Elements of culture are viewed as being fairly autonomous, and distinct from subjective states of the individual. Categories, boundaries, and elements, are key concepts.

The communicative or expressive aspects of culture are the main focus for the dramaturgic approach. Culture and social structure are thought to interact; that is, culture expresses social relations. The relations between events, discourse, objects, etc., and the ways in which social life are ordered are central. Symbolic acts, such as rituals and ideologies, express social relations. Culture is "symbolic-expressive."

The institutional approach views culture as "patterned sets of elements" that express aspects of the moral order; however, these elements are affected by resource distribution. Culture "...is produced by actors who have special competencies and is perpetuated by organizations that in a sense process resources for the purpose of ritualizing, codifying, and transmitting cultural products" (Wuthnow 1989, p. 15). The organizations which perpetuate culture tend to have relationships with other organizations which have power, as well as being "challenged by movements" that have other resource bases.

The discussions of knowledge and methods of cultural analysis illustrate some of the problems for the present research. At the general level, the present research is a cultural analysis. The present study is limited by there not being a comprehensive framework for cultural analysis. There are four main perspectives on culture and cultural analysis, as well as various other perspectives. Although there may be an emerging framework for cultural analysis stemming from the alternative approaches of Peter Berger, Mary Douglas, Michel Foucault, and Jurgen Habermas (Wuthnow 1984), at this time it is necessary to analysis culture, or an aspect of culture, largely from one perspective. I have chosen to largely use the "subjective" perspective in the present research.

In general, the present research is interested in the relationship between culture and knowledge. More specifically, the present research is interested in the relationship between the social stock of knowledge, a component of culture, and everyday knowledge. And, very specifically, the present research is interested in the relationship between psychological models, as a component of the social stock of knowledge, and psychological models as a component of the individual stock of knowledge. In addition to this approach, and to complement the subjective approach, the relationship between *Weltanschauung* and styles of thought and knowledge is also of interest. In other words, does culture contain *Weltanschauungen* and "styles of thought" that shape individual knowledge? More specifically, are psychological models a style of thought, and express or contribute to *Weltanschauungen*?

EVERYDAY LIFE, SOCIAL INTERACTION, AND LANGUAGE

Everyday Life

Since it is knowledge within the everyday life that is the focus of the present research, it is necessary to describe the nature of the subjective reality of everyday life. This can be achieved by describing the everyday life phenomenologically. That is, the reality of everyday life can be described from the viewpoint of subjective experience (Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 19-28).

In the everyday life, consciousness is always focused on objects. And, although consciousness recognizes that these objects may belong to "different spheres of reality," it is the reality of everyday life that is the "paramount reality." "This wide-awake state of existing in and apprehending the reality of everyday life is taken by me to be normal and self-evident, that is, it constitutes my natural attitude" (Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 21).

Everyday life is apprehended as an objective, ordered reality. It is experienced as an intersubjective world (Berger and Luckmann 1967). People assume that other people share the same consciousness, that is, they have the same meanings for the same things and can understand one another. Additionally, it is known that a cultural and social world existed prior to the individual and is the main reference point for the individual, and that this world is the "natural world" (Schutz and Luckmann 1973, p. 3-8).

The everyday world is "taken-for-granted as reality" (Berger and Luckmann 1967). The things experienced are not questioned, and there are no problems; that is, until new experiences or problems can not be fit into the reality of everyday life. This reality is unexamined (Schutz and Luckmann 1973, p. 3-8).

Actions in the everyday life are guided by a pragmatic attitude and are goal oriented. People carry out "projects" they want to complete. When there are no problems, that is,

when experience fits into everyday life, much of human action is carried out following "recipes" for behavior. However, when new experience does not fit into the existing everyday reality, the new experience becomes a problem and is either made to fit into the existing everyday reality or the new experience modifies everyday reality. But, everyday reality is characterized by an absence of problems for the most part. The details of an experience or event or object are not sought, but only enough knowledge of the experience is sought in order to make the experience fit into the existing everyday reality. One does not step outside of everyday reality in everyday life if this can be avoided (Berger and Luckmann 1967; Schutz and Luckmann 1973).

Social Interaction

Social interaction is also an important component of the reality of everyday life (Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 28-34). It is during social interaction that others are experienced most fully. All the other modes of experiencing others are derived from face-to-face interaction.

During face-to-face interaction subjective expressions are exchanged. During this exchange of subjective meanings the subjective meanings themselves are modified. Although this exchange and modification of subjective meanings gives flexibility to the interaction, face-to-face interactions which take place within the bound of everyday

reality are patterned. The other is apprehended in terms of "typifactory schemes" which order the interaction. Unless the other contradicts the typifactory schemes, they will guide the interaction. Usually the other is viewed as a type in a situation, a situation which is also a patterned type.

The social reality of everyday life is thus apprehended in a continuum of typifications, which are progressively anonymous as they are removed from the "here and now" of the face-to-face situation. Social structure is the sum total of these typifications and of the recurrent patterns of interaction established by means of them. As such, social structure is an essential element of the reality of everyday life.
(Berger & Luckmann 1966, p. 33)

Language

Everyday reality is largely produced and maintained through language (Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 34-46). Humans express their subjective meanings in the products they produce ("externalization"). These products are fairly permanent signs of human social processes, and are shared with others not only in face-to-face situations, but in other situations also. It is objectivations that make everyday reality possible, and it is language that enables human productions to be objectified.

Language originates in and has its primary reference to everyday life; it refers above all to the reality I experience in wide-awake consciousness, which is dominated by the pragmatic motive...and which I share with others in a taken-for-granted manner.... As a sign system, language has the quality of objectivity. I encounter language as a facticity external to myself and it is coercive in its effect on me. Language forces me into its patterns.
(Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 38)

Language makes it possible for experience to be objectified by providing a means whereby subjective meaning can be expressed. Language allows experience to be typified and anonymized, that is, people can share the same categories for understanding and sharing experiences. Also, language connects the various zones in everyday life into a "meaningful whole." Additionally, language makes it possible for objects to be present that aren't present in the "here and now." That is, past meanings and experiences can become part of the present.

Another aspect of language is that language can transcend everyday reality. Experiences within "finite provinces of meaning" or "discrete spheres of reality" can be expressed through language. In other words, the experiences of realities other than everyday reality can become part of everyday reality as a result of language bringing these experiences into everyday reality.

Language can also create other realities. "Any significative theme that...spans spheres of reality may be defined as a symbol, and the linguistic mode by which such

transcendence is achieved may be called symbolic language" (Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 40). Symbolic language creates spheres of reality that are not available in everyday reality. These realities cover everyday reality. The most important symbol systems have been philosophy, science, art, and religion.

Language is capable not only of constructing symbols that are highly abstracted from everyday experience, but also of "bringing back" these symbols and appresenting them as objectively real elements in everyday life. In this manner, symbolism and symbolic language become essential constituents of the reality of everyday life and of the common-sense apprehension of this reality. I live in a world of signs and symbols every day. (Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 41)

Psychological Models And Everyday Life

Hypothesis I states that in everyday life an individual will use a psychological model more often than any other kind of model which explains human nature and human behavior. As part of everyday life psychological models are part of everyday reality, and share in the characteristics of everyday reality. They are part of the natural attitude and, as such, are apprehended as an objective reality, taken-for-granted, known to be intersubjective, and applied pragmatically.

A casual observation of American social interaction and language suggests that hypothesis I will be supported by the present research. It is common to hear individuals use words from the language of psychology during social

interaction while explaining or discussing someone's behavior. Psychological models can be used to typify behavior, and to express subjective meanings during social interaction. Psychological models may also provide some of the basis for typification of the situation itself, that is, psychological models may specify when psychological models are appropriate and how they are to be used. Also, it is through the exchange of psychological models, during social interaction, that psychological models are shared intersubjectively.

Psychological language is not only used during social interaction, but is also very common in the American media. Words such as neurotic, psychotic, schizophrenic, unconscious, personality, therapist, client, childhood trauma, psychological, psychology, Freudian, reinforcement, and so on, are part of everyday language. By being expressed in language psychological models are part of objective reality. The words contained within psychological models can be used to objectify and typify one's past, present, and future experiences, as well as others experiences and behavior.

Psychological models are also commonly used to explain other spheres of reality, that is, psychological language is used to express and understand other realities. Art, music, drug induced experiences, religious experience, dreams, death, and so on are often discussed and explained in the

language of psychology in everyday life. For example, it is not uncommon to hear people interpreting their dreams in terms of repressed needs or wants, or to hear the media interpret UFO sightings or cult religious experience in psychological terms.

In addition to psychological models being used to interpret alternate spheres of reality, psychological models can create other spheres of reality. They can be used symbolically to cover all areas of life--both everyday reality and other realities. They can be used to explain and connect all spheres of reality. It is not uncommon in our culture to hear someone, or some aspect of the media, attempt a psychological explanation of life in general. It may be that psychological models are replacing, or have replaced, religious models as the "canopy" for explaining life.

THE SOCIAL STOCK OF KNOWLEDGE

The "social stock of knowledge" contains the accumulated meanings and experiences, that is, the knowledge of a society. Things such as knowledge of institutions, roles, everyday life, and recipe knowledge are contained within the social stock of knowledge (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

The social stock of knowledge presents the social world as an objective facticity. It orders the world. It presents the social world as a coherent whole with people

accepting this as taken-for-granted (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

It is language that stores the social stock of knowledge, and it is through language that the social stock of knowledge attains its objectivity.

Knowledge..."programs" the channels in which externalization produces an objective world. It objectifies this world through language and the cognitive apparatus based on language, that is, it orders it into objects to be apprehended as reality. It is internalized again as objectively valid truth in the course of socialization. Knowledge about society is thus a *realization* in the double sense of the word, in the sense of apprehending the objectivated social reality, and in the sense of ongoingly producing this reality. (Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 66)

Language creates and sets the boundaries of "Semantic fields" (zones of meanings), that is, language creates classification schemes (Berger and Luckmann 1967). An example would be, say the occupation of gravedigger, where linguistic objectifications that are required for this occupation orders everyday routines in this occupation. A variety of semantic fields are built up through which experience can be accumulated and retained.

By virtue of this accumulation a social stock of knowledge is constituted, which is transmitted from generation to generation and which is available to the individual in everyday life. What is more, I know that others share at least part of this knowledge, and they know that I know this. My interaction with others in everyday life is, therefore, constantly affected by our common participation in the available social stock of knowledge. (Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 41)

The social stock of knowledge: 1) provides knowledge about the functioning of the everyday social world; 2)

provides "recipe" knowledge; 3) differentiates everyday reality by providing more knowledge on the aspects of everyday life that are common and occur frequently while supplying less knowledge to areas of less concern; 4) supplies typification schemes for everyday pragmatic problems as well as for interactions, events, and most routine situations; 5) provides the "relevant structures" which show what knowledge is and isn't relevant to individuals or society; and 6) provides knowledge about the social distribution of the social stock of knowledge (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

The Origins Of The Social Stock Of Knowledge

Everyday reality is for the most part derived from the social stock of knowledge. It is the social stock of knowledge which contains, and from which, "objective reality" is appropriated. (Berger and Luckmann 1967; Schutz and Luckmann 1973).

However, the social stock of knowledge originates from human activity. This social construction of reality occurs through dialectical processes (Berger 1966, p. 1-18; Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 60-61). The processes involved are "externalization," "objectivation," and "internalization." Externalization refers to human beings' subjective meanings being expressed in products, both material and non-material, through activity. Objectivation refers to the products of human activity which express subjective meanings becoming

apprehended as objective facticities outside the individual. Internalization refers to the products or objects that have become objectivated becoming part of subjective consciousness.

Through externalization man produces the social world. Through objectivation the social world becomes objective reality. Through internalization the objective social world becomes subjectively real. In other words, society is produced by men, society is an objective facticity, and men are produced by society. This relationship between man and society is dialectical (Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 60-61).

Another way of saying this is that it is the individual stock of knowledge, or individual experiences and explications, that give rise to the social stock of knowledge. It is the experiences and explications of individuals from which social knowledge originates. However, in actuality, the individual stock of knowledge is not acquired independently of the social stock of knowledge. As members of society, the individual stock of knowledge is derived from the social stock of knowledge. However, the individual stock of knowledge can influence and shape the social stock of knowledge, that is, knowledge from the social stock of knowledge can be modified by the individual stock of knowledge before again becoming part of the social stock of knowledge (Schutz and Luckmann 1973, p. 262-264).

Additionally, although the social stock of knowledge originates from individual activity, the social stock of knowledge is not the sum of individual experiences and subjective meanings. The social stock of knowledge does not contain all the individual experiences and subjective meanings, and it contains more than individual experiences and subjective meanings (Schutz and Luckmann 1973, p. 263-264). Also, although the social stock of knowledge arises from individual experience, it is the social stock of knowledge that for the most part shapes individual experience. In other words, although it was individual experiences and subjective meanings that gave rise to the social stock of knowledge, once formed, the social stock of knowledge shapes individual experiences and subjective meanings (Schutz and Luckmann 1973, p. 243-264). But, it should be remembered that the relationship between the social stock of knowledge and the individual stock of knowledge is still dialectical, even though the social stock of knowledge is the more important in shaping experiences and subjective meanings.

The everyday life being socially constructed, that is, being a shared intersubjective reality, affects the individual stock of knowledge in several ways (Schutz and Luckmann 1973, p. 243-244). First, the social world exists prior to the individual. The social world shapes, and determines, the experiences that become sedimentated in the

individual stock of knowledge. Second, much of the knowledge within the individual stock of knowledge is learned from the social stock of knowledge rather than obtained through individual "explications."

Social structure and the coexistent "relative-natural world view" exist prior to the individual. Social relations and the meanings attached to them are already institutionalized and objectivated through language. The social world has already been typified and defined (Schutz and Luckmann 1973, p. 243-244). So has everyday reality, that is, "the customary attentional advertences and interpretational schemata for nature, society, and conduct in general are objectivated in language and are more or less firmly institutionalized in the social structure" (Schutz and Luckmann 1973, p. 244).

Additionally, language, one of the most important components of the social stock of knowledge, a component that is internalized in every society, reflects a "relative-natural world view" and the meanings associated with this view. It is this language, and the meanings and structures contained within this language that individuals use to objectivate their experiences in everyday life. As a result of language providing meanings and a relative-natural world view for the individual, the individual does not have to explicate problems or form his own typifications. With the typification of experiences through language and the

relative-natural world view contained within language, subjective experiences as well as the explication of subjective experiences become similar for individuals. These shared experiences, and the shared interpretations of these experiences, and the resulting "plans" and "acts" can become part of the social stock of knowledge. However, individuals do not share all the social stock of knowledge. This is due in part to the social distribution of knowledge and to individual biography (Schutz and Luckmann 1973, p. 244-250).

The Social Stock Of Knowledge And Institutions

The social stock of knowledge is embodied primarily in institutions and roles (Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 53-92). It is through institutions and roles that the objective reality of society is experienced. It is institutions that provide much of the socially available knowledge and social order.

Institutions not only provide social order by providing blue-prints for actions but also by becoming apprehended as objective facticities. Most institutions are prior to the individual and appear as an external, historical, objective reality (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

Institutional order arises out of reciprocal typification of performances. This implies typified actors and actions. This also implies that individuals share goals and cooperate in their performances. Specific actors are

recognized as those who carry out certain specific actions. Also, actions are recognized as being carried out by all for whom the action is relevant (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

In order for "forms of actions" to be typified, these forms of actions have to be objective. This is achieved through "linguistic objectification." A vocabulary is developed for these forms of actions. This makes it possible for actions to be understood without understanding specific individual performances and specific individual subjective processes. Both the self and the other can be viewed as performing objective actions, actions which any appropriate actor can engage in (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

Roles are also an important part of the social stock of knowledge. It is through roles that institutions become part of individual experience (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

The roles, objectified linguistically, are an essential ingredient of the objectively available world of any society. By playing roles, the individual participates in a social world. By internalizing these roles, the same world becomes subjectively real to him.
(Berger and Luckmann 1967 p. 74).

The common stock of knowledge contains the information about roles and role performance. It also contains the information that everyone knows these roles and the conduct appropriate for these roles. Individuals can thereby be made responsible for their performances of specific roles (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

Also, roles distribute specific parts of the common stock of knowledge. A role presents specific cognitive, normative, and affective aspects of knowledge; "...each role opens an entrance into a specific sector of the society's total stock of knowledge" (Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 77). There is a social distribution of knowledge in terms of generally relevant knowledge and knowledge specific to a role.

Psychological Models

The social stock of knowledge contains the institution of psychology (psychological ideas, behaviors, organizations, roles, etc.). Psychology as an institution is apprehended as an objective reality.

The scope of psychology, as an institution, is very broad. It encompasses all human beings and most of human behavior, at least in American society. The role "psychological human being" applies to everyone, and everyone can be held accountable for their behavior. Psychology is relevant to everyone, since everyone is included in this institution.

That psychology as an institution is part of the social stock of knowledge, and thus part of the objective reality of American society, suggests that research hypotheses will be supported. Psychology appears to be the most widespread institution for explaining behavior and human nature.

It is not hard to see the spread of psychological ideas and practices in American society. Therapy and counseling are common practices. Self-help books dealing with psychological matters are numerous. Psychology courses are available in high schools and most colleges. Advertising, sports, business, churches, and many organizations use psychological techniques. Psychological principles are applied to weight loss, quitting smoking, raising children, training pets, and a host of other things. Psychological ideas are available in many movies and television shows, sometimes explicitly.

The "psychological complex" has its own special language, roles, and semantic fields. These can be used to objectify and interpret experience. For example, there are the roles therapist and client. Each of these roles specify the conduct appropriate for the role. Both the therapist and the client can be held accountable for their behavior. These roles specify plans or blue-prints for behavior.

Furthermore, the institution psychology is embedded within the larger institution of science. This gives psychology much of its legitimacy. The social stock of knowledge contains the information that it is science that possesses the specific knowledge about the nature of the world and the nature of human beings. It is science that is the expert on the world.

Since the individual stock of knowledge is mostly derived from the social stock of knowledge, it can be argued that psychological models, as part of the individual stock of knowledge, came from psychology, part of the social stock of knowledge. However, since the social stock of knowledge originates from individual activity and explications and experience, there is the question of whether pre-theoretical psychological ideas and practices gave rise to formal psychology or whether the ideas and practices of psychology were independently discovered. Put another way, do psychological models come directly from psychology, or were there psychological models in everyday life before there was a formal psychology?

It could be argued that psychological models in everyday life preceded formal psychology. Institutions arise from habitualized actions. It is only later that special roles arise--the roles of legitimating the institution and the roles of those who engage in pure theory (Berger and Luckmann 1967). However, the present research can't, and doesn't attempt to, show empirically whether psychological ideas and notions come from the field of psychology or from everyday life. The source of psychological ideas and notions would have to be determined through historical/sociological research. However psychological ideas and notions came about they are now part of the social stock of knowledge. And, also, there is

theoretical support for believing that many psychological ideas and notions come specifically from the field of psychology in current times.

INTERNALIZATION OF THE SOCIAL STOCK OF KNOWLEDGE

It is during internalization (Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 129-180) that the objective reality embodied in the social stock of knowledge is transferred to the individual stock of knowledge, becoming part of subjective reality. Internalization makes it possible to understand others, and gives meaning and reality to the world (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

The process through which the "objective reality contained within the social stock of knowledge is transferred to the individual's stock of knowledge is referred to as "socialization." During primary socialization part of the social stock of knowledge of the society is transferred to, and appropriated by, the individual. Primary socialization is the process by which individuals "become part of society" (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

The individual is provided with an objective social world and an objective social structure. This is presented to the individual by "significant others" during childhood. During the mediation of the objective social world significant others modify the objective social world. The

objective social world is modified in terms of biography, class positions, and so on (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

Additionally, significant others' "selves" were also formed through earlier primary socialization.

...Their action is determined by social institutions, their experiences stamped by the relative-natural world view, their knowledge derived extensively from the "social stock of knowledge." Thus, with respect to the child they conduct themselves in ways which are determined by social institutions...and the child is apprehended by them in socially derived typical forms.... (Schutz and Luckmann 1973, p. 246)

Internalization takes place as identity takes place. The individual takes on the roles and attitudes of the significant others, thereby acquiring a subjective identity. This is a dialectical process. That is, the individual acquires not only the objective identity provided by significant others, but also subjectively appropriates identity (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

As the individual acquires the attitudes and roles of significant others, he also acquires the significant others' social world. Identity is always within a specific social world. "Subjective appropriation of identity and subjective appropriation of the social world are merely different aspects of the same process of internalization, mediated by the same significant others" (Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 132).

The "generalized other" forms in consciousness through socialization. This is where the individual identifies not

only with the attitudes and roles of significant others, but abstracts from these, and identifies with a "generality of others." The individual has an identity sustained by significant others, as well as an identity sustained by the generalized other (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

When the generalized other has become part of consciousness, society, objective reality, and identity have become internalized. "Society, identity, and reality are subjectively crystallized in the same process of internalization. This crystallization is concurrent with the internalization of language" (Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 133).

With the internalization of the generalized other, subjective reality and objective reality can be translated into each other. This is achieved primarily through language. However, although subjective and objective reality are similar to one another, they are not the same. There is more objective reality than can or needs to be internalized, as well as aspects of subjective reality that did not originate through socialization.

"Institutional 'sub-worlds'" are internalized during secondary socialization. Secondary socialization in this sense is defined as the "acquisition of role-specific knowledge." Additionally, there is the acquisition of "semantic fields" and all they entail (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

The similarity, the correspondence, between objective and subjective reality has to be produced and maintained. The reality, identity, and society that were internalized during socialization are not static. The objective reality that was transmitted during socialization has to be maintained. There are always threats to subjective as well as objective reality (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

"Routine maintenance" is one type of reality-maintenance. Everyday reality is maintained by routines, that is, institutionalization. In addition, this reality is maintained by interaction. This reality is created through social processes and maintained by social processes. The social processes of internalization and the social processes of maintenance are similar in that subjective reality is always related to objective reality, an objective reality that is socially defined (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

Reality-maintenance of subjective reality is through significant and non-significant others that are encountered in everyday life. It is the social definitions provided by others that maintain and confirm subjective reality (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

Conversation is the most important reality maintainer. It is conversation that modifies and maintains subjective reality. The reality-maintenance of conversation is implicit. The statements made during conversation imply a taken-for-granted world. Additionally, conversation

reaffirms this subjective world. Conversation not only maintains subjective reality but modifies it (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

Conversation is reality maintaining due to the fact that linguistic objectification objectifies and gives order to the world. "In conversation the objectifications of language become objects of individual consciousness" (Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 154). Reality-maintenance results from language being used to objectify experience.

Identity

Berger and Luckmann (1967, p. 173-180) in their discussion of "theories about identity" show the importance of identity: Identity and socialization both occur during the process of internalization. Identity is necessary for primary socialization. It is through identification with significant others that the social world of the significant others is internalized. Also, it is through identifying with significant others that an identity and the social world that goes with that identity are acquired.

Identity is an important part of subjective reality. Identity and society are in a dialectical relationship; that is, it is social processes that give rise to identity, social processes that are determined by social structure. But, identities once formed, turn around and influence social structure.

"Identity types" are part of objective reality, and they are theorized about.

Theories about identity are always embedded in a more general interpretation of reality; they are "built into" the symbolic universe and its theoretical legitimations, and vary with the character of the latter. Identity remains unintelligible unless it is located in a world. (Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 174)

Theories about identity have to be understood in terms of the objective reality in which they are developed. Cosmologies precede "psychologies." In this context "psychologies," or "psychology," is referring to theories about identity. Any theory referring to identity that is an "adequate" explanation of identity, scientific or otherwise, is considered a "psychology."

Identity and society are in a dialectical relationship. Psychologies add to this dialectic when specifying and explaining subjective reality. That is, there is a dialectic between the subjective reality and the theories themselves. This affects all individuals, since psychologies are attempting to explain aspects of subjective reality. This is relevant to everyone.

Psychological theories are used to solve problems. They are used to interpret. Psychologies can be used to explain conflict between identity and the identity assigned to an individual by society, as well as the conflict between identity and biological organism. Psychologies allow these problems to be understood in terms of categories.

The psychological theories...serve to legitimate the identity-maintenance and identity-repair procedures established in the society, providing the theoretical linkage between identity and world, as these are both socially defined and subjectively appropriated.
(Berger and Luckmann 1967, p. 176)

Psychological theories that can be used to interpret "empirical phenomena" are said to be "adequate." The theoretical concepts of "adequate" psychologies, during socialization, become part of subjective reality. The realities defined by "adequate" psychologies are part of both subjective and objective reality. The realities defined by "adequate" psychological theories are part of everyday life.

Psychological theories not only reflect the reality they are said to explain, but also shape this reality. Psychological theories, as part of the "social definition of reality," can create reality, as can other theories that are legitimating. Psychological theories are especially powerful since they are involved in the formation of identity.

Psychologies define and explain "internal reality," and through internalizing psychologies, these definitions and explanations of identity tend to become "realized" in the formation of identity. A reality is created by psychologies and this reality is then used to test the adequacy of the psychologies. In other words, the categories created by psychologies are internalized as part of subjective reality,

and can be used by the individual to interpret his psychological reality and experiences. Additionally, the more institutionalized a psychology is, the more it will be used to interpret phenomena (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

Psychological Models

Psychology, as an institution, is part of the objective reality of American society. Through socialization and identification some of the ideas and notions of psychology are communicated to, and appropriated by, new generations.

The specific psychological ideas and views that are communicated through primary socialization vary. Significant others present different psychological models. For example, the psychological model presented by an upper class business elite would be different than the psychological model communicated by a construction worker. Although the specific content of psychological models may vary, it is that psychological models, of whatever sort, are communicated that is important.

The psychological models acquired during primary socialization are maintained through social interaction. It is during conversation with significant and non-significant others that the psychological models learned during primary socialization are maintained and modified. Psychology, as an institution, provides much of the language that is used to maintain psychological models.

Psychological models can also be acquired through secondary socialization. There are many roles requiring some knowledge of psychological ideas and views. For example, daycare workers, policemen, lawyers, sports trainers, ministers, and so on require some knowledge of psychological ideas. Additionally, psychological ideas and views can be acquired in great detail by those who need specialized psychological knowledge. The psychological models that are part of these roles are also maintained by these roles.

PSYCHOLOGICAL MODELS, LEGITIMATION, AND SYMBOLIC UNIVERSES

It can be argued that psychologies, particularly scientific psychology, are legitimating theories and share the characteristics of all legitimating theories. Berger and Luckmann (p. 92-116, 1967) discuss legitimation theories.

Legitimizing theories: 1) are used to make the meanings contained within institutions both subjectively and objectively plausible, as well as to integrate these meanings; 2) explain and justify institutional order; and 3) state why one should do something, as well as state why things are the way they are.

"Symbolic universes" are the most comprehensive and inclusive legitimating schemes. Psychology can be viewed as part of the "symbolic universe," "Science." Some of the

aspects of "symbolic universes" are: 1) they are theoretical; 2) they integrate "alternative spheres of reality"; 3) they legitimate the already existing meanings in the institutional order and individual biography by ordering experience under one interpretation of experience, that is, by providing meanings for all experience; and 4) they also legitimate identity by placing identity within an all encompassing universe of explanations.

Methods of social control have to be developed to keep everyone within the symbolic universe. These techniques that are used to legitimate symbolic universes are called "conceptual machineries of universe-maintenance." Science, including psychology, can be viewed as one of these conceptual machineries. Although most individuals no longer know how the symbolic universe is kept together, they do know that it is the experts in science who maintain the symbolic universe.

Therapies, in whatever form, are an applied "conceptual machinery of universe-maintenance." Therapies attempt to maintain the "official definitions of reality." Therapies, in order to try and bring someone back to the official reality, develop diagnostic techniques, explanations of deviance, and methods of "cure." The expert tries to get the deviant to internalize the official definitions, by re-socialization.

SOCIAL DISTRIBUTION OF KNOWLEDGE

The social stock of knowledge, including psychological models, is socially distributed. The social stock of knowledge contains more than just knowledge that is relevant for everyone. Some of the knowledge contained is relevant only to those in special roles. However, although the "social stock of knowledge" is differentiated, it is still available to everyone, at least in principle (Schutz and Luckmann 1973, p. 299-300).

Specialized knowledge, that is, role-specific knowledge, is more means-goal oriented than everyday knowledge. It is more systematic and explicit in its solutions to problems. This knowledge is also generally transmitted only between people whose roles are relevant to the knowledge. This knowledge is not transmitted to everyone, nor is everyone interested in this role-specific knowledge. However, the solutions to the problems that are solved by the specialist are available to everyone. Who the experts are and who to consult is part of the social stock of knowledge. Additionally, role-specific knowledge can become separated from actions, everyday reality, and pragmatic concerns and develop its own meanings and structures (Schutz and Luckmann 1973, p. 299-304).

In American society the social stock of knowledge contains the information that it is psychology which is the carrier of knowledge about human behavior and human nature.

If a person wants to know anything about human behavior it is psychology that is to be consulted. Just from the fact that it is the psychologist who is specified as the expert on human behavior is enough to legitimate psychological models.

WELTANSCHAUUNG AND STYLES OF THOUGHT

Weltanschauung

Mannheim (1920, p. 3-7; 1921, p. 8-58) sought to develop a method of cultural analysis where cultural objects could be understood in their totality. He argued that the cultural and social sciences have sliced the cultural/social world up into different specialties, with each specialty having its own peculiar way of perceiving the world. For example, sociology and psychology each have a somewhat different perspective about the world.

Mannheim was trying to develop a social science that would interpret culture as a whole. He didn't believe the whole could be understood from the parts, but only by examining the whole.

One way of interpreting the social/cultural world is to examine culture in terms of *Weltanschauungen*. *Weltanschauung* can be defined as the global outlook or approach to the world of a culture, group, or individual. *Weltanschauung* refers to the total view or "impulse of a culture." "In order to reach the latter, we...must perform

a mental operation..., transcending each objectification as something merely itself" (Mannheim 1921, p. 17).

Weltanschauung is a totality and beyond cultural objectification, but somehow is expressed in cultural objectifications. *Weltanschauung* can be described only metaphysically. It is the source of "creative tendencies," perspectives, and all cultural objectifications.

Mannheim used art as an example of his approach. In art the form and content of the work of art can be analyzed. However, knowing the form and content does not allow one to interpret the work of art. But, by examining a work of art, or changes in the form of art, in terms of changes in the *Weltanschauung* ("historical spirit") behind the cultural objectifications, the changes in forms of art can be interpreted and understood.

Weltanschauungen are a-theoretical (not produced by thought), and are the basis of all "cultural objectifications." Philosophy, religion, mores, as well as customs, demeanor, rituals, theoretical discourse, art, etc., are examples of "cultural objectifications." "Cultural objectifications" are carriers of meaning, and manifest an underlying *Weltanschauung* (Mannheim 1921, p. 8-13).

Mannheim (1921, p. 18-38) establishes the usefulness, and the existence of, *Weltanschauung*. He does so by

examining the presentation of objects, and three kinds of meanings.

Objects can be given immediately or mediately. When given immediately the object itself is given. When given mediately the object is not present itself, but is mediated by another object. An object that is mediately given is apprehended as an object itself, but also plays "mediator" roles such as "evidence" and "expression," that is, the object is a signification of another object. Cultural objectifications which are immediately given can be analyzed to see if they mediate a "global outlook."

Cultural objects carry meaning at three different levels: 1) "objective meaning"; 2) "expressive meaning"; and 3) "documentary meanings." For example, social interactions (cultural objects) can be examined at three levels of meaning. "Objective meaning" is given in the event, the situation itself. "Objective meanings" would be carried in the patterned interactions, patterned interactions that everyone knows, that is, everyone knows the objective meaning of the specific social interaction.

While the "intentionality" of the producer of the cultural object doesn't need to be known at the objective level of meaning, at the level of expressive meaning the "intentionality" and experience of the producer, the subjective component, is precisely what provides the meanings. To grasp expressive meaning one has to grasp the

meaning the individual had in consciousness, what he subjectively intended.

While objective meaning arises from the act itself, and expressive meaning arises from the intended meaning of the individual, documentary meaning involves interpretation of the cultural objectification independent of the objective and expressive meanings. Documentary meaning is an appraisal of the cultural object, an interpretation that points to something beyond the objective and expressive levels of meaning. Documentary meanings can be brought together and expressed in general concepts such as *Weltanschauung*.

Mannheim makes it clear that *Weltanschauung* is both a-theoretical and theoretical. One of the issues he discusses is how to theoretically deal with something that is a-theoretical. In other words, *Weltanschauung* exists in experience, prior to being theoretically distinguished.

Cultural objects given immediately, that is, as they are experienced, may not possess the three levels of meaning that were analytically distinguished. The objects as presented are non-stratified and homogeneous. Mannheim (1921, p. 38-45) therefore examines the structure of cultural objects in immediately given objects.

Cultural objects that are immediately given have several characteristics. First, cultural products are not stratified; that is, objective, expressive, and documentary

meaning are given simultaneously. Second, many of the objective and expressive meanings of cultural objects can not be defined theoretically. There are no concepts developed to represent some meanings. However, just because meanings can't be theoretically defined does not mean that they do not exist at the pre-theoretical level. Many objective and expressive meanings are at the pre-theoretical level where there are no theoretical concepts to describe them. However, they still represent "meaningful patterns of experience."

Third, intuition can be used to grasp meanings and is as acceptable as theoretical grasps of meanings. It is only when one is outside "formed experience," that is, when the act or event has no meanings, that cultural objects are meaningless.

Fourth, it is at the level of subjective experience-meanings that documentary and expressive meanings can be grasped. It is subjective experience-meanings that reshape "objective" meanings, that is, how the individual interprets "objective meanings."

Fifth, subjective experience-meanings can lead to a re-interpretation of objective meanings. The original objective meanings become "bracketed" when the cultural objects are examined in terms of expressive or documentary meanings.

Sixth, meaningful objects are grasped at once, as a whole, and do not consist of adding up the parts. It is by grasping the whole that the parts are given meaning.

Expressions of *Weltanschauungen* can be found in the documentary meanings of cultural objects. This interpretation looks for what lies behind cultural objects. It is through examining and interpreting all cultural objectifications and their documentary meanings that *Weltanschauungen* can be found (Mannheim 1921, p. 8-57).

Mannheim did not see *Weltanschauungen* as the determinants of cultural objectifications. Cultural objects express *Weltanschauungen* but are not determined by *Weltanschauungen*. Cultural objectifications can also affect *Weltanschauungen* (Mannheim 1921, p. 8-57).

Styles Of Thought

"Styles of thought" can be said to be an expression of *Weltanschauungen*. However, it is not *Weltanschauungen* that determine styles of thought. Social and historical forces are behind the development of both *Weltanschauungen* and styles of thought (Mannheim 1927, p. 132-222).

Thought develops in styles. It is social groups that form the basis for styles of thought. It is social groups that "carry" the style of thought.

Individuals do not think very much on their own. Individuals use the language, concepts, and world-views of the groups or social strata they belong to. Styles of

thought, ways of dealing with problems, plans for appropriate action, all exist prior to the individual. Knowledge isn't created by each individual independently, but appropriated from groups. In understanding thinking, or put another way, in understanding knowledge, one has to look beyond the individual's cognitive processes. These processes are socially conditioned (Mannheim 1936, p. 1-54). For example, styles of thought change as the social factors influencing the group's dynamic history change (Mannheim 1927, p. 132-222).

Social forces affect the thought style of groups by affecting the group's view or way of perceiving the world. Although much of Mannheim's work focuses on the political thought styles of "conservatism" and "liberalism," his view that it is social forces that shape the development of thought styles can be applied to other areas of thought. The agent that thought is centered upon--the agent that shapes the group's *Weltanschauung*--whether political, religious, psychological, etc., can be the focus of analysis (Mannheim 1927, p. 132-222).

What is important in the development of styles of thought is the way the world is interpreted. For example, it would seem that philosophy and politics of the same time period could be clearly distinguished in terms of their thought styles. However, this is not necessarily the case. They both may share the same style of thought, that is, both

may be underlain by a kind of "action." "This 'action'...is a special way, peculiar to each group, of penetrating social reality..." (Mannheim 1927, p. 142). It is styles of thought that are used to interpret the world. Those who have similar styles of thought interpret the world similarly. They use similar thought categories.

The thought style of the individual comes from the groups belonged to, the groups belonged to having their own way of interpreting the world (Mannheim 1927, p. 132-222).

Thought styles can be ascertained by examining the categories and thought patterns used by specific groups. Mannheim examined the changing thought styles of thinkers of specific time periods, changes in the thought styles of the thinkers being a reflection of the changes in thought style of the groups they represent (Mannheim 1927, p. 132-137).

"Basic intention" is the concept used to describe the "dynamic force" behind changes in thought style. Basic intention "expresses the idea that different ways of approach to the world are ultimately at the bottom of different ways of thinking" (Mannheim 1927, p. 136). Styles of thought are basically determined by the "basic intention." However, the basic intention itself is dynamic, being formed by the conflicts and struggles of the group which carries the specific basic intention. The style of thought of a group arises out of the basic intention of the

group, that is, the "inarticulated group experience." It is only later that the style of thought becomes theoretical.

By examining basic intentions and styles of thought, it can be shown that there are forces or principles within groups which shape the very experiences and knowledge of individuals. These "determining principles" can be found by discovering the social forces which gave rise to them.

The development of "conservatism" (Mannheim 1927, p. 132-222) can be used to illustrate the development of *Weltanschauung* and styles of thought. Conservatism is a way of acting and thinking. Conservatism guides individual's thinking and action. This may be at a conscious or unconscious level.

Conservatism has its own history and development independent of the individual, even though the individual can affect conservatism. Conservatism may be produced by human groups, but conservatism exists before the individual and after the individual is gone. Conservatism has its structure, a dynamic structure that is shaped by history.

Conservatism is not only a political form, but also a way of experiencing and thinking. Conservatism is a style of thought. Conservatism both expresses an underlying *Weltanschauung* and in part contributes to the *Weltanschauung*.

The style of thought of a group is basically derived from the way the group interprets the world--the group's

Weltanschauung. It is social differentiation that is the dynamic force behind the differentiation of groups and the intellect.

Existential Factors

In his later writings Mannheim (1936, p. 264-311) set out to develop the sociology of knowledge perspective. He never forgot his earlier interests in *Weltanschauung* and styles of thought, but his focus was more on the social basis of knowledge. He believed that through sociological analysis of the history of ideas the social basis of knowledge could be determined for socio-historical periods.

Mannheim gave two examples of "existential" factors that shape knowledge. First, competition shapes knowledge. Competition "...furnishes...the motor impulse behind diverse interpretations of the world which, when their social background is uncovered, reveal themselves as the intellectual expression of conflicting groups struggling for power" (Mannheim, 1936, p. 269). Second, "generations" influence and shape knowledge. "This factor influences in very many cases the principles of selection, organization, and polarization of theories and points of view prevailing in a given society at a given moment" (Mannheim 1936, p. 270).

It is world-views that shape action, thought, and reality. It is largely through groups, and the conflict between groups, that world-views arise. World-views of

groups develop out of the experience of the group. However, groups are in conflict over their different world-views. Groups in a position of power and prestige are in a position to enforce, or promote more readily, their perspectives. Groups such as political groups, economic groups, religious groups, educators, the producers and controllers of media, are in a position to promote their specific world-views, (Mannheim 1936, p. 1-54).

Weltanschauung, Styles Of Thought, And Psychological Models

To describe the expressions of *Weltanschauung* or *Weltanschauungen* in American society would be an overwhelming task. With specialization and an extended divisions of labor, and a large variety of cultures within our culture, the number of *Weltanschauung* must be very large. However, one can point out some of the outstanding existential factors of American society that may reflect and contribute to a common *Weltanschauung*. It can be argued that, first, it is the political/economic institutions that define much of the available objective reality of the external world. Second, it is the institution psychology that defines much of the objective reality of the internal world. Both political/economic reality and psychological reality are legitimated and produced, largely through another institution--science. Whatever the American *Weltanschauung* or *Weltanschauungen* may be, the political,

economic, and psychological realms certainly express, as well as influence, the *Weltanschauungen*.

By examining styles of thought as an expression of *Weltanschauungen*, more specifically psychological models as a style of thought and an expression of *Weltanschauungen*, some aspect of the current American *Weltanschauungen* may be revealed. In the literature review, Gross, Lapiere, Starker, and Rieff illustrated the extent of the influence of psychology in American culture. It was shown to be quite extensive. However, as stated earlier, the question as to whether psychological thinking is part of everyday taken-for-granted knowledge remains open. This is a question that the present research hopes to be able to address, at least in some way. But it is clear that psychological models are part of American culture, at least at the objective level.

The theories and ideas of psychology can be viewed as cultural products. Since, all cultural objectifications are said to express an underlying *Weltanschauung*, psychology can be said to express an underlying *Weltanschauung*. Additionally, since it is through examination of documentary meanings of cultural products that aspects of *Weltanschauungen* can be found, an examination of the part of documentary meanings that can be found in individual's causal attributions can show some aspect of *Weltanschauung*.

Although *Weltanschauung* or *Weltanschauungen* can't be clearly identified, and a larger sample of cultural objects

would be needed than just individual's causal attributions in order to approximate *Weltanschauung* or *Weltanschauungen*, one can speculate. This will be taken up in greater detail in the conclusion section of this paper.

BERGER, LUCKMANN, SCHUTZ, AND MANNHEIM

The theoretical and conceptual background draws upon the work of Berger, Luckmann, Schutz and Mannheim. Both the approach to understanding social knowledge taken by Berger, Luckmann, and Schutz, and the approach to understanding knowledge taken by Mannheim are important to the present research. Berger and Luckmann focus on the social construction of reality, that is, social knowledge arises from the social construction of objective and subjective reality. Mannheim focuses on two aspects of knowledge. First, Mannheim is concerned with *Weltanschauung* and its expression in cultural objects as well as how cultural objects may affect *Weltanschauung*. Second, Mannheim is concerned with styles of thought and the existential factors that give rise to social knowledge, that is, social knowledge arises from the experiences of groups within specific socio-historical times. Additionally, Schutz and Luckmann focus on outlining the subjective and intersubjective nature of the everyday life-world.

Although Berger, Luckmann, and Schutz's approach to understanding social knowledge is different from Mannheim's

approach, as Berger and Luckmann point out themselves, I see Berger, Luckmann, and Schutz's approach as an addition to, rather than a replacement of Mannheim's work. There are many continuities and similarities between the two approaches. That Berger and Luckmann focus on the individual, subjective processes, intersubjectivity, and everyday knowledge, and that Mannheim focuses on worldviews, groups, styles of thought, ideas, and existential factors is certainly some of the differences between the two approaches. However, Mannheim is also concerned with the individual, subjective processes, intersubjectivity, and everyday knowledge, but to a lesser degree. Also, Berger and Luckmann are also concerned with worldviews, groups, styles of thought, ideas, and existential factors, but to a lesser degree. If one looks for similarities, if one is willing to translate the language or style of one approach into the other, there are many similarities and continuities in the two approaches.

Comparing the similarities and differences between the two approaches to social knowledge would be very profitable to the sociology of knowledge. A greater contribution to the sociology of knowledge would be a synthesis between the two approaches. However, this would be way beyond the scope of the present research and beyond my present abilities.

In the present research the work of Berger, Luckmann, and Schutz provide the background for the research question

which asks whether or not psychological models are part of an individual's subjective reality. The work of Mannheim provides the background for the research questions that asks whether "categories" use psychological models as a style of thought and whether psychological models are part of the current American *Weltanschauung*. Both theoretical approaches are a necessary background for the present research.

METHODS, UNITS OF ANALYSIS, AND HYPOTHESES

Methods

Questionnaires with open-ended questions were used to gather data. The respondents were asked 13 questions which asked for explanations for human behaviors and human characteristics. For example, one question asked for an explanation of why some juveniles join street gangs. Another question asked for an explanation of why some teenagers imitate rock stars. If psychological models are part of everyday knowledge, then psychological models should be reflected in respondents' explanations of human behaviors. Additionally, other kinds of explanations for human behavior should also be reflected in the respondents' explanations. In other words, individuals were asked to make causal attributions for human behavior, and the causal attributions were examined.

From these causal attributions a typology of the "kinds of causal attributions" (models) that respondents used to explain human behavior was developed. Then, each of each individual's causal attributions was analyzed and categorized in terms of the typology "kinds of causal attributions." For example, one of the kinds of causal attributions developed out of all the causal attributions given by respondents was "psychological models." This model contained all the causal attributions given by individuals that seemed to go together. This model contained attributions such as needs, self, feelings, attitudes, psychological states, childhood, past abuse, learning, motivation, and so on. The kind of causal attribution called "psychological model" contains all the causal attributions that seem to hang together and that are psychological in nature. Additionally, each one of an individual's causal attributions that fit into this category was labeled "psychological model." It is the kind of causal attribution that the individual made, or put another way, the kind of model the individual used to explain human behavior that is the focus of the present research. The models that individuals used in their causal attributions were analyzed in two different ways.

The Two Kinds Of Analysis

The Individual. The first kind of analysis focused on each individual. It was the kind of causal model that each individual used more than any other kind of model that was of interest. For example, the kind of model used for each question by an individual was determined. Then by determining the kind of model that was used the most to answer the 13 questions, the individual was assigned one kind of model--his dominant model. So, the first kind of analysis examined each individual's causal attributions for the 13 questions and assigned each individual a dominant model. The focus was the dominant model used by each individual.

The frequency distribution for each individual's usage of a dominant model was calculated. The dominant model used by each individual was counted, and the percentage of individuals who used the same dominant model determined. For example, 25 out of 73 individuals may have used a physiological model as their dominant model, thus 34% ($25/73$) of the individuals in the sample used a physiological model as their dominant model for explaining human behavior. Additionally, characteristics such as age, sex, and education were analyzed to see if these characteristics effected the dominant model an individual used for explaining human behavior.

Categories. Categories based on age, sex, and education were the focus of the second kind of analysis. Although these categories are statistical categories and are not groups in the sociological sense, it can be argued that individuals in a category may share certain aspects of culture and may belong to some of the same groups.

This kind of analysis examined the models individuals used for each question rather than assigning each individual a dominant model. The first part of the analysis was concerned with the kind of models categories used more frequently than any other model--the dominant model. For example, question 1 asked for a causal explanation of juveniles joining a street gang. It could be that 30% of the individuals in the sample used a psychological model, 45% of the individuals in the sample used an interpersonal model, 10% used a physiological model, while 15% of the individuals in the sample used other various models as a dominant model. The dominant model used to explain this question would be an interpersonal model. This kind of analysis was carried out for each question. After a dominant model was assigned to each question it was possible to determine what kind of dominant models were used by individuals in the sample, or individuals in any of the categories examined. Additionally, it was possible to assign any category a dominant model. For example, if individuals in the sample used a psychological model more

frequently than any other model for explaining human behavior for 8 out of 13 questions, it could be said that individuals in the sample gave a psychological model as a dominant model for 62% (8/13) of the questions. If a psychological model was used more than any of the other dominant models for explaining the 13 questions it could be said that the individuals in the sample used a psychological model as a dominant model when explaining all the human behaviors. This part of the analysis was concerned with the dominant model of categories. For example, it could be that the statistical category "males" used a psychological model as a dominant model for explaining human behaviors. This means that the individuals in the category "male" used a psychological model more frequently than any other model in explaining the 13 human behaviors or human characteristics. The dominant model of each category was determined, and the dominant model of different categories compared.

The second part of this analysis was concerned with the analysis of the dominant model of categories in detail. This part of the analysis examined the kinds of models used, and their frequency of use. This analysis specifically shows the relationship between the models used by a category. The dominant model as well as the other models used for each question were described and analyzed. For example, it could be that 15% of the individuals in the sample used a psychological model for explaining why

juveniles join a street gang, and 50% of the individuals used an interpersonal model, and 12% used a psychological/interpersonal model, and 10% of the individuals used a physiological model, and 13% used some other model. The models that were used for this question and their frequency of use, and their relationship to the dominant model for this question could be clearly seen. This analysis was carried out for each question. Additionally, comparisons were made between different categories to see if different categories who had the same kind of dominant model used the same models with the same frequency, or whether different categories used different models with different frequencies. For example, the dominant model and other models used by "males" and "females" for explaining why juveniles join a street gang could be compared in detail. This kind of comparison could be carried out for each question. If both these categories have the same kind of dominant model it could then be determined whether the category "males" and the category "females" used dominant and other models similarly or dissimilarly. The methods used, as well as the analysis of the data will be explained in more detail in the methods and findings section.

Hypotheses

There are three guiding hypotheses for the present study.

1) In everyday life an individual will use a psychological model more often than any other kind of model (dominant model) which explains human behavior and human characteristics.

Here, the individual is the focus of analysis. It is the model that an individual uses more frequently than any other model (dominant model) in all his causal attributions that is of interest.

In American society psychology has been designated as the "knower" and transmitter of the knowledge explaining human nature and human behavior. Part of this theoretical knowledge, although in a modified, simplified, and distorted form (psychological models), may be part of the "general social stock of knowledge," and part of everyday reality (Berger 1965).

2) There will be more than one kind of psychological model, or a mixture of psychological models, used in everyday life to explain human behavior and human nature.

There are a number of psychologies, such as psychoanalytic, behaviorism, humanistic, cognitive, etc., that are recognized as carrying knowledge about human nature and human behavior. This may be reflected in everyday knowledge.

3) In everyday life, categories will use a psychological model more often than any other kind of model

(dominant model) for explaining human behavior and human characteristics.

Although these are categories based on age, education, and sex, it can be argued that group membership in the real world may vary in terms of the characteristics of these categories. And, also, although it has been clearly shown in research that age, sex, education, and other characteristics have an effect on the causal attributions an individual makes, it doesn't necessarily follow that these characteristics have an effect on the kinds of models that individuals use for explaining human behavior.

Different categories may have a different style of thought. If so, these differences will be reflected in the dominant model each category uses. For example, males may have a psychological model for their dominant model while females have a physiological model for their dominant model. Or alternatively, different categories may have the same style of thought which would also be reflected in the dominant model each category uses. For example, males and females may both have a psychological model as their dominant model. Also, if categories do share a common style of thought it could be argued that categories may also share a common social stock of knowledge or a common *Weltanschauung*.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

SAMPLING, SUBJECTS, MEASUREMENT, COLLECTION, AND PROCESSING

Sampling

A convenience sample was used to select respondents for the research. However, a variety of respondent were chosen who varied in terms of age, sex, and education. This allowed the creation of statistical categories based on these characteristics. Also, this allowed examination of whether these characteristics had an effect on the kind of explanation an individual used for human behavior. Part of the sample consisted of undergraduate students who were taking an introductory sociology course at P. S. U.. And, part of the sample consisted of individuals from non-college settings. There were 73 respondents in the sample.

Subjects

Thirty-four P. S. U. undergraduates who were taking an introductory sociology course participated in the research. Only four out of the 38 students present in the class chose not to voluntarily participate.

The rest of the sample consisted of 39 volunteers from non-college settings. There were: 1) eleven employees at

an electrical supply company; 2) four employees at a pharmacy; 3) three employees at a legal office; 4) thirteen people waiting to play bingo at a bingo parlor; and 5) eight people from no specific setting.

Respondent's Age. Table I shows the age distribution of the respondents.

TABLE I
AGE DISTRIBUTION FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

age category	f
17-20	17
21-24	10
25-28	8
29-32	6
33-36	5
37-40	9
41-44	5
45-48	4
49-52	0
53-56	0
57-60	3
61-64	1
65-68	0
69-72	3
73-76	1
NR	1

	N = 73

About half the respondents were under 30 years of age, while about half the respondents were over 30 years of age. The median was 30.

Respondent's Sex. Table II shows the distribution for the sex of the respondents.

TABLE II
SEX DISTRIBUTION FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

Sex	f
Male	28
Female	43
NR	2

	N = 73

The table indicates that 59% of the respondents were female, while 38% of the respondents were male.

Respondent's Education. Table III shows the distribution for the respondent's years of education.

TABLE III
DISTRIBUTION FOR YEARS OF EDUCATION COMPLETED

years of education completed	f
10	3
11	3
12	18
13	11
14	14
15	8
16	8
17	5
more than 17	1
NR	2

	N = 73

Thirty-three percent of the respondents had completed 12 years or less of school, while 67% of the respondents had attended college. The years of education completed was quite diverse for the sample. The median was 14.

Psychology and Sociology Courses. Another characteristic that is of interest is the number of psychology and sociology courses taken. Table IV displays the distribution for this item.

Table IV show that 45% of the respondents had taken no psychology courses, and 36% of the respondents had taken no sociology courses. On the other hand, 52% had taken one or more psychology courses, while 62% had taken one or more sociology courses. The median for the number of psychology courses taken, as well as for the number of sociology courses taken, was 1.

TABLE IV
NUMBER OF PSYCHOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY COURSES TAKEN

Number of courses taken	f	f
	psychology	sociology
0	33	26
1	11	13
2	10	17
3	11	7
4	3	2
5 or more	3	7
NR	2	1
	---	---
	N = 73	N = 73

Religious Preference. One final characteristic that is of interest is the respondent's religious preference. Rather than reducing the respondents religious preference to "Protestant," "Catholic," or "other," or some other

classification scheme, the religious preferences as given by the respondents are presented in Table V.

Table V indicates that "Christian" was chosen by 25% of the respondents, "None" by 23% of the respondents, and "Catholic" by 12% of the respondents. Each of the other categories were chosen less than 6% of the time.

TABLE V
RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE OF RESPONDENTS

religious preference	f
Atheist	1
Baptist	3
Catholic	9
Christian	17
Episcopalian	3
Lutheran	6
Mormon	2
New Thought	2
Protestant	4
None	18
Not Codable	3
NR	5

	N = 73

Summary Of The Respondent's Characteristics. The characteristics of the sample can be summarized: 1) About half of the respondents were under 30 years of age; 2) Fifty-nine percent of the respondents were female; 3) About 67% of the respondents had one or more years of college completed; 4) About 52% of the respondents had taken one or more psychology courses, and about 62% had taken one or more sociology courses; and 5) About 25% of the respondents chose "Christian" as their religious preference, while about 23%

chose "None" as their religious preference. However, if all the Christian denominations are counted in the category Christian, then 60% of the respondents expressed a Christian preference.

Measurement

The present research is primarily interested in two variables. The first variable can be called "causal attributions." This variable can be defined as "the responses respondents gave to questions asking for a causal explanation of human behaviors." The second variable can be called "kinds of causal attributions," or "models" used for explaining human behaviors. The "models" variable is derived from the "causal attributions" variable. The variable "models" is the focus of the research.

Causal Attributions. Causal attributions were acquired from respondents through the use of a questionnaire. The questionnaire used an open-ended response format. There were thirteen questions in the questionnaire. The respondents were asked to state what they believed caused certain behaviors. Table VI lists the questions respondents were asked. (See Appendices B and C)

The questions used in the questionnaire were chosen for several reasons. First, the questions were designed in such a way so as to allow respondents as much freedom as possible in giving causal explanations of the behaviors. In other

words, the behaviors could be explained by different "models" of human behavior. Since the present research is interested in the kinds of models individuals use to explain human behavior, it seemed reasonable to ask questions that could be explained by various models of human behavior.

TABLE VI

THE QUESTIONS USED IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE

- 1 There are various kinds of juvenile delinquency. One kind, street gang violence, is considered to be a growing problem. What do you think causes juveniles to become members of a street gang?
- 2 It is not uncommon for people to feel depressed (feel blue). For example, a person may be in the process of a divorce, have a parent die, or loose his/her job. These are obvious reasons for feeling depressed. However, sometimes people feel depressed for no apparent reason. What do you think causes people to feel depressed for no apparent reason?
- 3 People can be classified as heterosexual, homosexual, or bi-sexual. What do you think causes someone to be heterosexual?
- 4 What do you think causes someone to be homosexual?
- 5 Personality can be defined as the characteristic way in which an individual behaves and thinks. What do you think causes people to have the kind of personality they have?
- 6 Most people in our society abide by the social laws and rules of our society. What do you think causes people to obey the laws and rules in our society?
- 7 It is estimated that approximately 5 percent of the American population is alcoholic, that is, alcohol consumption causes problems in their lives. What do you think causes people to be alcoholic?

TABLE VI
THE QUESTIONS USED IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE
(continued)

8 Some people constantly experience extreme anxiety, that is, they feel apprehension and tension, a sense of danger, and have expectations of not being able to cope. Extreme anxiety interferes with a person's normal functioning in everyday life. What do you think causes this kind of anxiety?

9 Some people break social laws and rules, have a total disregard for others, and do so without any guilt. For example, a bank robber may shoot someone while robbing a bank and not feel guilt. What do you think causes someone to be this way?

10 A number of Americans are fat. What do you think causes someone to be fat?

11 Billions of dollars are spent each year on rock concerts and rock recordings. Also, many kids, and young adults, spend additional time listening to and viewing rock music on cable TV. It is not unusual to see these kids trying to be like modern rock stars. What do you think causes many kids to try and be like rock stars?

12 Over the last three decades violence has increased in the United States. Homicides, forcible rape, child abuse, aggravated assault, and robbery, have all increased, for example. What do you think has caused the increase in violence?

13 Where do you think your understanding of the causes of human behavior comes from?

For example, the first question asking for a causal attribution for juveniles joining a street gang can be explained by a number of different "models" of human behavior. The causal model used could be moral or religious, psychological, biological, sociological, etc..

Second, the questions were similar to questions that

have been used in the study of "lay explanations" (Furnham 1989). For example, research on lay explanations shows that individuals use different models of human behavior for explaining alcoholism, juvenile delinquency, depression, etc..

Third, the topic of each question was described at a general or categorical level, followed by the question asking for a causal explanation. Since it was models used for explaining general human behaviors that was of interest, and since most models of human behavior are at a general level, the questions in the questionnaire were at a general level.

Kinds Of Causal Attributions, Or "Models." The main variable of interest was "kinds of causal attributions," or put another way, "models." This variable was developed out of the causal attributions given by all the respondents. The "models" variable can be defined as "the kinds of causal attributions given by respondents in explaining human behaviors."

The following steps were taken in the development of the "models" variable. The first step was to bring some kind of order to the more than 900 causal attributions that were gathered. First, the causal attributions were reduced to their basic content. For example, one causal attribution given for why some juveniles join street gangs was, "Lack of family base, insecurity. Kids need moms and dads and when

its not provided at home they will look for it elsewhere." This causal attribution was reduced to "need" and "family." Another causal attribution given for juveniles joining street gangs was "Juveniles become gang members because of a break-down of the family. Gang life offers them a sense of family and belonging." This causal attribution was reduced to "need", and "family." This process was carried out for each response. This was the first step in developing the "models" variable.

The second step was to create categories for the kinds of causal attributions given, or put another way, to find the kinds of "models" that were used in causal attributions. These categories were discovered by examining all the causal attributions that the respondents gave. These categories were created by grouping the respondent's causal attributions into categories which expressed a similar kind of causal attribution. The categories created were: 1) psychological causes; 2) inter-personal causes; 3) physiological causes; 4) social structural causes; and 5) cultural causes. Table VII shows the causal attributions which are part of each category of attributions, that is, it shows the models used in causal attributions.

Additional models were created for multi-causal attributions. These additional categories were made up of combinations of the 5 basic models. An example would be the

category "psychological/interpersonal," or "physiological/psychological/cultural."

The respondent's causal attributions were classified in terms of the model, or models, used for explaining human behavior. For example, one of the causal attributions given for "joining a street gang" was "need and family." These attributions fall under the models "psychological" and "interpersonal," as shown in Table VII. This attribution was labeled "psychological/interpersonal." Another example, is the attribution "genetic," "social learning," and "attitudes," for explaining alcoholism. These attributions fall under the models "physiological," "interpersonal," and "psychological." This attribution was labeled, "physiological/psychological/interpersonal."

The reliability of the classification system was checked. After being instructed as to how the classification system worked, and the kinds of causal attributions within each model, an associate classified 25 of the responses given to the questionnaire. Inter-coder reliability was 88%.

Data Collection

About half the data was collected from individuals in a P. S. U. undergraduate sociology class. The questionnaire was administered during a regularly scheduled class. The students were told that research was being done on students beliefs about the causes of human behavior. Students were

TABLE VII
TYPES OF MODELS, AND THE CAUSAL ATTRIBUTIONS
WITHIN EACH MODEL

Psychological Model	

causal attributions	
needs	childhood
self	past abuse
feelings	morals/conscience
attitudes	motivation
cognitive	learning
psychological states	personal traits
unconscious	personal knowledge

Interpersonal Model	

causal attributions	
family	parents
peers	people
socialization	social learning
environment	personal circumstance

Social Structural Model	

causal attributions	
society	economy
government	education system
social conditions	social problems
informational knowledge	

Cultural Model	

causal attributions	
social norms	social sanctions
cultural values	cultural morals
life-styles	traditions
general culture	

Physiological Model	

causal attributions	
biological	innate/genetic
addiction	other physical

then asked to voluntarily participate in the research by filling out a questionnaire that was handed out.

The questionnaires were handed out, filled out by the students, and returned as soon as they were completed. The time to complete the questionnaire ranged from ten minutes for a few students to thirty minutes for most students.

About half the data was collected from individuals who were from non-college settings. Research assistants distributed questionnaires at their places of employment. These questionnaires contained additional and specific instructions for completing the questionnaire. Subjects were asked to fill out the questionnaire: 1) without help from anyone; 2) in a quiet atmosphere; 3) in one setting; 4) to seal the questionnaire in a provided envelope; 5) to spend no more than forty-five minutes on it; and 6) return it to the person who gave it to them the next day.

I believe the respondents from non-college settings followed the instructions they were given. First, the research assistants told me that the respondents took the questionnaire seriously. Second, they returned the questionnaires promptly. Third, the questionnaires were complete. Fourth, the responses were similar in form to the responses given by the college respondents. There was no evidence that the instructions for filling out the questionnaire were not followed.

Data Analysis

After each causal attribution was reduced to its basic content and classified in terms of the "model" typology (e.g. psychological model, physiological model, interpersonal model, etc.), the data was analyzed in two ways. The first kind of analysis focused on the kind of model each individual used for each question. This analysis can be made clearer by examining the analysis of one of the respondents in more detail.

For question 1, which asks for a causal explanation of juveniles joining a street gang, the respondent replied that "kids needs are not being met, and their is no guidance from parents." This causal attribution was reduced to its basic content: "needs" and "parents." "Needs" fits into the classification "psychological model," while "parents" fits into the classification "interpersonal model." This causal attribution was labeled "psychological/interpersonal model." This is the kind of causal attribution the respondent used for this question.

For question 2, which asks for a causal explanation of depression, the respondent replied that "sometimes people's relationships with other people don't work out and this makes them depressed." This causal attribution fits into the classification "interpersonal model," and was labeled "interpersonal model."

So, this respondent used a psychological/interpersonal model for explaining question 1, and an interpersonal model for explaining question 2. Further, suppose that the respondent used a psychological model for answering 6 questions, an interpersonal model for answering 2 questions, and a physiological model for answering 3 questions. This respondent has made 13 causal attributions, one for each question in the questionnaire. It can be seen that this respondent used a psychological model for six of his causal attributions. This model was used more than any other kind of model (6 out of 13 questions). So, it could be said that this respondent used a psychological model as his dominant model.

The above kind of analysis was carried out for each respondent. Each respondent was classified in terms of his dominant model used for explaining human behavior, that is, each individual was labeled as using one kind of model more than any other kind of model for explaining human behavior.

After a dominant model was assigned to each individual the dominant model used by each individual was counted to see the kind and frequency of the kind of models individuals used as dominant models. For example, it could be that 10 out of 73 respondents use a psychological model as a dominant model, 30 out of 73 use a physiological model as a dominant model, 20 out of 73 use an interpersonal model,

and 13 out of 73 use a psychological/interpersonal model as a dominant model.

Additionally, the characteristics age, sex, and education were examined to ascertain whether these characteristics effected the dominant model an individual used. For example, if the dominant model used by each male was compared to the dominant model used by each female it could be determined whether sex had an influence on the dominant model an individual used.

The second kind of analysis focused on statistical categories and the dominant kind of model each category used to explain human behavior. For each question it was determined which model individuals in a category used as a dominant model. For example, if 30 of the respondents used a physiological model to explain depression, and 20 of the respondents used a psychological model, while 23 of the respondents used an interpersonal model, the dominant model used by the sample (considered a category in the present context) to explain depression would be a physiological model. This procedure was carried out for all the questions. A dominant model was assigned to each question. It could then be said what dominant model individuals in the sample used for each question, and what the frequency of use was.

After determining the dominant model individuals in the sample used for each question it was possible to assign a dominant model to the sample. In other words it was determined what kind of model a category used more frequently than any other model for explaining all 13 questions. For example, if individuals in the category "female" use a psychological model as a dominant model for 6 out of 13 questions, and a physiological model for 5 of the questions, and an interpersonal model for 2 of the questions, the dominant model individuals in the "female" category used to explain all the human behaviors would be a psychological model. The dominant model used by different categories were compared.

Also, this analysis examined all the models and their frequency of use. By examining all the models and their frequency of use the models that gave rise to a categories dominant model can be made clearer. First, all the models and their frequency of use by a category was determined for each question. It was not only the dominant model used for the question that was of interest, but also all the models and their relationship to the dominant model that was of interest.

The dominant model and other models used for each question by different categories were compared. For example, the dominant and other models that individuals in the category "male" used for each question could be compared

to the dominant and other models that individuals in the category "female" used. It could be determined whether individuals in the categories "male" and "female" used models similarly or dissimilarly.

The models used by different categories were compared in three ways. First, the dominant model categories used for each question were compared. For example, it was ascertained whether those who had taken psychology courses and those who had not taken psychology courses used the same dominant models for the same questions. It was then determined whether individuals in these two categories used dominant models similarly or dissimilarly. Second, the models used for each question by those who had taken psychology courses and those who had not taken psychology courses were compared to see if these individuals used the same or different models for each question. Third, the frequency of use for the same model, for the same question, was compared to see if the individuals in the two categories used models with a similar or dissimilar frequency.

The above analysis not only allowed determination of hypothesis III which states that categories use a psychological model as their dominant model, but also shows specifically how the dominant model of a category is related to the other models that a category used. The above analysis also allowed comparison of dominant models and other models between different categories.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

Due to the nature of the hypotheses and the theoretical framework for the research it was necessary to analyze the data using two different units of analysis.

The hypotheses were basically concerned with the relationship between psychological models and everyday knowledge. It was the individual's subjective stock of knowledge that was of interest. This required examining each individual's stock of knowledge, as expressed in causal attributions, to see if psychological models, as well as other kinds of models, were part of each individual's stock of knowledge.

For example, the first hypothesis stated that an individual will use psychological models more often in everyday life than any other model which explains human behavior. This hypothesis was concerned with the models that each individual used in causal attributions. This required individual examination of all the responses given by each individual. Additionally, the second hypothesis stated that there will be more than one psychological model, or a mixture of psychological models, used in everyday life

to explain human behavior. Again, it was the individual's subjective knowledge, as expressed in causal attributions, that was of interest.

Additionally, part of the theoretical and conceptual framework centers on the "subjective reality" of everyday life. Put another way, the theoretical and conceptual framework is interested in the relationship between the social stock of knowledge and the individual stock of knowledge. This also entailed examining the individual.

Hypothesis III stated that categories will use a psychological model more often than any other kind of model for explaining human behavior. This required a different unit of analysis. The focus was the dominant model and other kinds of models used by categories rather than the dominant model used by each individual. This hypothesis was tested by examining the models categories used in causal attributions. It was the dominant model, as well as other models, that were used for each question that were analyzed.

Additionally, part of the theoretical and conceptual framework which addresses the hypothesis is concerned with *Weltanschauung*, styles of thought, and the "general social stock of knowledge." This required a unit of analysis other than the individual.

ANALYSIS OF THE DOMINANT MODEL USED BY EACH INDIVIDUAL

The Overall Sample

When the sample was analyzed and the dominant model used by each individual determined, it was found that individuals used a psychological model as their dominant model. This was indicated by 26 out of 73 respondents (36%) making a psychological attribution more often than any other kind of attribution. Additionally, an interpersonal model was used as a dominant model by 16 of the respondents (22%). Seven of the respondents (10%) used a physiological model as a dominant model. Also, six of the respondents (8%) did not use any model more than twice. For example, one respondent used a psychological twice, an interpersonal/ physiological twice, and nine other models. No model appeared to be used more frequently than any other model, that is, there seemed to be no basis on which to distinguish the dominant model. These responses were classified as "none." Other models each accounted for less than 8% of the total causal attributions given. It is clear that the model used most often as a dominant model by individuals in the overall sample is a psychological model. These findings can be seen in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII
PERCENTAGES AND FREQUENCIES FOR THE DOMINANT
MODEL USED BY AN INDIVIDUAL IN THE SAMPLE

Dominant model used	f	%
IP	16	22%
PSY	26	36%
C	1	1%
PH	7	10%
SS	2	3%
PH/PSY	4	5%
IP/PH	3	4%
C/IP	1	1%
IP/PSY	6	8%
IP/PH/SS	1	1%
NONE	6	8%
	---	---
	N = 73	99%

Education

By comparing the dominant model used by each individual who shared a common characteristic to the dominant model used by each individual who shared an opposing characteristic it was determined whether a certain characteristic had an effect on the dominant model used by an individual. For example, the dominant model used by each individual who had completed 12 or fewer years of education was compared to the dominant model used by each individual who had completed more than twelve years of education. Also, the dominant model used by each individual who had not taken any psychology courses was compared to the dominant model used by each individual who had taken one or more psychology courses.

Years Of Education Completed. Table IX shows the relationship of years of education to the dominant model an individual used for explaining human behavior.

TABLE IX
YEARS OF EDUCATION COMPLETED AND THE DOMINANT
MODEL AN INDIVIDUAL USED

Dominant model used	Individuals with 12 or fewer years of education		Individuals with more than 12 years of education	
	%	f	%	f
IP	22%	5	20%	10
PSY	26%	6	40%	20
PH	22%	5	10%	5
C	0	0	2%	1
SS	4%	1	0	0
PH/PSY	4%	1	6%	3
IP/PSY	13%	3	6%	3
C/IP	4%	1	0	0
IP/PH	0	0	4%	2
IP/PH/SS	0	0	2%	1
NONE	4%	1	10%	5
	---	---	---	---
	99%	N = 23	100%	N = 50

Twenty-six percent (6/23) of the individuals with 12 or fewer years of education used a psychological model as their dominant model. An interpersonal model, as well as a physiological model, were used as a dominant model by 22% (5/23) of the individuals. Additionally, an interpersonal/psychological model was used as a dominant model by 13% (3/23) of the individuals. The other dominant models used were each used by less than 4% (1/23) of the individuals.

Forty percent (20/50) of the individuals with more than twelve years of education used a psychological model as

their dominant model. An interpersonal model was used as a dominant model by 20% (10/50) of the individuals, while a physiological model was used as a dominant model by 10% (5/50) of the individuals. Additionally, 10% (5/50) of the individuals did not use a dominant model. Other dominant models used were each used by less than 5% (2/50) of the individuals.

The dominant model used by individuals with 12 or fewer years of education and the dominant model used by individuals with more than 12 years of education tended to be a psychological model. This gives support to hypothesis I. That is, in everyday life an individual uses a psychological model as a dominant model more often than he uses any other model as a dominant model.

Although an individual with 12 or fewer years of education and an individual with more than 12 years of education tended to use a psychological model as a dominant model, years of education had a moderate effect on a psychological model being used as a dominant model. For example, forty percent of the individuals with more than 12 years of education used a psychological model as a dominant model, but only 26% of the individuals with 12 or fewer years of education used a psychological model. Also the individuals with 12 or fewer years education used psychological, physiological, and interpersonal models as dominant models about equally. Additionally, 10% of the

individuals with more than twelve years education used a physiological model as a dominant model, while 22% of the individuals with 12 or fewer years of education used this model as a dominant model.

Psychology Courses Taken. Table X shows the relationship of having taken one or more psychology courses or having taken no psychology courses to the dominant model an individual used.

TABLE X
NUMBER OF PSYCHOLOGY COURSES TAKEN AND THE
DOMINANT MODEL AN INDIVIDUAL USED

Dominant model used	No psychology courses taken		One or more psychology courses taken	
	%	f	%	f
IP	19%	6	26%	10
PSY	41%	13	28%	11
PH	19%	6	10%	4
C	0	0	3%	1
SS	3%	1	0	0
IP/PSY	9%	3	8%	3
IP/PH	0	0	5%	2
PH/PS	3%	1	8%	3
IP/PH/SS	3%	1	0	0
C/IP	3%	1	0	0
NONE	0	0	13%	5
	---	---	---	---
	100%	N = 32	101%	N = 39

Forty-one percent (13/32) of the individuals who had taken no psychology courses used a psychological model as their dominant model. An interpersonal model and a physiological model were each used as a dominant model by 19% (6/32) of the individuals. Also, an interpersonal/

psychological model was used as a dominant model by 9% (3/32) of the respondents. Other dominant models were each used by less than 4% (1/32) of the individuals.

Twenty-eight percent (11/39) of the individuals who had taken one or more psychology courses used a psychological model as their dominant model. An interpersonal model was used as a dominant model by almost as many individuals, as shown by 26% (10/39) of the individuals using this as their dominant model. A physiological model was used as a dominant model by 10% (4/39) of the individuals, while the other dominant models were each used by less than 9% (3/39) of the individuals.

The dominant model used by individuals who had taken one or more psychology courses and the dominant model used by individuals who had taken no psychology courses tended to be a psychological model. This gives support to hypothesis I. That is, in everyday life an individual uses a psychological model as a dominant model more often than he uses any other model as a dominant model.

Although individuals who had taken one or more psychology courses and individuals who had taken no psychology courses tended to use a psychological model as their dominant model, having taken or not taken psychology courses did have an effect on the number of individuals who used a psychological model as their dominant model. For example, 41% of the individuals who had taken no psychology

courses used a psychological model as a dominant model, while 26% of the individuals who had taken one or more psychology courses used a psychological model as a dominant model. Also, individuals who had taken one or more psychology courses used a psychological model and an interpersonal model about equally (26%, 28%).

Age

Fifty-two percent (14/27) of the individuals under 25 used a psychological model as their dominant model. Twenty-six percent (7/27) of the individuals used an interpersonal model as their dominant model. Other dominant models were each used by less than 5% (1/27) of the individuals.

Twenty-one percent (6/29) of the individuals between the ages of 25 and 40 used an interpersonal model and a physiological model as their dominant model. A psychological model was used as a dominant model by 17% (5/29) of the respondents, while a physiological/psychological model was used by 10% (3/29) of the individuals. Fourteen percent (4/29) of the respondents did not show a dominant model. Other dominant models were each used by less than 8% (2/29) of the individuals.

Thirty-eight percent (6/16) of the individuals over forty used a psychological model as their dominant model. A physiological model and an interpersonal/psychological model were each used by 19% (3/16) of the individuals as a dominant model. An interpersonal model was used by 13%

(2/16) of the respondents, while each of the other dominant models were used by less than 7% (1/16) of the individuals.

The dominant model used by individuals under 25 and the dominant model used by individuals over 40 tended to be a psychological model. However, the dominant model used by individuals between 25 and 40 tended to be an interpersonal model or a physiological model, with a psychological model being used by almost the same number of individuals. This only gives moderate support to hypothesis I.

It is clear that age does have an effect on an individual using a psychological model as his dominant model. For example, individuals between 25 and 40 did not tend to use a psychological model as their dominant model, while individuals under 25 or over 40 tended to use a psychological model as their dominant model. Also, 52% of the individuals under 25 used a psychological model as a dominant model, 17% of the individuals 25 to 40 used a psychological model as a dominant model, while 38% of the individuals over 40 used a psychological model as a dominant model. These findings are shown in Table XI.

Sex

Table XII shows the relationship between sex and the dominant model used by an individual. This analysis shows that 37% (16/43) of the female individuals used a psychological model as their dominant model.

TABLE XI

AGE AND THE DOMINANT MODEL AN INDIVIDUAL USED

Dominant model	Individuals under 25		Individuals 25-40		Individuals over 40	
	%	f	%	f	%	f
IP	26%	7	21%	6	13%	2
PSY	52%	14	17%	5	38%	6
PH	4%	1	21%	6	19%	3
C	4%	1	0	0	0	0
SS	0	0	0	0	6%	1
PH/PSY	4%	1	10%	3	0	0
IP/PSY	4%	1	7%	2	19%	3
IP/PH	0	0	7%	2	0	0
C/IP	0	0	4%	1	0	0
IP/PH/SS	0	0	0	0	6%	1
NONE	7%	2	14%	4	0	0
	---	---	---	---	---	---
	101%	N = 27	101%	N = 29	101%	N = 16

An interpersonal model was used as a dominant model by 19% (8/43) of the females, while a physiological model was used as a dominant model by 16% (7/43) of the females. An interpersonal/ psychological model was used by 9% (4/43) of the females, while the other dominant models were each used by less than 6% of the individuals.

Thirty-six percent (10/28) of the males used a psychological model as their dominant model. An interpersonal model was used as a dominant model by 25% (7/28) of the individuals, while a physiological/ psychological model was used as a dominant model by 11% (3/28) of the respondents. The other dominant models were each used by less than 8% (2/28) of the individuals.

TABLE XII
SEX AND THE DOMINANT MODEL AN INDIVIDUAL USED

Dominant model used	female		male	
	%	f	%	f
IP	19%	8	25%	7
PSY	37%	16	36%	10
PH	16%	7	7%	2
C	2%	1	0	0
SS	2%	1	0	0
PH/PSY	5%	2	11%	3
IP/PSY	9%	4	7%	2
IP/PH/SS	0	0	4%	1
IP/PH	0	0	4%	1
C/IP	0	0	4%	1
NONE	9%	4	4%	1
	---	---	---	---
	99%	N = 43	102%	N = 28

Males and females both tended to use a psychological model as their dominant model. This supports hypothesis I; that is, an individual in everyday life uses a psychological model as a dominant model more often than other models for explaining human behavior. Additionally, an individual being male or female had little effect on an individual using a psychological model as his/her dominant model.

Table XIII presents a summary of the dominant model used by each individual in the sample, as well as the dominant model used by an individual when characteristics such as age, sex, and education are considered.

One can conclude from the above findings that hypothesis I is supported by the data. An individual does use a psychological model as his dominant model more often than any other kind of model for explaining human behaviors.

TABLE XIII
SUMMARY OF DOMINANT MODEL USED BY AN INDIVIDUAL

Characteristic	Dominant model	f	%
sample	PSY	26/73	36%
12 or fewer years education	PSY	6/23	26%
more than 12 years education	PSY	20/50	40%
under 25	PSY	14/27	52%
age 25-40	IP & PH	6/29	21%
over 40	PSY	6/16	38%
no psychology courses	PSY	13/32	41%
1 or more psy courses	PSY	11/39	28%
female	PSY	16/43	37%
male	PSY	10/28	36%

Additionally, only one characteristic, age, was shown to differentially affect the individual using a psychological model as his dominant model.

It should be pointed out that although an individual tended to use a psychological model as his dominant model, only 36% (26/73) of the individuals in the sample used a psychological model as a dominant model. This means that although a psychological model was the dominant kind of model used when compared to other models, 64% of the respondents used a dominant model that was not

psychological. However, a psychological model was still the dominant kind of model used when each individual was assigned a dominant model. Additionally, if the multi-causal dominant models which contain a psychological model as part of the dominant model that were used by each individual are also counted, then 49% of the individuals in the sample used a psychological model as their dominant model. Table XIV presents a summary of the data concerning the individual and his dominant model.

TABLE XIV

PERCENTAGES FOR THE DOMINANT MODEL USED
BY AN INDIVIDUAL IN SUMMARY

Dominant model	n	<12	>12	NPC	PC	<25	25-40	>40	F	M
PSY	36	26	40	41	28	52	17	38	37	36
IP	22	22	20	19	26	26	21	13	19	25
PH	10	22	10	19	10	4	21	19	16	7
CU	1	0	2	0	3	4	0	0	2	0
SS	3	4	0	3	0	0	0	6	2	0
PH/PSY	5	4	6	3	8	4	10	0	5	11
IP/PH	4	0	4	0	5	0	7	0	0	4
IP/PSY	8	13	6	9	8	4	7	19	9	7
CU/IP	1	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
IP/PH/SS	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	6	0	4
NONE	8	4	10	0	13	7	14	0	9	4

n = sample; <12 = twelve or fewer years of education;
>12 = more than 12 years of education; NPC = no psychology
courses taken; PC = one or more psychology courses taken;
<25 = under 25 years of age; 25-40 = 25 to 40 years of age;
>40 = over 40 years of age; F = female; M = male

ANALYSIS OF THE DOMINANT MODEL USED BY CATEGORIES

Hypothesis I was concerned with the dominant model of each individual. Dominant models can also be studied by analyzing categories based on age, sex, and education. The first part of this analysis examined the dominant model categories used for each question. For example, a category had a dominant model for each of the 13 questions. What kind of models were used as dominant models and their frequency of use was determined. If a category used a psychological model as a dominant model for 6 out of 13 questions, and a physiological model was used for 4 out of 13 questions, and an interpersonal model was used for 3 out of 13 questions, the dominant model used by this category would be a psychological model. The dominant model used by categories were compared to ascertain whether different categories used the same or different dominant models.

The second part of the analysis involved a detailed examination of the dominant model used by categories. The relationship between the dominant model of a category and the other models the category used was the focus. First, the dominant model a category used for a question and its relationship to the other models used for the question was examined. Second, the dominant model a category used for all 13 questions and the dominant model's relationship to the other models used was examined. This analysis shows in detail the models that were used by a category and how

they were used. Additionally, comparisons were made between categories to assess the similarity or dissimilarity between categories and their dominant model.

Dominant Model

Table XV shows the dominant model for each question for the sample. It was found that the sample used a psychological model as the dominant model for explaining human behavior. This is shown by a psychological model beings used the most frequently for 6 out of 13 questions (46%). A psychological model was used most frequently for explaining depression, alcoholism, anxiety, sociopath behavior, social laws, and explanations of human behavior.

Additionally, the sample used an interpersonal model as the dominant model for 3 out of 13 questions (23%). This model was used to explain the causes of joining a street gang, personality and imitating rock stars. Also, a physiological model was used as a dominant model for 2 out of 13 questions (15%) to causally explain heterosexuality and homosexuality. A social structural, and physiological/psychological model were each used as a dominant model for 1 out of 13 questions (8%) to explain increase in violence, and fat, respectively.

Table XVI shows the dominant model, for each question, used by the category whose membership is based on having taken no psychology courses. This table also shows the dominant model used, for each question, by the category

TABLE XV
PERCENTAGES AND FREQUENCIES FOR THE DOMINANT
MODEL USED BY THE SAMPLE FOR EACH QUESTION

Dominant model used for each question (n = 73)		f	%
<hr/>			
Q1	IP	26	35%
Q2	PSY	24	33%
Q3	PH	23	31%
Q4	PH	24	33%
Q5	IP	28	38%
Q6	PSY	18	25%
Q7	PSY	17	24%
Q8	PSY	30	41%
Q9	PSY	39	53%
Q10	PH/PSY	22	30%
Q11	IP	50	68%
Q12	SS	16	22%
Q13	PSY	23	31%

whose membership is based on having taken one or more psychology courses.

Individuals in the category whose membership is based on having taken no psychology courses (NPC) used a psychological model as their dominant model for explaining human behavior. This is shown by a psychological model being used as a dominant model for 7 out of 13 questions (54%). A psychological model was used as a dominant model for explaining depression, homosexuality, obeying social laws, alcoholism, anxiety, sociopathic behavior, and individual's source of causal explanations.

Additionally, the NPC category used an interpersonal model for 2 out of 13 questions (15%). This model was used as a dominant model to explain the causes of personality,

TABLE XVI

PERCENTAGES FOR THE DOMINANT MODEL USED BY THE NPC
CATEGORY AND THE PC CATEGORY FOR EACH QUESTION

No psychology courses category (NPC)			One or more psychology courses category (PC)		
Dominant model			Dominant model		
		%			%
Q1	IP/PSY	44%	IP		32%
Q2	PSY	34%	PSY		31%
Q3	PH	34%	PH		31%
Q4	PSY	25%	PH		41%
Q5	IP	41%	IP		36%
Q6	PSY	22%	PSY		31%
Q7	PSY	25%	PSY		21%
Q8	PSY	53%	PSY		26%
Q9	PSY	47%	PSY		56%
Q10	PH/PSY	41%	PH		28%
Q11	I	75%	IP		62%
Q12	SS	22%	SS		23%
Q13	PSY	41%	PSY		28%

and imitating rock stars. Also, a social structural, interpersonal/ physiological, physiological, and physiological/ psychological model were each used for 1 out of 13 questions (8%).

Individuals in the category whose membership was based on having taken psychology courses (PC) used a psychological model as their dominant model for explaining human behavior. This is shown by a psychological model being used the most frequently to answer 6 out of 13 questions (46%). Depression, obeying societal rules and laws, alcoholism, anxiety, sociopath behavior, and source of understanding of human behavior were explained by a psychological model.

Also, the PC category used a physiological model for 3 out of the 13 questions (23%) to causally explain heterosexuality, homosexuality, and fat. Additionally, the PC category used an interpersonal model for three out of the 13 questions (23%) to causally explain joining a street gang, personality, and imitating rock stars. Also, a social structural model was used for 1 out of 13 questions (8%) to causally explain increase in violence.

Both categories used a psychological model as their dominant model. The NPC category used a psychological model as a dominant model for explaining 7 out of 13 questions (54%), while the PC category used a psychological model as a dominant model for explaining 6 out of 13 questions (46%). This supports hypothesis III, that is, in everyday life categories use a psychological model as their dominant model for explaining human behavior.

However, although both categories used a psychological model as their dominant model, category membership had an effect on the use of psychological models as well as on other dominant models. The two categories both used a psychological model as the dominant model for explaining 6 questions, but for one question one category used a psychological model while the other category used a physiological model. Additionally, the percentage of individuals in the two categories who used a psychological model for the same question were quite different for 3 out of 6 questions.

This analysis also shows that the PC category and the NPC category used somewhat similar dominant models. The two categories used the same dominant model for ten (77%) of the questions. The same kind of dominant model was used by both categories for the questions asking for a causal attribution for depression, heterosexuality, personality, obeying social laws, alcoholism, anxiety, sociopath behavior, imitating rock stars, violence, and source of individuals understanding of human behaviors. However, the percentage of individuals in each category who gave these attributions varied. Additionally, the two categories used different dominant models for 3 out of 13 questions (23%), and the frequency of use for the same dominant model for the same question was different for 4 out of 13 questions (38%). The above findings suggest that although both categories used a psychological model as their dominant model they used dominant models differently. The dominant models used by each category as well as the other models used need to be analyzed in greater detail so as to ascertain the relationship between dominant models and other models, as well as to ascertain the similarities and differences between different categories.

In summary, one can conclude from the above findings that categories do use a psychological model as their dominant model. The overall sample (6/13), the category whose membership was based on having taken one or more

psychology courses (6/13) and the category whose membership was based on having taken no psychology courses (7/13), used a psychological model as their dominant model. However, the comparison of the dominant models used by the NPC and the PC categories show that these two categories used psychological models as well as other dominant models differently.

It should be made clear that although a psychological model was used as a dominant model more than any other dominant model, only the NPC category used a psychological model as a dominant model for the majority (54%) of their causal attributions. The sample and the PC category used a psychological model as a dominant model for 6 out of 13 questions (46%). For the sample and for the PC category the majority of the dominant models used were not psychological models. However, a psychological model was still the dominant model used by the above categories. Additionally, if the multi-causal dominant models which contain a psychological model as part of the dominant model that were used for each question are also counted, then the sample used a psychological model as a dominant model for 54% of the questions, while the NPC category used a psychological model as a dominant model for 69% of questions, and the PC category still used a psychological model as a dominant model for 46% of the questions. The findings concerning the dominant models used are summarized in Table XVII.

TABLE XVII

PERCENTAGES FOR THE DOMINANT MODEL USED BY
CATEGORIES FOR EACH QUESTION IN SUMMARY

Sample			NPC		PC		<12	
DM		%	DM	%	DM	%	DM	%
Q1	IP	35	I/PSY	44	IP	32	IP/PSY	48
Q2	PSY	33	PSY	34	PSY	31	PH	26
Q3	PH	31	PH	34	PH	31	PH	35
Q4	PH	33	PSY	25	PH	41	PH	30
Q5	IP	38	IP	41	IP	36	IP	52
Q6	PSY	25	PSY	22	PSY	31	PSY	30
Q7	PSY	24	PSY	25	PSY	21	PSY & PH	22
Q8	PSY	41	PSY	53	PSY	26	PSY	52
Q9	PSY	53	PSY	47	PSY	56	PSY	57
Q10	PH/PSY	30	PH/PSY	41	PH	28	PH/PSY	43
Q11	IP	68	IP	75	IP	62	IP	70
Q12	SS	22	SS	22	SS	23	SS	30
Q13	PSY	31	PSY	41	PSY	28	PSY	39
<hr/>								
DM	PSY	5/13	PSY	7/13	PSY	6/13	PSY	4/13
<hr/>								
> 12			< 25		25 - 40		> 40	
DM		%	DM	%	DM	%	DM	%
Q1	IP	40	IP	48	IP	28	IP	50
Q2	PS	38	PS	44	PH/PSY	28	PH & PSY	31
Q3	PH	29	PH	30	PH	34	PH	31
Q4	PH	33	PH	33	PH	34	I/PH	31
Q5	IP	31	IP	44	IP/PH	38	I/PH	38
Q6	C & PSY	27	C	30	C	28	PSY	31
Q7	PSY	23	PSY	22	PH	21	PSY	31
Q8	PSY	33	PSY	52	PSY	28	PSY	38
Q9	PSY	50	PSY	63	PSY	52	PSY	38
Q10	PS & PH/PSY	25	PH/PSY	33	PH	28	PH/PSY	38
Q11	IP	67	IP	78	IP	66	IP	50
Q12	SS	19	SS	22	SS	21	SS	25
Q13	PSY	31	IP/PSY	22	PSY	28	PSY	69
<hr/>								
DM	PSY	5/13	PSY	4/13	PH	4/13	PSY	5/13
<hr/>								

DM = dominant model; n = sample; <12 = twelve or fewer years of education; >12 = more than 12 years of education; NPC = no psychology courses taken; PC = one or more psychology courses taken; <25 = under 25 years of age; 25-40 = 25 to 40 years of age; >40 = over 40; F = female; M = male.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN A CATEGORIES DOMINANT MODEL AND OTHER MODELS

Although any of the categories examined up to this point could be examined in detail, only the sample, the category whose membership is based on having taken no psychology courses, and the category whose membership is based on having taken one or more psychology courses will be examined in detail. It is the relationship between a categories' dominant model and the other models used that is the focus. Also, the differences and similarities between different categories in their use of a dominant model and its relationship to other models is of interest.

The Sample

The total sample will be analyzed in detail first. This analysis shows the relationship between the dominant model for each question and the other models. This analysis also shows the relationship between the sample's dominant model and other models. The data can be seen in Table XVIII.

Question 1 asks for a causal attribution for "juveniles joining a street gang." Thirty-five percent of the sample used an interpersonal model as their dominant model. Also, 27% of the sample used an interpersonal/ psychological model, while a psychological model was used by 11% of the individuals. Other models were each used by less than 10% of the sample.

Question 2 asks for a causal attribution for "depression." For this question 33% of the sample used a psychological model as their dominant model. Also, 19% of the sample used a physiological model, while 15% of the sample used a physiological/psychological model. The other models were each used by less than 7% of the sample.

Question three asks for a causal explanation for "heterosexuality." Thirty-one percent of the sample used a physiological model as their dominant model. Also, 11% of the sample used a psychological model, while another 11% of the sample used an interpersonal/physiological model. The other models were each used by less than 8% of the sample.

For question 4, which asks for a causal attribution for homosexuality, 33% of the sample used a physiological model as their dominant model. Also, the sample used a psychological model 17% of the time, an interpersonal/physiological model 13% of the time, an interpersonal model 10% of the time, and a physiological/psychological model 10% of the time. The other models were each used by less than 8% of the sample.

Question 5 asks for a causal explanation of "personality." For this question 38% of the sample used an interpersonal model as their dominant model. Also, an interpersonal/physiological model was used by 33% of the sample, while an interpersonal/psychological model was used

TABLE XVIII

THE MODELS USED FOR EACH QUESTION
BY THE SAMPLE

Q1 GANGS		Q2 DEPRESSION		Q3 HETEROSEXUAL	
IP	.35	PSY	.33	PHY	.31
PSY	.11	PH	.19	PSY	.11
IP/PSY	.27	PH/PSY	.15	IP	.06
PSY/SS	.05	IP	.03	C	.06
IP/PSY/SS	.03	C/PSY	.03	IP/PH	.11
C/SS	.03	IP/PSY	.02	C/IP	.03
IP/SS	.09	C/PH	.03	C/PH	.07
C/IP	.04	IP/PH	.04	IP/PSY	.06
SS	.03	IP/PH/PSY	.03	C/PSY	.03
DK		IP	.06	PHY/PSY	.05
NR	.02	IP/PSY	.03	C/PSY	.02
NC		DK	.04	IP/PH/SS	.02
		NR	.02	IP/PH/PSY	.02
		NC	.02	IP/SS	.01
				C/IP/PSY	.01
				DK	.03
				NR	.01
				NC	.01
Q4 HOMOSEXUAL		Q5 PERSONALITY		Q6 SOCIAL LAWS	
PHY	.33	IP	.38	PSY	.27
PSY	.17	IP/PHY	.33	C	.25
IP	.10	IP/PSY	.10	IP	.16
PH/PSY	.10	C/IP	.02	IP/PSY	.10
IP/PSY	.07	PH	.03	C/PSY	.04
IP/PH	.13	PSY	.02	SS	.05
IP/PH/PSY	.02	C/PH/PSY	.02	PSY/SS	.02
C/PH	.01	C/IP/PH	.02	C/IP	.04
DK	.06	PH/PSY	.03	IP/SS	.03
NC	.03	IP/PH/PSY	.03	C/PH	.01
		IP/SS	.01	NR	.02
		IP/PH/PSY/SS	.01	NC	.02
		NR	.03		

PSY = psychological, IP = interpersonal, PH = physiological,
SS = social structural, C = cultural, DK = don't know,
NR = no response, NC = not codable.

TABLE XVIII
THE MODELS USED FOR EACH QUESTION
BY THE SAMPLE
(continued)

Q7 ALCOHOLISM		Q8 ANXIETY		Q9 SOCIOPATH	
PSY	.24	PSY	.41	PSY	.54
PH	.17	PH	.11	IP	.06
PH/PSY	.18	PH/PSY	.14	IP/PSY	.07
IP	.08	C/IP	.02	IP/PH/PSY	.03
IP/PH	.09	IP/PSY	.05	PH	.06
IP/PSY	.07	C/PH	.02	IP/PH	.04
IP/PH/PSY	.07	SS	.03	C/PSY	.04
IP/SS	.03	IP	.05	PH/PSY	.01
PH/SS	.02	IP/PH	.03	IP/PH/SS	.01
C	.01	SS	.01	DK	.03
SS	.01	PH/SS	.01	NR	.05
DK	.01	DK	.03	NC	.03
NR	.02	NR	.07		
		NC	.04		
Q10 FAT		Q11 ROCK STAR		Q12	
PH/PSY	.30	IP	.68	SS	.22
PH	.23	PSY	.11	IP	.14
PSY	.20	IP/PSY	.07	C	.10
IP/PH/PSY	.03	SS	.03	PSY	.09
C/PSY	.02	C	.03	C/SS	.07
IP/PSY	.05	PSY/SS	.01	PSY/SS	.07
C	.02	IP/PSY/SS	.01	C/PSY	.02
IP/PH	.04	NR	.06	IP/PSY	.02
IP/PSY	.04			IP/SS	.07
C/PH/PSY	.02	NC	.01	C/IP	.04
IP	.01			IP/PH	.03
SS	.04			PH	.01
C/PH	.01			IP/PH/SS	.01
NR	.02			NR	.10
				NC	.01

PSY = psychological, IP = interpersonal, PH = physiological,
SS = social structural, C = cultural, DK = don't know,
NR = no response, NC = not codable.

TABLE XVIII
THE MODELS USED FOR EACH QUESTION
BY THE SAMPLE
(continued)

Q13 SOURCE

PSY	.32
IP/PSY	.10
PSY/SS	.16
IP	.08
SS	.07
PSY/SS	.02
C/PSY	.02
PH/PSY	.02
IP/SS	.05
IP/PH/SS	.03
IP/PSY/SS	.01
DK	.01
NR	.09
NC	.01

PSY = psychological, IP = interpersonal, PH = physiological,
SS = social structural, C = cultural, DK = don't know,
NR = no response, NC = not codable.

by 10% of the sample. The other models were each used by less than 4% of the sample.

For question 6, which asks for a causal explanation of "obeying social laws and rules," 27% of the sample used a psychological as their dominant model. Also, 25% of the sample used a cultural model, while 16% of the sample used an interpersonal model. Additionally, 10% of the sample used an interpersonal/psychological model, while the other models were each used by less than 6% of the sample.

Question 7 asks for a causal explanation of alcoholism. For this question 24% of the sample used a

psychological model as their dominant model. Also, a physiological/psychological model was used by 18% of the sample, while a physiological model was used by 17% of the sample. The other models were each used by less than 10% of the sample.

For question 8, which asks for a causal explanation of "anxiety," 41% of the sample used a psychological model as their dominant model. Also, 14% of the sample used a physiological/psychological model, while 11% of the sample used a physiological model. The other models were each used by less than 6% of the sample.

For question 9, which asks for a causal explanation of "sociopath behavior," 54% of the sample used a psychological model as their dominant model. The other models were each used by less than 8% of the sample.

Question 10 asks for a causal explanation of "fat." For this question 30% of the sample used a physiological/psychological model most frequently. Also, 23% of the sample used a physiological model, while a psychological model was used by 20% of the sample. Each of the other models were used by less than 6% of the sample.

For question 11 which asks for a causal explanation of "imitation of rock stars," 68% of the sample used an interpersonal model as their dominant model. Also, a psychological model was used by 11% of the sample. The other models were each used by less than 8% of the sample.

When the data for the sample is analyzed for each question, a psychological model is used as a dominant model more often than any other dominant model. A psychological model was used for 6 out of 13 questions (46%). Also, an interpersonal model was used as a dominant model for 3 out of 13 questions (23%), while a physiological model was used as a dominant model for 2 out of 13 questions (15%). Additionally, a physiological/ psychological model, as well as a social structural model, were each used as a dominant model for 1 out of 13 questions (8%).

The above analysis makes it possible to see not only what the dominant models used for each question were, but also the dominant model's relationship to the other models used in each question. The analysis also makes it possible to see how it came about that the dominant model used by the sample was a psychological model.

Other Categories

The category whose membership is based on having taken no psychology courses, and the category whose membership is based on having taken one or more psychology courses was also examined in detail. The dominant model of a category and its relationship to other models used can be clarified by a fuller examination. Different categories were also compared to see if their dominant model and its relationship to other models used was similar or dissimilar. The data for this analysis can be seen in Table XIX.

TABLE XIX

THE MODELS USED BY THE NPC CATEGORY (n = 32)
AND THE PC CATEGORY (n = 39)

Q1 GANGS			Q2 DEPRESSION			Q3 HETEROSEXUAL		
	NPC	PC		NPC	PC		NPC	PC
IP/PSY	.44	.15	PSY	.34	.31	PH	.34	.31
IP	.28	.38	PH/PSY	.06	.23	PSY	.22	.03
IP/SS	.09	.10	PH	.22	.15	IP/PH	.13	.13
PSY	.06	.13	IP	.16	.05	IP	.09	.05
C/SS	.00	.05	IP/PSY	.06	.03	C/PH	.03	.13
PSY/SS	.00	.08	IP/PH	---	.08	C	.03	.08
C/IP	.06	.03	IP/PH/PSY	---	.05	PH/PSY	.03	.08
SS	.00	.05	IP/SS	.03	---	C/IP	---	.05
IP/PSY/SS	.03	.03	C/PSY	.03	.03	C/PSY	.03	.03
NR	.03	---	C/PH	---	.03	IP/PSY	.06	.05
			DK	.06	---	IP/SS	---	.03
			NR	.03	---	C/IP/PSY	.03	---
			NC	---	.03	IP/PSY/SS	---	.03
Q4 HOMOSEXUAL			Q5 PERSONALITY			Q6 SOCIAL LAWS		
	NPC	PC		NPC	PC		NPC	PC
PH	.22	.41	IP	.41	.36	PSY	.22	.31
PSY	.25	.10	IP/PH	.28	.36	IP	.16	.18
IP/PH	.13	.15	IP/PSY	.06	.13	C	.19	.31
IP	.13	.08	PH/PSY	.06	---	IP/PSY	.06	.10
PH/PSY	.13	.05	PSY	.03	---	IP/C	.09	---
IP/PSY	.06	.08	PH	.03	.03	SS	.06	.05
C/PH	---	.03	IP/SS	.03	---	PSY/SS	.03	---
IP/PH/PSY	---	.03	C/IP	.03		C/PSY	.06	.03
DK	.06	.05	IP/PH/SS	.03	---	IP/SS	.06	---
NC	.03	.03	C/PH/PSY	---	.03	C/PH	---	.03
			C/IP/PSY	---	.03	NR	.03	---
			IP/PH/PSY	---	.03	NC	.03	NR
			.06	---				

NPC = No psychology courses; PC = psychology courses taken.
PSY = psychological, IP = interpersonal, PH = physiological,
SS = social structural, C = cultural, DK = don't know, NR =
no response, NC = not codable.

TABLE XIX

THE MODELS USED BY THE NPC AND PC CATEGORIES
(continued)

Q7 ALCOHOLISM			Q8 ANXIETY			Q9 SOCIOPATH		
	NPC	PC		NPC	PC		NPC	PC
PSY	.25	.21	PSY	.53	.26	PSY	.47	.56
PH	.22	.13	PH/PSY	.13	.15	I	.09	.15
PH/PSY	.16	.18	PH	.13	.10	PH	.09	.05
I/PH	.06	.13	I/PSY	.03	.05	I/PSY	.09	.05
I/PH/PSY	.06	.10	I/PH	---	.05	I/PH	.03	.05
I/PSY	.09	.05	I	.03	.08	I/PH/PSY	---	.05
I	.09	.08	SS	.03	.03	PH/PSY	.03	---
SS	---	.03	C/I	---	.03	C/PSY	.03	.03
C	.03	---	C/PH	---	.03	I/PH/SS	.03	---
I/SS	---	.05	PH/SS	---	.03	DK	.03	---
PH/SS	---	.03	DK	---	.05	NR	.06	.05
DK	---	.03	NR	.09	.05	NC	.03	.03
NR	.03	---	NC	.03	.08			
Q10 FAT			Q11 ROCK STAR			Q12		
	NPC	PC		NPC	PC		NPC	PC
PH/PSY	.41	.23	IP	.75	.62	SS	.22	.23
PH	.16	.28	PSY	.09	.13	I	.09	.15
PSY	.19	.21	I/PSY	.03	.10	C	.03	.15
SS	.06	.03	SS	---	.05	PSY	.13	.08
I/PSY	.06	.05	C	.03	.03	C/SS	.13	.03
I/PH	.03	.05	PSY/SS	.03	---	I/SS	.06	.10
C	.03	---	I/PSY/SS	.03	---	PSY/SS	.09	.05
C/PSY	.03	---	NR	---	.08	C/I	.06	.03
I/PH/PSY	---	.05	NC	.03	---	I/PH	.03	.03
C/PH/PSY	---	.03				PH	---	.03
C/PH	---	.03				I/PH/SS	.03	---
IP	.03	.03				C/PSY	---	.03
NR	---	.03				I/PSY	---	.03
						NR	.13	.05
						NC		.03

NPC = no psychology courses; PC = psychology courses taken.
PSY = psychological, IP = interpersonal, PH = physiological,
SS = social structural, C = cultural, DK = don't know,
NR = no response, NC = not codable.

TABLE XIX
THE MODELS USED BY THE NPC AND PC CATEGORIES
(continued)

Q13	SOURCE	NPC	PC
	PSY	.41	.28
	PSY/SS	.16	.21
	I/PSY	.16	.13
	I	.09	.05
	SS	.03	.08
	I/SS	.03	.08
	I/PSY/SS	.03	.05
	C/PSY	.03	---
	PH/PSY	---	.03
	NR	.06	.08
	NC	---	.03

NPC = no psychology courses; PC = psychology courses taken.
 PSY = psychological, IP = interpersonal, PH = physiological,
 SS = social structural, C = cultural, DK = don't know,
 NR = no response, NC = not codable.

First, the NPC (no psychology courses) and PC (psychology courses) categories were examined separately. This was followed by a comparison between the two categories. Only the models that were used by at least 10% of the categories were considered in the first part of the analysis.

Question 1 asks for a causal attribution for "juveniles joining a street gang." Forty-four percent of the NPC category used an interpersonal/psychological model as the dominant model for explaining this question. Additionally, 28% of the NPC category used an interpersonal model, while 9% used an interpersonal/social structural model. Also, 15%

of the category used three other models which were each used by less than 7% of the category.

Question 2 asks for a causal attribution for "depression." For this question 34% of the NPC category used a psychological model as the dominant model. Also, 22% of the NPC category used a physiological model, while 16% used an interpersonal model. Additionally, 18% of the category used four other models which were each used by less than 7% of the category.

Question three asks for a causal explanation for heterosexuality. Thirty-four percent of the NPC category used a physiological model as the dominant model. Additionally, 22% of the NPC category used a psychological model, while 13% used an interpersonal/physiological model, and 9% used an interpersonal model. Also, 21% of the category used 7 other models which were each used by less than 7% of the category.

Question 4 asks for a causal explanation of homosexuality. Twenty-five percent of the NPC category used a psychological model as the dominant model. Also, 22% of the NPC category used a physiological model. Additionally an interpersonal model, interpersonal/physiological model, and a physiological/psychological model, were each used by 13% of the category. Also, 6% of the category used one other model.

Question 5 asks for a causal explanation of "personality." For this question 41% of the NPC category used an interpersonal model as the dominant model. Also, 28% of the NPC category used an interpersonal model. Additionally, 21% of the category used 7 other models which were each used by less than 7% of the category.

For question 6, which asks for a causal explanation of "obeying social laws and rules," 22% of the NPC category used a psychological model as the dominant model. Also, 19% of the NPC category used a cultural model, while 16% used an interpersonal model, and 9% used an interpersonal/ cultural model. Additionally, 27% of the category used 5 other models which were each used by less than 7% of the category.

Question 7 asks for a causal explanation of "alcoholism." For this question 25% of the NPC category used a psychological model as the dominant model. Also, 22% of the NPC category used a physiological model, while 16% used a physiological/psychological model. An interpersonal model, and a social structural model were each used by 9% of the category. Additionally, 15% of the category used 3 other models which were each used by less than 7% of the category.

Question 8 asks for a causal explanation of anxiety. Fifty-three percent of the NPC category used a psychological model as the dominant model. A physiological/psychological model, and a physiological model were each used by 13% of

the category. Also, 9% of the category used 3 other models which were each used by 3% of the category.

For question 9, which asks for a causal explanation of "sociopath behavior," 47% of the NPC category used a psychological model as the dominant model. Also, an interpersonal model, a physiological model, and an interpersonal/psychological model were each used by 9% of the category. Additionally, 12% of the category used 4 other models which were each used by 3% of the category.

Question 10 asks for a causal explanation of "fat." For this question 41% of the NPC category used a physiological/ psychological model as the dominant model. Also, 19% of the NPC category used a social structural model, while 16% used a physiological model. Additionally, 24% of the category used 6 other models which were each used by less than 7% of the category.

Question 11 asks for a causal explanation of "imitation of rock stars." Seventy-five percent of the NPC category used an interpersonal model as the dominant model. Also, 9% of the NPC category used a psychological model. Additionally, 12% of the category used 4 other models which were each used by 3% of the category.

Question 12 asks for a causal explanation of "increase in violence in American society." Twenty-two percent of the NPC category used a social structural model as the dominant model. Also, a psychological model, and a cultural/social

structural model were each used by 13% of the category. An interpersonal model, and a psychological/social structural model were each used by 9% of the category. Additionally, 21% of the category used 5 other models which were each used by less than 7% of the category.

For question 13, which asks for a causal explanation of "the respondents causal explanations," 41% of the NPC category used a psychological model as the dominant model. Also, a psychological/social structural, and an interpersonal/psychological model were each used by 16% of the category, while 9% of the category used an interpersonal model. Additionally, 12% of the category used 4 other models which were each used by 3% of the category.

The PC category can also be examined in detail. For question 1 which asks for a causal attribution for "juveniles joining a street gang," 38% of the PC category used an interpersonal model as the dominant model. An interpersonal/psychological model, and a psychological model were each used by 15% of the category. Also, 10% of the PC category used an interpersonal/social structural model. Additionally, 24% of the category used 5 other models which were each used by less than 9% of the category.

Question 2 asks for a causal attribution for "depression." For this question 31% of the PC category used a psychological model as the dominant model. Also, 23% of the PC category used a physiological/psychological model,

while 15% of the category used a physiological model. Additionally, 23% of the category used 6 other models which were each used by less than 9% of the category.

Question three asks for a causal explanation for "heterosexuality." Thirty-one percent of the PC category used a physiological model as the dominant model. Also, an interpersonal/physiological, and a cultural/physiological model were each used by 13% of the category. Additionally, 43% of the category used 9 other models which were each used by less than 9% of the category.

Question 4 asks for a causal explanation of "homosexuality." Forty-one percent of the PC category used a physiological model as the dominant model. Also, 15% of the category used an interpersonal/physiological model, while 10% of the category used a psychological model. Additionally, 27% of the category used 5 other models which were each used by less than 9% of the category.

Question 5 asks for a causal explanation of "personality." For this question an interpersonal model and an interpersonal/physiological model were each used as a dominant model by 36% of the PC category. Additionally, 13% of the category used an interpersonal/psychological model. Also, 12% of the category used 4 other models which were each used by 3% of the category.

For question 6, which asks for a causal explanation of "obeying social laws and rules," a psychological model and a

cultural model were each used by 31% of the PC category as a dominant model. Additionally, 18% of the PC category used an interpersonal model, while 10% used an interpersonal/psychological model. Also, 11% of the category used 3 other models which were each used by less than 6% of the category.

Question 7 asks for a causal explanation of "alcoholism." For this question 21% of the PC category used a psychological model as the dominant model. Additionally, 18% of the category used a physiological/psychological model, while a physiological model, and an interpersonal/physiological model were each used by 13% of the category. An interpersonal/physiological/psychological model was used by 10% of the PC category. Also, 27% of the category used 5 other models which were each used by less than 9% of the category.

Question 8 asks for a causal explanation of "anxiety." Twenty-six percent of the PC category used a psychological model as the dominant model. Also, 15% of the PC category used a physiological/psychological model, while 10% of the category used a physiological model. Additionally, 30% of the category used 7 other models which were each used by less than 9% of the category.

For question 9, which asks for a causal explanation of "sociopath behavior," 56% of the PC category used a psychological model as the dominant model. Additionally, 15% of the category used an interpersonal model. Twenty-

three percent of the category used 5 other models which were each used by less than 6% of the category.

Question 10 asks for a causal explanation of "fat." For this question 28% of the PC category used a physiological model as the dominant model. Also, 23% of the PC category used a physiological/psychological model, while 21% of the category used a psychological model. Twenty-seven percent of the category used 7 other models which were each used by less than 6% of the category.

Question 11 asks for a causal explanation of "imitation of rock stars." Sixty-two percent of the PC category used an interpersonal model as the dominant model. Also, 13% of the PC category used a psychological model, while 10% used an interpersonal/psychological model. Additionally, 8% of the category used 2 other models which were each used by less than 6% of the category.

Question 12 asks for a causal explanation of "increase in violence in American society." Twenty-three percent of the PC category used a social structural model as the dominant model. An interpersonal model and a cultural model were each used by 15% of the PC category. Also, 10% of the PC category used an interpersonal/social structural model. Thirty-one percent of the PC category used 8 other models which were each used by less than 9% of the category.

For question 13, which asks for a causal explanation of "the respondent's causal explanations," 28% of the PC

category used a psychological model as the dominant model. Also, 21% of the PC category used a psychological/social structural model, while 13% of the category used an interpersonal/psychological model. Additionally, 29% of the category used 5 other models which were each used by less than 9% of the category.

The preceding examination shows the relationship between the dominant model and the other models used for each question. Both the category whose membership was based on having taken no psychology courses (NPC), and the category whose membership was based on having taken one or more psychology courses (PC) were examined. This examination shows how dominant models and other models were used by each category. As discussed earlier both categories have a psychological model for their dominant model.

The NPC category and the PC category were compared to see what the differences and similarities were between the two categories in their usage of dominant and other models, and their overall dominant model. The relationship between the dominant model and other models used for each question, by each category, were compared. This comparison can be seen in Table XIX.

As shown in Table XIX there are similarities and differences in both the kind of models used and in the frequency of use. In this examination only the major differences or similarities will be pointed out; that is,

only the models used by more than 10% of the respondents will be considered. The two categories will be considered dissimilar when: 1) there is a difference of about 10% or more between the percentages given for the same kind of model; 2) when different models are used for the same question; and 3) when different dominant models are used for the same question.

Question 1 asks for a causal attribution for "juveniles joining a street gang." For this question the NPC category used an interpersonal/psychological model as the dominant model (44%), while the PC category used an interpersonal model as the dominant model (38%). This is a clear difference between the two categories. Another difference is that 44% of the NPC category used an interpersonal/psychological model, while 15% of the PC category used this model. Also, 28% of the NPC category used an interpersonal model, while 39% of the PC category used this model. Additionally, there were two similarities between the two categories. First, 9% of the NPC category used an interpersonal/social structural model, while 10% of the PC category used this model. And, second, 6% of the NPC category used a psychological model, while 15% of the PC category used this model.

Question 2 asks for a causal attribution for "depression." For this question both categories used a psychological model as the dominant model. Thirty-four

percent of the NPC category used this model while 31% of the PC category used this model. Another similarity is that 22% of the NPC category used a physiological model, while 15% of the PC category used this model. Also, there were two differences. First, 6% of the NPC category used a physiological/ psychological model, while 23% of the PC category used this model. Second, 16% of the NPC category used an interpersonal model, while 5% of the PC category used this model.

Question three asks for a causal explanation for "heterosexuality." Both categories used a physiological model as the dominant model. Thirty-four percent of the NPC category use this model, while 31% of the PC category used this model. Another similarity is that 13% of both categories used an interpersonal/ physiological model. Additionally, there were two differences. First, 22% of the NPC category used a psychological model, while 3% of the PC category used this model. Second, 3% of the NPC category used a cultural/ physiological model, while 13% of the PC category used this model.

Question 4 asks for a causal explanation of "homosexuality." The NPC category used a psychological model as the dominant model (25%), while the PC category used a physiological model as the dominant model (41%). There were two additional differences. First, 22% of the NPC category used a physiological model, while 41% of the PC

category used this model. Second, 25% of the NPC category used a psychological model, while 10% of the PC category used this model. Also, there were three similarities. First, 13% of the NPC category used an interpersonal/physiological model, while 15% of the PC category used this model. Second, 13% of the NPC category used an interpersonal model, while 8% of the PC category used this model. Third, 13% of the NPC category used a physiological/psychological model, while 5% of the PC category used this model.

Question 5 asks for a causal explanation of "personality." For this question 41% of the NPC category used an interpersonal model as the dominant model, while 36% of the PC category used this model as the dominant model. Another similarity is that 28% of the NPC category used an interpersonal/physiological model, while 36% of the PC category used this model. An additional similarity is that 6% of the NPC category used an interpersonal/ psychological model, while 13% of the PC category used this model.

For question 6, which asks for a causal explanation of "obeying social laws and rules," the NPC category used a psychological model as the dominant model (22%), as did the PC category (31%). Another similarity was that 16% of the NPC category used an interpersonal model, while 18% of the PC category used this model. An additional similarity was that 6% of the NPC category used an interpersonal/

psychological model, while 10% of the PC category used this model. One of the differences found was that 19% of the NPC category used a cultural model, while 31% of the PC category used this model.

Question 7 asks for a causal explanation of "alcoholism." For this question the NPC category used a psychological model as the dominant model (25%), as did the PC category (21%). There were four other similarities. First, 22% of the NPC category used a physiological model, while 13% of the PC category used this model. Second, 16% of the NPC category used a physiological/psychological model, while 18% of the PC category used this model. Third, 6% of the NPC category used an interpersonal/physiological model, while 13% of the PC category used this model. Fourth, 6% of the NPC category used an interpersonal/physiological/psychological model, while 10% of the PC category used this model.

Question 8 asks for a causal explanation of "anxiety." Both categories used a psychological model as the dominant model. Fifty-three percent of the NPC category used this model as a dominant model, while 26% of the PC category used this model. An additional similarity is that 13% of the NPC category used a physiological/psychological model, while 15% of the PC category used this model. Another similarity was that 13% of the NPC category used a physiological model, while 10% of the PC category used this model. Additionally,

although both categories used a psychological model as the dominant model, there still was a difference between the two categories in that the frequency of use of the dominant model for the two categories was quite different (53%, 26%).

For question 9, which asks for a causal explanation of "sociopath behavior," 47% of the NPC category used a psychological model as the dominant model, while 56% of the PC category used this model. Another similarity is that 9% of the NPC category used an interpersonal model, while 15% of the PC category used this model.

Question 10 asks for a causal explanation of "fat." For this question 41% of the NPC category used a physiological/ psychological model as the dominant model (41%), while 28% of the PC category used a physiological model as the dominant model. There were two other differences. First, 41% of the NPC category used a physiological/psychological model, while 23% of the PC category used this model. Second, 16% of the NPC category used a physiological model, while 28% of the PC category used this model. A similarity was that 19% of the NPC category used a psychological model, while 21% of the PC category used this model.

Question 11 asks for a causal explanation of "imitation of rock stars." Both categories used an interpersonal model as the dominant model. Seventy-five percent of the NPC category used this model as the dominant model, while 62% of

the PC category used this model as the dominant model. Another similarity was that 9% of the NPC category used a psychological model, while 13% of the PC category used this model. Also, 3% of the NPC category used an interpersonal/psychological model, while 10% of the PC category used this model. One of the differences found was the difference in the frequency of use for the dominant model (75%, 62%).

Question 12 asks for a causal explanation of "increase in violence in American society." Both categories used a social structural model as the dominant model. Twenty-two percent of the NPC category used this dominant model, while 23% of the PC category used this dominant model. Three additional similarities were found. First, 9% of the NPC category used an interpersonal model, while 15% of the PC category used this model. Second, 13% of the NPC category used a psychological model, while 8% of the PC category used this model. Third, 6% of the NPC category used an interpersonal/social structural model, while 10% of the PC category used this model. One of the differences found was that 13% of the NPC category used a cultural/social structural model, while 3% of the PC category used this model.

For question 13, which asks for a causal explanation of "the respondents causal explanations," both categories used a psychological model as the dominant model. Forty-one percent of the NPC category used this dominant model, while

28% of the PC category used this dominant model. There were two additional similarities. First, 16% of the NPC category used a psychological/social structural model, while 21% of the PC category used this model. Second, 16% of the NPC category used an interpersonal/psychological model, while 13% of the PC category used this model. One of the differences found was the difference between the frequency of use of the dominant model (41%, 28%).

The similarities and differences between the NPC category and the PC category and their use of models is summarized in Table XX. The findings, as shown in Table XIX, and summarized in Table XX, show that there are both similarities and differences between the two categories. As previously shown, the NPC and the PC categories were similar in the dominant models used. Individuals in both categories

TABLE XX

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NPC AND
THE PC CATEGORIES IN THEIR USE OF MODELS

aspect of model compared for each question	frequency of similarities between the two categories	frequency of differences between the two categories
The dominant model.	10/13 (77%)	3/13 (23%)
Frequency of use for a model	32/48 (67%)	16/48 (33%)
Models used.	48/48 (100%)	0/0

used the same dominant models 77% of the time, while they used different dominant models 23% of the time. In the comparison of the frequency of use for a model in a question both categories used the model with about the same frequency (within 10%) 67% of the time, while the frequency of use for a model in a question was different 33% of the time. In the comparison of the models used by the two categories they used the same models 100% of the time.

These results show the NPC category and the PC category are more similar than different. Both categories had a psychological model as their dominant model. Also, both categories were more similar than dissimilar in the models they used and the frequency of use of models. The NPC category and the PC category used models similarly.

The findings, as shown in Table XIX, were also analyzed using all the data, not just the data in which models were used at least 10% of the time. The results of this alternative analysis can be seen in Table XXI.

Both categories were similar in the frequency of use for a model in a question. They were similar 89% of the time, while they were different 11% of the time. Also, both categories were more similar in the models used. They were similar 65% of the time, while they were different 35% of the time.

TABLE XXI

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NPC CATEGORY
AND THE PC CATEGORY IN THEIR USE OF MODELS
WHEN ALL THE DATA IS CONSIDERED

aspect of model compared for each question	frequency of similarities between the two categories	frequency of differences between the two categories
The dominant model used.	9/13 (69%)	4/13 (31%)
Frequency of use for a model.	115/129 (89%)	14/129 (11%)
Models used.	86/133 (65%)	47/133 (35%)

Although the perecentages for similarities and differences were different than when analyzing just the models that were used at least 10% of the time, the results were the same. There were more similarities between individuals in the two categories than differences.

HYPOTHESIS II

Hypothesis II states that there will be more than one kind of psychological model, or a mixture of psychological models used in everyday life to explain human behavior. However, it was not possible to separate causal attributions into distinct kinds of psychological models, such as cognitive, behavioral, psychoanalytic, etc.. I was unable to separate causal attributions into different kinds of psychological models for two main reasons. First, many of the psychological causal attributions given were brief.

They didn't contain enough information to allow a kind of psychological model to be distinguished. For example, some of the mono-causal attributions given for depression were "low self-esteem," "stress," "psychological problems," "anger and frustration haven't been vented," "loneliness and too much self interest," "build up of emotional problems that haven't been grieved for," "the way one thinks about life," etc.. These are clearly psychological attributions for depression, but if one were to try and distinguish the kinds of psychological models based on this little information one would only be guessing. Even in the psychological attributions that were somewhat detailed it was not possible to ascertain specifically what kind of psychological model was being used. There still was not enough information to do so.

Secondly, individuals, at the everyday level of understanding, may not use a specific kind of psychological model for causal attributions but use psychological ideas and notions eclectically. For example, some of the psychological attributions for anxiety were "feelings of insecurity beginning during childhood, and feeling that no one cares," "fear of rejection, low self-esteem, and repressive past experiences," "thinking of failure and something that happened when you were young," "worrying how others see you and lack of self-confidence," etc.. In these attributions one could possibly see a

primitive "psychoanalytic psychology" combined with a "cognitive psychology." However, I do not believe there is enough information in these causal attributions to make these kinds of judgments. However, one can see that individuals use psychological ideas and notions in a variety of combinations to explain human behaviors. The causal attributions that respondents used can be seen in Table VII under the category "psychological model." These causal attributions were used in many different ways to explain the human behaviors in question.

Since psychological models could not be distinguished in the data, hypothesis two is not supported.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Individual And His Dominant Model

When the kinds of models each individual used was analyzed to find out what kind of dominant model an individual used for explaining human behavior it was found that individuals tend to use a psychological model as their dominant model. This supports hypothesis I, that is, in everyday life an individual uses a psychological model as his dominant model for explaining human behavior.

Also, the dominant model of each individual who shared the same characteristic (age, sex, education) was compared to the dominant model of each individual who shared an opposing characteristic. It was found that individuals who

had 12 or fewer years of education and individuals who had more than 12 years of education tended to use a psychological model as their dominant model. However, this characteristic did effect a psychological model being used as a dominant model by an individual. Forty percent of the individuals who had more than 12 years of education used a psychological model as a dominant model, while 26% of the individuals with 12 or fewer years of education used a psychological model as a dominant model.

When the dominant model used by an individual who had taken psychology courses was compared to the dominant model used by an individual who had not taken psychology courses it was found that individuals tended to use a psychological model as their dominant model regardless of having or not having taken psychology courses. However, this characteristic did have an effect on a psychological model being used as a dominant model by an individual. Forty-one percent of the individuals who had taken no psychology courses used a psychological model as their dominant model, while 26% of the individuals who had taken psychology courses used a psychological model as their dominant model.

When the dominant model used by an individual under 25, an individual between 25 and 40, and an individual over 40 were examined it was found that individuals under 25 and individuals over 40 tend to use a psychological model as

their dominant model for explaining human behavior. However, individuals between 25 and 40 tended not to use a psychological model as their dominant model. This gives moderate support to hypothesis I. But, this characteristic did have an effect on a psychological model being used as a dominant model by an individual. Fifty-two percent of the individuals under 25 used a psychological model as a dominant model while 38% of the individuals over 40 used a psychological model as a dominant model. Also, only 17% of the individuals between 25 and 40 used a psychological model as the dominant model.

When the dominant model used by a female was compared to the dominant model used by a male it was found that these individuals tended to use a psychological model as their dominant model. Also, whether an individual was male or female had no affect on individuals using a psychological model as their dominant model.

A Category's Dominant Model

When the data were analyzed by categories to find out what kind of model categories used as a dominant model it was found that categories used a psychological model as a dominant model more than any other kind of model. This supports hypothesis III, that is, a category uses a psychological model as a dominant model for explaining human behavior.

The sample used a psychological model as a dominant model more often than any other model. The sample used a psychological model as a dominant model for 6 out of 13 questions (46%).

Also, the category whose membership was based on having taken no psychology courses used a psychological model as a dominant model more often than any other model. This category used a psychological model as a dominant model for 7 out of 13 questions (54%).

Additionally, the category whose membership was based on having taken one or more psychology courses used a psychological model as a dominant model more often than any other model. This category used a psychological model for 6 out of 13 questions (46%).

It is clear that these different categories used a psychological model as their dominant model. However, these categories used psychological models differently. They did not always use a psychological model as a dominant model for the same questions, and the number of people who used a psychological model as a dominant model for the same question varied between categories.

The second part of the analysis examined the relationship between the dominant model and other models used for each question by different categories in detail. This was done for the sample, for the category whose membership was based on having taken no psychology course,

and for the category whose membership was based on having taken one or more psychology courses. This detailed analysis found that the NPC category and the PC category were more similar in the dominant models and other models they used than dissimilar.

Hypothesis II

Individuals seemed to use a mixture of psychological models for explaining human behavior as indicated by the psychological causal attributions that individuals gave. These causal attributions are listed under the model "psychological" in the methods section. However, specific kinds of psychological models could not be distinguished in the data. So, hypothesis II is not supported.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, RESEARCH WEAKNESSES, AND CONCLUSION

INTRODUCTION

A number of authors, such as LaPiere (1959), Gross (1978), Rieff (1966), Starker (1989), and Berger (1965), have analyzed American society to assess the degree to which the ideas and notions of psychology have penetrated our culture. These writings show that psychology is indeed an important and influential institution in the United States.

As an institution, psychology is widespread. There are over one million psychologists in the United States. There are literally thousands of psychology clinics as well as many psychologists who are engaged in private practice. Additionally, individuals are psychologically evaluated in schools, by the criminal justice system, by employers, and in many other settings. Psychology courses are taught in colleges, as well as psychological information being presented in self-help books and on educational broadcasting programs.

At the beginning of this thesis I stated that I wanted to know if ideas and notions derived from psychology had become distorted, modified, reified, and become part of the individual's subjective reality. Since many writers had

addressed the question of the scope of psychology in our culture, and shown it to be wide, I still had the question as to whether ideas and notions derived from psychology were part of everyday life. Even though it had been shown that psychology is part of "society as objective reality," I was not satisfied as to whether ideas and notions derived from psychology are part of "society as subjective reality." Just because psychology is a widespread institution, both at the academic and applied level, it doesn't necessarily follow that the ideas and notions of psychology are part of the everyday knowledge of everyday life. So I developed research questions and a research design to ascertain whether or not psychological ideas and notions are part of everyday life, or put another way, part of everyday subjective reality. Additionally I wanted to know if psychological ideas and notions could be considered a style of thought and an expression of, or a contributor to, the American *Weltanschauungen*.

THE HYPOTHESES

By discussing each hypothesis the answers to the research questions can be partially answered. However, since the sample was a non-random sample it must be remembered that the answers, the findings, apply only to the sample.

Also, there is the problem as to what the source of psychological ideas and notions are. Since the present research couldn't establish empirically that psychological models are indirectly derived from the field of psychology, the hypotheses had to side-step this issue. The hypotheses refer to psychological models, but do not state the source of psychological models. However, the theoretical and conceptual background point to the field of psychology as one of the sources of psychological models. It may be that psychological models existed in the everyday life prior to the development of the field of psychology, and that even the field of psychology has its roots in everyday life. But, the field of psychology has long been separated from the everyday life. Also, it is the field of psychology that is intersubjectively known to be the carrier of psychological information. Thus it can be said that psychological models are for the most part probably derived from the field of psychology. However, other institutions such as economic and political institutions also contain psychological models about human behavior and human nature. These psychological models may or may not be similar to the psychological models presented in psychology. Additionally, there are many areas of social life that are left uninstitutionalized. Psychological models may also, in part, come from uninstitutionalized sources. So, it appears that psychological models may have multiple sources, but

that psychology may be the main source of psychological models. Also, it may be that whatever the sources of psychological models are, these sources are a reflection of something bigger than the sources themselves--
Weltanschauung.

Hypothesis I

Hypothesis I states that in everyday life an individual will use a psychological model more often than any other kind of model which explains human behavior and human characteristics. The research findings show that individuals in the sample (36%) did use a psychological model as their dominant model more often than any other model.

I feel that one of the reasons that more individuals in the sample didn't use a psychological model as their dominant model had to do with the questions asked individuals. The questions were designed to allow the individual to use any kind of explanation. If the questions were designed to specifically elicit psychological explanations I think the use of psychological models as a dominant model would have been very high. However, the present research was interested in all the kinds of dominant models individuals or categories use, not just in psychological models as dominant models. In other words, using questions that allowed the respondents to use any kind of explanation probably underestimates the usage of

psychological models for explaining human behavior and human characteristics in the everyday life.

The social construction of reality perspective (Berger and Luckmann 1967) offers a theoretical approach from which the research findings can be explained. This theoretical approach sees the social construction of reality as being a necessity. Man as a species is born with a "world-openness." Since man's world for the most part is not ordered by biological instincts, man has to create his own social order.

The social construction of reality occurs through dialectical processes. The first process is externalization where individuals externalize their subjective meanings and subjective processes. The second process is objectification where the products that arose from externalization are viewed as objects external to the individual. The third processes is internalization where the objective products produced through externalization are internalized and become part of subjective reality (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

The actions resulting from externalization and objectification can become habitualized and institutionalized. Whenever there is reciprocal typifications of actions by types of actors there is institutionalization (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

For actions and actors to be typified a language has to be developed to represent the actions and actors. Language

makes it possible for actions, actors, and general experience to be typified and anonymized (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

Through language "semantic fields" (which can be thought of as "zones of meaning" or classifications and the accompanying meanings) are built up around some activity. These semantic fields contain accumulated experience. From these semantic fields the social stock of knowledge arises (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

So, through the externalization and objectification of subjective meanings and processes, human beings have created a social world which provides social order. These subjective meanings and processes have been objectified in language and institutions, that is, subjective meanings and processes have become objectively real. The social stock of knowledge which was created by human beings presents itself as objective reality and shapes much of human subjective reality (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

So it is the social stock of knowledge that is the basis of objective reality. The social stock of knowledge contains the accumulated meanings and experiences of society. This knowledge is transmitted from generation to generation (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

The social stock of knowledge contains the knowledge about how the social world operates. It contains the blue-prints for action. It also contains the knowledge that the

social stock of knowledge is intersubjective, and that the social stock of knowledge is socially distributed (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

The social stock of knowledge is stored primarily in language and institutions. Institutions provide plans for actions, exist prior to the individual, and are apprehended as an objective facticity. Institutions contain language that typifies and anonymized the roles and the actors of the institution. Institutions and language contain much of the objective reality of a society (Berger and Luckmann).

The social stock of knowledge affects the individual stock of knowledge in several ways. The social stock of knowledge shapes the subjective meanings and experiences of the individual. Additionally, the social stock of knowledge contains the "relative-natural view" which presents social relations and their meanings as objective knowledge. This is achieved through language and institutionalization. Language contains the "relative-natural world view." It is from this perspective that individuals interpret experience (Schutz and Luckmann 1973).

It can be argued that the field of psychology arose from dialectical processes and institutionalization processes. Although a sociological/historical analysis would be necessary to show this, a hypothetical scenario for the development of psychology can be discussed.

It is possible that with the decline of religious explanations of human behavior a new approach was needed for understanding human behavior. Through the externalization of subjective meanings and the objectification of these meanings different explanations of human behavior were created.

These new explanations of human behavior did not arise solely from individual explications. These new explanations of human behavior were shaped by the existing social stock of knowledge. The already existing "relative-natural world view" and the already existing language affected the development of new explanations of human behavior.

In the development of these new explanations of human behavior a special language was created. This language objectified and typified human behavior and human characteristics. With the typification of human behavior through language a new institution arose. This was the institution of psychology.

Whatever the socio-historical development of psychology was it was a product of the socio-historical times during which it began. The knowledge contained within psychology was affected by the already existing social stock of knowledge. It is only later on in its development that an institution can separate itself from the existing social stock of knowledge and engage in pure theory (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

The part of the social stock of knowledge that contains the explanations of human behavior and human characteristics is for the most part contained within the institution of psychology. Psychology as an institution presents an objective reality. Part of this objective reality has become part of everyday life. Some of the knowledge, the objective reality contained within psychology, has spread from the field of psychology to the everyday commonsense level.

The objective reality presented by psychology is largely contained within language and roles. For example, clinical psychology contains the roles therapist and client. The therapist possesses the knowledge about human behavior and human characteristics. The client learns the objective knowledge presented by the therapist. Additionally, each role specifies certain actions for the actor in each role. Also, clinical psychology has a language for describing and explaining human behavior and human characteristics. Words such as psychotic, obsessive, unconscious, sexual instincts, and so on, categorize and explain human behavior.

Another example is psychology as part of the larger institution "science." There are the roles of teacher, student, and so on and the language that was developed for whatever aspect of psychology that is being taught and learned.

Also, psychology presents an objective reality in other areas that use the language of psychology. For example, self-help books, social work, and information presented in the media.

In the United States psychology has been specified as the institution that carries the knowledge about human behavior and human characteristics. This knowledge is part of the social stock of knowledge. Everyone knows who the experts on human behavior are.

So it can be seen that psychology presents an objective reality. Part of this objective reality has become part of everyday reality. It is no surprise that individuals in the sample used a psychological model as their dominant model. Psychology, as well as other institutions, present a psychological view of human behavior and human characteristics. However, the question remains as to how psychological models become part of the individual stock of knowledge, and why different individuals use psychological models differently or possess psychological models in differing degrees.

The social stock of knowledge is socially distributed, that is, the individual stock of knowledge of different individuals contain somewhat different parts of the total social stock of knowledge. The social stock of knowledge is acquired in three basic ways.

First, during primary socialization the objective reality of society is internalized. Significant others present their subjective version of the objective social world, a version that was shaped by the social stock of knowledge. Things such as biography and class position modify the social world that is presented by significant others. So, significant others pass on the objective social world to individuals, but the objective social world is presented somewhat differently by different significant others (Berger and Luckmann 1967; Schutz and Luckmann 1973).

Second, during secondary socialization role-specific knowledge is presented. Specialized knowledge and "semantic fields" are attached to specific roles. Part of the social stock of knowledge can be acquired through roles (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

Third, the subjective reality that an individual acquires through socialization is maintained and modified. Institutionalization and social interaction maintain and modify subjective reality. Additionally, other people's definitions of reality support or modify the individual's subjective reality. This is achieved largely through language. Conversation implies a taken-for-granted world and objectifies the world (Berger and Luckmann 1967).

In sum, subjective reality is appropriated from and maintained by an objective reality provided by the social stock of knowledge.

The findings of the present research show that individuals in the sample used a psychological model as a dominant model more often than any other kind of model. Additionally the research findings show that characteristics such as age, sex, or education have an effect on an individual's using a psychological model as his dominant model or on the frequency of use of psychological models. These findings can be seen in Table XXII which summarizes the findings concerning the dominant model assigned to each individual.

Since much of the individual stock of knowledge is acquired from the social stock of knowledge, some of the possible ways in which knowledge is socially distributed may account for characteristics such as age, sex or education affecting the use and frequency of use of a psychological model. First, the socialization of each individual is unique in some ways. Significant others present their interpretation of the social stock of knowledge. Also individuals appropriate different parts of the social world that is presented. Second, different individuals undergo different secondary socialization processes. Some individuals have roles that require psychological knowledge more than other roles. Third, different individuals engage in social interaction with different people and engage in different conversations. Individuals are exposed to

TABLE XXII
PERCENTAGES FOR THE DOMINANT MODEL USED
BY AN INDIVIDUAL IN SUMMARY

Dominant model	n	<12	>12	NPC	PC	<25	25-40	>40	F	M
PSY	36	26	40	41	28	52	17	38	37	36
IP	22	22	20	19	26	26	21	13	19	25
PH	10	22	10	19	10	4	21	19	16	7
CU	1	0	2	0	3	4	0	0	2	0
SS	3	4	0	3	0	0	0	6	2	0
PH/PSY	5	4	6	3	8	4	10	0	5	11
IP/PH	4	0	4	0	5	0	7	0	0	4
IP/PSY	8	13	6	9	8	4	7	19	9	7
CU/IP	1	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
IP/PH/SS	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	6	0	4
NONE	8	4	10	0	13	7	14	0	9	4

n = sample; <12 = twelve or fewer years of education;
>12 = more than 12 years of education; NPC = no psychology
courses taken; PC = one or more psychology courses taken;
<25 = under 25 years of age; 25-40 = 25 to 40 years of age;
>40 = over 40 years of age; F = female; M = male

different definitions of reality and to different aspects of
our language.

So, individuals are exposed to different parts of the
social stock of knowledge resulting from socialization,
social interaction, and the language they acquire and are
exposed to. Different individuals' stock of knowledge may
contain somewhat different parts of the social stock of
knowledge as well as the social stock of knowledge being
interpreted differently by different people. However, since
objective reality is defined by the same social stock of
knowledge, the individual stocks of knowledge of different

individuals have much in common. This is the basis of everyday knowledge.

The findings also show that an interpersonal model was used by 22% of the sample, as well as a few individuals using a variety of other models as their dominant model. This suggests that although a psychological model was used as a dominant model by more individuals than any other model, there are other dominant models that individuals used for explaining human behavior and characteristics which are also important and shared among individuals. These other dominant models are also part of the individual stock of knowledge, or put another way, the subjective reality of some individuals. These models are also part of the social stock of knowledge.

More specifically, age was the only characteristic that was related to an individual using a dominant model that was other than a psychological model. Individuals who were between 25 and 40 tended not to use a psychological model as a dominant model. Twenty one percent of these individuals used an interpersonal model as their dominant model while 21% of these individuals used a physiological model as their dominant model. So both an interpersonal model and a physiological model was the dominant model used by individuals between 25 and 40 years of age. Respondents under 25 and over 40 most often used a psychological model as their dominant model.

That individuals in different age categories used psychological models differently can be partially explained by the idea of "generations." Mannheim (1927 p. 276-320) views "generations" within specific socio-historical times as being an important factor for the knowledge and outlook of individuals.

The fact of belonging to the same class, and that of belonging to the same generation or age group, have this in common, that both endow the individuals sharing in them with a common location in the social and historical process, and thereby limit them to a specific range of potential experience, pre-disposing them for a certain characteristic mode of thought and experience, and a characteristic type of historically relevant action. Any given location, then, excludes a large number of possible modes of thought, experience, feeling, and action, and restricts the range of self-expression open to the individual to certain circumscribed possibilities. (Mannheim 1927, p. 291)

Generations may also account for the different frequency of use of a psychological model as a dominant model for individuals in the different age categories. It is of some interest that the respondents that were between 25 and 40 are part of the "1960's generation." However, it should not be forgotten that socialization, conversation, social interaction, and language also play a role in the social distribution of psychological models.

Another variation in the frequency of use of a psychological model as a dominant model by an individual can be seen between the individuals who had 12 or fewer years of education and individuals who had more than 12 years of education. Twenty-six percent of the individuals with 12 or

fewer years of education used a psychological model as their dominant model while 40% of the individuals with more than 12 years of education used a psychological model. One of the possible explanation for this difference is that the more educated individuals were exposed to more psychological models. However, another finding was that 41% of the individuals who had taken no psychology courses used a psychological model as their dominant model while 28% of the individuals who had taken one or more psychology courses used a psychological model as their dominant model. It seems that those who had taken psychology courses would be exposed to more psychological models than those who had not taken psychology courses. It could be that those with more than 12 years of education were exposed to more psychological models than those with 12 or fewer years of education, but these psychological models may have not come specifically from academic psychology. They may have come from literature, philosophy, or history also. It may be that individuals who had taken psychology courses were exposed to more psychological models, but these individuals may also have learned to apply psychological models to a smaller range of behaviors. Or alternatively, that individuals who had taken no psychology courses used a psychological model as a dominant model more than individuals who had taken psychology courses may indicate that psychological models are also derived from sources

other than psychology, sources which may be independent and have existed prior to the development of psychology. One of these sources may be *Weltanschauung*.

Another interesting finding is that whether the individual was male or female did not effect the dominant model an individual used. Both males and females used a psychological model as their dominant model, and with the same frequency. This finding would appear to run counter to theories that indicates that males and females experience reality differently. However, it is possible that males and females experience the world differently but still use the same dominant explanatory model with the same frequency. The psychological reality concerning identity must surely be different in American society for males and females. It has been shown that both primary and secondary socialization is somewhat different for males and females. But it appears that the psychological models used to explain external behaviors are very similar. Of even more interest than males and females both using a psychological model and with similar frequency is that the frequency of use of a psychological model was more similar for males and females than for any other characteristic. Why this might be so is not clear.

What the research findings show is that psychological models are part of the individual stock of knowledge and that psychological models are part of the reality of

everyday life. As part of everyday life psychological models are experienced in a certain way. As part of everyday life psychological models are part of the "natural attitude." Psychological models are apprehended as an objective reality. They are taken-for-granted. Also, psychological models are known to be intersubjective and part of the cultural and social world that existed prior to the individual. Psychological models are used as a "recipe" for explaining human behavior and human characteristics.

Social interaction and language are two of the factors that help shape the reality of everyday life. It is during social interaction that psychological models are exchanged and modified. It is during social interaction that psychological models are shared intersubjectively. During social interaction psychological models can be used to typify the other individual as well as to typify the situation.

Language is perhaps the most important factor in the shaping of everyday reality. Language is the main vehicle for the expression of human subjective meanings and processes. Language makes it possible to objectify, typify, and anonymize experience. Language also makes it possible for alternative realities to be understood in terms of everyday reality. Additionally language can transcend everyday reality (Berger and Luckmann 1967). Psychological

models are part of language and used to objectify and understand experience.

Most psychological models are probably derived indirectly from psychology. The knowledge of psychology is specialized knowledge and is socially distributed. But, some of this knowledge, although modified, simplified, and distorted, has filtered out into the everyday world. This is probably the main source of most psychological models in everyday life.

Hypothesis II

Hypothesis II states that there will be more than one kind of psychological model, or a mixture of psychological models used in everyday life to explain human behavior and human characteristics. This hypothesis was based on the assumption that individuals may use psychological models that would be similar to the schools of thought within psychology. However, this hypothesis was not supported.

Several explanations of this hypothesis not being supported are possible. First, it may be that the ideas and notions contained within the schools of thought within psychology are only relevant to certain individuals. This more specific knowledge may be socially distributed in terms of roles; that is, this kind of knowledge may be role specific. For example, it is not unreasonable to assert that a psychologist, a social worker, teachers, psychology

students, and so on, may use psychological models that are similar to the schools of thought within psychology in explaining human behavior in everyday life.

Another related possibility is that the nature of everyday knowledge and everyday reality excludes psychological models that are similar to the schools of thought within psychology. These kinds of psychological models may be too complex, even in a simplified form, to be part of everyday knowledge. Everyday knowledge is characterized by a taken-for-grantedness and a lack of reflection. Psychological models that would correspond to the schools of thought within psychology would probably require reflection. Reflection would seem unavoidable since the schools of thought within psychology would not match the psychological models learned during primary socialization. Some questioning and reflection would be necessary.

However, some individuals, who for practical reasons require the knowledge within psychology, may develop everyday knowledge that contains psychological models that correspond to the schools of thought within psychology. For example, someone in long term therapy, or a relative of someone in long term therapy, may appropriate the psychological explanations provided by the therapist for explaining the problem at hand. These ideas and notions could then end up being taken-for-granted and need no further reflection.

Another possibility is that psychology is not the main source of psychological models. It might even be possible that psychological models in everyday life and psychology have the same roots. Perhaps there is some style of thought or *Weltanschauung* that gave rise to the schools of thought within psychology as well as to psychological models in everyday life.

Hypothesis III

Hypothesis III states that, in everyday life, categories of individuals will use a psychological model more often than any other kind of model for explaining human behavior and human characteristics. This hypothesis was supported.

It is important to remember that the categories examined are statistical categories, not groups in a sociological sense. Also, the sample is being considered as a category. I would have preferred to have used true groups. But since none were available to me at the time of the research I created statistical categories so as to allow at least some consideration of psychological models and a unit of analysis other than the individual. Using statistical categories rather than social groups can certainly be criticized. However, I feel that some useful information can be obtained from examining statistical categories when groups are not available.

The total sample, the categories "having taken one or more psychology courses," "having taken no psychology courses," "twelve or fewer years of education," twelve or more years of education," "under 25 years of age," "over forty years of age," "male," and "female" used a psychological model as a dominant model. The only category that didn't use a psychological model as a dominant model was the category "twenty-five to forty years of age." These findings are summarized in Table XXIII.

Since this hypothesis was developed from a different theoretical perspective than the hypotheses dealing with the individual, the explanations will be from Mannheim's (1920; 1921; 1927; 1936) perspective rather than from the perspective of Berger, Luckmann and Schutz. However, the perspective of Berger, Luckmann, and Schutz could also be used to explain the findings concerning hypothesis III. There are many similarities between the two theoretical approaches.

Why categories used a psychological model as a dominant model can be explained by examining the kinds of causal attributions that were used by the different categories. The dominant models used can be viewed as cultural objectifications.

All cultural objects carry meaning and express or contribute to *Weltanschauung*. Cultural objects contain objective meaning, expressive meaning, and documentary

meaning. It is documentary meanings that are of interest. Documentary meanings refer to meanings that are beyond objective and expressive meanings. Documentary meaning is the interpretation of a cultural object, an interpretation that points beyond the cultural object itself (Mannheim 1921).

Weltanschauung, that is, the global outlook, the total view, or the approach to the world, of an individual, group or culture, is expressed in documentary meanings. On the other hand, documentary meanings are also expressed in and contribute to *Weltanschauung*. Another way of saying this is that the meanings contained within cultural objectifications are an expression of *Weltanschauung*, but, also, the meanings within cultural objectifications contribute to the *Weltanschauung* (Mannheim 1920; 1921; 1927).

Psychological models can be examined as cultural objectifications to see what aspect of *Weltanschauung* they may express or contribute to. Psychological models can be examined in terms of styles of thought.

Styles of thought are a reflection of and contribute to *Weltanschauungen*. Styles of thought reflect the style of thought produced and carried by groups. Thought is said to develop in styles, styles arising from a group's experience (Mannheim 1927).

TABLE XXIII

PERCENTAGES FOR THE DOMINANT MODEL USED BY
CATEGORIES FOR EACH QUESTION IN SUMMARY

Sample			NPC		PC		<12	
DM		%	DM	%	DM	%	DM	%
Q1	IP	35	I/PSY	44	IP	32	IP/PSY	48
Q2	PSY	33	PSY	34	PSY	31	PH	26
Q3	PH	31	PH	34	PH	31	PH	35
Q4	PH	33	PSY	25	PH	41	PH	30
Q5	IP	38	IP	41	IP	36	IP	52
Q6	PSY	25	PSY	22	PSY	31	PSY	30
Q7	PSY	24	PSY	25	PSY	21	PSY & PH	22
Q8	PSY	41	PSY	53	PSY	26	PSY	52
Q9	PSY	53	PSY	47	PSY	56	PSY	57
Q10	PH/PSY	30	PH/PSY	41	PH	28	PH/PSY	43
Q11	IP	68	IP	75	IP	62	IP	70
Q12	SS	22	SS	22	SS	23	SS	30
Q13	PSY	31	PSY	41	PSY	28	PSY	39
<hr/>								
DM	PSY 5/13		PSY 7/13		PSY 6/13		PSY 4/13	

> 12			< 25		25 - 40		> 40	
DM		%	DM	%	DM	%	DM	%
Q1	IP	40	IP	48	IP	28	IP	50
Q2	PS	38	PS	44	PH/PSY	28	PH & PSY	31
Q3	PH	29	PH	30	PH	34	PH	31
Q4	PH	33	PH	33	PH	34	I/PH	31
Q5	IP	31	IP	44	IP/PH	38	I/PH	38
Q6	C & PSY	27	C	30	C	28	PSY	31
Q7	PSY	23	PSY	22	PH	21	PSY	31
Q8	PSY	33	PSY	52	PSY	28	PSY	38
Q9	PSY	50	PSY	63	PSY	52	PSY	38
Q10	PS & PH/PSY	25	PH/PSY	33	PH	28	PH/PSY	38
Q11	IP	67	IP	78	IP	66	IP	50
Q12	SS	19	SS	22	SS	21	SS	25
Q13	PSY	31	IP/PSY	22	PSY	28	PSY	69
<hr/>								
DM	PSY 5/13		PSY 4/13		PH 4/13		PSY 5/13	

DM = dominant model; n = sample; <12 = twelve or fewer years of education; >12 = more than 12 years of education; NPC = no psychology courses taken; PC = one or more psychology courses taken; <25 = under 25 years of age; 25-40 = 25 to 40 years of age; >40 = over 40; F = female; M = male.

An individual's thinking comes from the world-view, plans for actions, and the style of thought of the groups and social strata to which he belongs. The style of thought of groups provide the individual with a way to interpret the experiences he has in the world. An individual does not acquire knowledge or think totally on his own, but acquires his thinking style and knowledge from the groups to which he belongs (Mannheim 1927).

A group's style of thought develops from the experience of the group. The group's experience is affected by social/historical forces. Social/historical forces shape and change the way in which groups interpret the world. For example, social stratification, competition, and generations are some of the factors that shape a group's experience and style of thought (Mannheim 1927).

It is world-views that guide action and form a basis for interpretation and reality. World-views arise from groups and conflict between groups, each group attempting to establish its interpretation of the same phenomena (Mannheim 1927; 1936).

The documentary meanings expressed in the dominant model used by categories can be examined to see what aspect of *Weltanschauung* these cultural objectifications may express. Styles of thought, which express and contribute to *Weltanschauung*, can be the focus of analysis.

One of the findings of the present research that needs explanation is why almost all the different categories used a psychological model as their dominant model. One possible explanation is that the categories share a style of thought.

The style of thought of the categories can be characterized as psychological. The individuals in the categories may belong to groups which share a common style of thought. That is, the style of thought of the groups that individuals within the categories belong to may be focused upon psychological ideas and notions. These psychological ideas and notions may shape as well as reflect *Weltanschauung*. It is *Weltanschauung* and styles of thought that provide a ready-made interpretation of phenomena for the individual.

Also, although the dominant model used by all but one category was a psychological model, the several categories sometimes used psychological models as dominant models for different questions. It may be that a psychological style of thought is sometimes applied differently by different individuals, but the style of thought is style psychological.

That the category "25 to 40 years of age" used a physiological model as the dominant model also needs to be examined. In Table XXIII it can be seen that the dominant model used for each question by this category is somewhat similar to the dominant models used by some of the other

categories. For question seven, which asked for an explanation of anxiety, the 25 to 40 years of age category used a physiological model as a dominant model. This is primarily what distinguishes this category from the other categories. Had the 25 to 40 years of age category used a psychological model for this question as most categories did, the dominant model for this category would also have been a psychological model. Additionally, the category "less than twelve years of education" used a physiological model as one of two dominant models for the question on anxiety.

It may be that the individuals in the 25 to 40 years of age category belong to groups that have a different style of thought than the groups that the individuals in other categories belong to. However, this seems unlikely since the dominant models used for the questions other than the question on anxiety are similar to the dominant models used by other categories. Or it may be that the style of thought used by the category 25 to 40 years of age is a reflection of the "generations" of the individuals in this age category. Another possibility is that psychological models and physiological models have a similarity in that both focus on characteristics of the individual as the causal agent of behavior. Physiological models were used quite often as dominant models, as well as being used in

combination with a psychological model to form a physiological/psychological model.

Another finding that needs explanation is that when the relationship between other models used and the dominant model used for each question by the NPC category and the PC category was examined it was found that individuals in both categories used models similarly. That is, these two categories were more similar in the dominant models they used for each question, in the frequency of use for a model, and in the use of the same models, than dissimilar. Again, this could be said to reflect a style of thought that is common to the groups that the individuals in the categories belong to. Or, if put in Berger and Luckmann's terms, this could be said to show these individuals share, at least partially, a common social stock of knowledge.

The question as to whether psychological models can be considered an expression of an underlying *Weltanschauung*, or contribute to a *Weltanschauung*, is not easy to answer. Even saying that psychological models represent a style of thought is not conclusive. It may be that psychological models themselves are a reflection of a different style of thought or of a more important component of *Weltanschauung*. For example, it could be argued that psychological models reflect a style of thought that could be called "individualistic." It could also be argued that individualism is an expression of *Weltanschauung*, and

contributes to *Weltanschauung*, and that psychological models are a by-product of individualism rather than being important in and of themselves. The question of whether psychological models express a *Weltanschauung* and are a style of thought can't be answered definitively by the present research. However, the present research does seem to indicate that it is possible that psychological models form a style of thought and reflect and contribute to a *Weltanschauung*.

The issue of individualism is also involved in the question of whether psychological models developed from psychology or from cultural values and norms that were embodied in other institutions prior to the development of psychology. Even if it could be shown that psychological models developed mainly from psychology, it would still be necessary to examine the development of psychology in a sociological/historical context. It could be that psychology is a reflection of, and fits in with, individualism.

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES AND RESEARCH WEAKNESSES

There are several weaknesses in the research design that should be pointed out and discussed. First, the sample was a convenience sample. This limits the findings of the present research from being able to be generalized to the larger population. It also brings in the questions

of how biased the sample was. Second, the size of the sample was $N = 73$. This is a rather small sample. Third, the use of an open ended questionnaire has its weaknesses. Fourth, the categorization of respondent's causal attributions into models did not specifically include a model that took into account the interaction between the situation and the individual.

A convenience sample was used for one primary reason. The present research was unfunded. I was unable to get cooperation from individuals I contacted to whom I had no personal connection. They were unwilling to fill out the questionnaire for nothing in return. Many of the individuals I contacted directly said they would fill out the questionnaire, but when I handed it to them and they saw it was open-ended and rather lengthy, they changed their minds. I had to rely on associates of mine who had direct contact with people where they work. Without a personal contact of some kind I probably could not have gotten a large enough sample from a non-college population to analyze. Although I could have obtained a somewhat random sample of P. S. U. undergraduates, it seemed unnecessary to do this since the other half of the sample was non-random.

The sample size was small for similar reasons for using a convenience sample. The research was unfunded, and I could only get as many individuals as I got, in a reasonable

amount of time, to participate. I could have gotten a large number of undergraduates for the study, but I also wanted individuals from a non-college population.

An open-ended questionnaire was used for several reasons. First, it was believed it would be more likely that individuals in the general population would fill out a questionnaire than consent to an interview. Second, research assistants didn't need any training to administer questionnaires, they just needed a few instructions. Third, although the research assistants were able to get people they worked with to fill out a questionnaire, it was unlikely they would be able to get these same people to consent to an interview.

So, although the research design was not the best it could be, it was the best that could be accomplished. The research findings are still useful, even though the results can be questioned for several reasons.

If the present research had been funded I would have designed the research differently. First, I would have used a random sample from the general population for the part of the research that used the individual as the unit of analysis. Second, I would have used a stratified random sample for the part of the research that used groups as the unit of analysis. Also, I would have used groups whose membership was based on occupation, ethnicity, belief system, or class, or some other meaningful criterion.

Third, I would have used a much larger sample. Fourth, I would have used indepth structured interviews.

By using random sampling the results of the research could be generalized to a larger population. Also, many of the biases of non-random sampling would have been eliminated, as well as alternative explanations being limited. Also, by using a larger sample more information could have been obtained.

The use of a structured in-depth interview would have been preferred for several reasons. First, causal attributions have been ascertained through the use of vignettes (Rabkin, 1972; Pedhazur, 1969; Alexander & Becker, 1978) , fixed-alternative questions (Beckman, 1979; Furnham & Lowick, 1984a, 1984b; Hollin and Howells, 1987; Furnham & Henderson, 1983; Tolar & Tamerin, 1975), open-ended questions (Harris & Smith, 1982), and a combination of fixed-alternative and open-ended questions (Forgas, Morris, & Furnham 1982). Both the survey and the interview format have been used, but the survey approach with fixed-alternative questions has been used most extensively. However, some of the recent research in the area of causal attributions suggest that these common approaches to the study of causal explanation may be inadequate methodologically (see Hilton, 1990; Kahneman, & Miller, 1986; Hilton, & Slugoski, 1986, Howard, 1984; Guimond,

Begin, & Palmer, 1989; McGill, 1989; Miller, 1984; Hewstone, 1983; Furnham, Jaspars, & Fincham, 1983).

Second, a structured in-depth interview, particularly if vignettes or narrative accounts were used, would allow respondents to consider the interaction between the situation and the individual in their explanations of human behavior. In the present research, one of the reasons why a model was not constructed that took into account the interaction between the situation and the individual is that the models were developed from the causal attributions given by the respondents. The models were developed from the data rather than being developed on some other basis. For the most part the respondents causal attributions did not reflect a concern with the interaction between the situation and the individual as a determinant of behavior. One of the reasons respondents didn't use causal attributions that reflected a concern with the interaction between the situation and the individual may have been due to the use of a questionnaire and the questions used. In other words, the way in which information was elicited may have been biased against explanations that specifically included situational factors and their affect on behavior in the interaction situation. For example, asking for explanations of general categories of behavior such as delinquency, violence, and alcoholism largely excludes explanations that include

the interaction between the situation and the individual in the interaction situation.

I would have preferred to use the methods used by Miller (1984), and Antaki (1988), although these methods would have been modified and combined to meet the needs of the present research. These methods appear to get around some of the methodological problems involved in eliciting causal attributions, as well as allowing subjective experience and interaction to be an explicit part of the research design. Miller (1984) asked subjects to narrate certain behaviors. Immediately after the narration of the behavior subjects were asked to explain the narrated behavior. Antaki (1988) also used narrative accounts, but the analysis of the data was different than Miller's analysis of the data. Antaki used a diagram system. Antaki diagramed each causal factor and the linkages between causal factors in the narrative accounts. All the causal factors and their linkages to one another were analyzed so as to get a clear picture of the causes imputed to the behaviors in the narrative accounts.

Subjects would have been asked to explain a variety of human behaviors, as in the present research, but they would have been asked in different ways. Some of the behaviors to be explained would have been elicited from the subject by asking the subject to tell a story. For example, the subject would have been asked to describe something that

somebody he knows did that would be an example of discrimination, and to follow the narrative with an explanation of the behavior. Additionally, or alternatively, some of the behaviors to be explained would have been presented in short descriptive vignettes which describe both dispositional and situational conditions, followed by a question asking for an explanation of the behavior. The causal structures (Antaki, 1988) of the narratives and the explanations of behaviors would have then been diagrammed and analyzed.

There are several reasons why narratives produced by the subject, in combination with vignettes, would have been preferred. 1) It is reasonable to think that the narratives produced may contain as much information about the models used to explain human nature and human behavior as do the explanations. 2) The subject would be using his experiences from his everyday life as the stimulus, which would be more meaningful and understandable to the subject. 3) Since the "life-world" is one of the areas of interest, it seems reasonable to use a stimulus from the life-world. 4) Some of the problems that arise from using just vignettes or other stimuluses are reduced, although using subject produced narratives may create some other methodological problems. 5) There would be a large number of diverse behaviors explained. 6) Using vignettes would allow subjects' explanations to be compared more reliably, since

they are responding to the same stimulus. 7) The bias against respondents considering situational factors in the interaction situation would be reduced. 8) Using narratives and vignettes together, within the structured interview, would appear to be one of the best methods for acquiring causal attributions and for the purposes of the present research.

CONCLUSION

The present research sought to discover whether ideas and notions derived from psychology had become modified, distorted, reified, and become part of the individual's subjective reality in everyday life. It was believed that causal attributions would contain somewhat specific ideas and language that could be connected to the field of psychology. This led to the development of hypothesis II which basically hypothesized that individuals would use psychological models that explicitly came from the field of psychology. This was not the case. The sample under examination did not use ideas and language, for the most part, that could be linked directly to the field of psychology. However, the research did indicate that psychological models, whatever the source, are an important factor in causal attributions. Psychological models were drawn on for explaining many of the behaviors respondents were asked to explain. So it can be said that psychological

models are part of the individual social stock of knowledge and part of everyday subjective reality.

One of the reasons that psychological models are an important part of everyday life may be that psychological models are part of, and fit in with, many institutions. Psychological models are reflected in, or reflect, the American economic, political, and other social institutions. Psychology can give legitimation to the individualistic and conservative tendencies of the American economic and political institutions. Psychology can also be a sort of "sacred canopy" that ties the various segments of the social world together. On the other hand, psychology may be a reflection of the individualistic and conservative tendencies in many American institutions. More than likely psychology both influences the social order and is influenced by the social order.

More research is needed to clearly show the relationship between psychological models and the individual stock of knowledge. Different methods and a more detailed analysis using multiple methods would give a better and fuller understanding of the research questions.

The research has led to some new questions concerning the individual stock of knowledge and the subjective reality of everyday life. Overwhelmingly the respondents focused on psychological, physiological, and interpersonal explanations of behavior. Even when the respondents considered the

social aspects of behavior it was usually still centered around the individual and his relationship to another individual.

When the respondents were assigned a dominant model, only one individual used a cultural model and one individual used a social structural model as a dominant model. When the dominant model for each question for the sample was examined not one question had a cultural model as a dominant model. Also, only one question had a social structural model as a dominant model. Cultural and social structural models were rather unimportant in individuals' causal attributions. The question arises as to why social structural and cultural models were not used more often for explaining human behavior and human characteristics. Even if psychological models are the dominant institutionalized mode of explanation for human behavior and human characteristics, it seems that there would be alternative models based on something other than the individual.

Additionally, only a very small number of individuals looked past the most manifest explanations of a human behavior or characteristic. Only one or two people mentioned a cause of behavior that was latent. For example, most individuals explained why a juvenile might join a gang by some combination of individuals needs, family, or parents. Very few people said anything about the social structural factors that shape the relations and interactions

within families or about the relationship of the family to the economic or political sphere. Another example is that a number of people said that social norms and social sanctions were what caused individuals to obey the social laws of society. Only one or two people included some notion of what lies behind social sanctions and social norms.

Individuals' causal explanations focused on the most obvious explanations for human behaviors and characteristics. Additionally, very few people said that they didn't know the explanation of a behavior or characteristic. The question arises as to why this was so. Although this may be somewhat understandable since everyday life is a reality that is taken-for-granted and a reality that avoids questions, surely some questions require stepping outside of everyday life. Some conditions require reflection and questioning.

The present research examined the relationship between psychological models as part of the social stock of knowledge and psychological models as part of the individual stock of knowledge in everyday life. It was found that everyday knowledge does contain psychological models, psychological models that probably come from multiple sources. The psychological models that were used to interpret and explain human behavior and human nature in everyday life were a-theoretical, very general, and flexible.

An understanding of the effects of psychological theory and ideas on culture, specifically individual consciousness, is essential. Additionally, although I singled out psychology, the effects of the theories and ideas of other social science, particularly economics, are also important. And, also, the effects of any institution as well as the effects of uninstitutionalized aspects of the social world need to be examined in great detail. If it is the social stock of knowledge that provides objective reality, and thereby shapes subjective reality, the contents of the social stock of knowledge need to be thoroughly examined. It is by examining the social stock of knowledge that sense can be made out of the thought and action of human beings. The concepts of styles of thought and *Weltanschauung* could be very useful in this examination.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, C., & Becker, H., (1978), "The use of vignettes in survey research," Public Opinion Quarterly, 42, 93-104.
- Antaki, C., (1988), "Structures of belief and justification," in Analysing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook of Methods, (ed.) Antaki, C., pp. 60-73. London: Sage.
- Beckman, L., (1979), "Beliefs about the causes of alcohol-related problems among alcoholic and non-alcoholic women," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 35, 663-670.
- Berger, P. L., (1965), "Towards a sociological understanding of psychoanalysis," Social Research, spring, 26-41.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T., (1967), The Social Construction of Reality, New York: Anchor Books.
- Berger, P. L., (1969), The Sacred Canopy, U. S.: Anchor.
- Forgas, J., Morris, S., & Furnham, A., (1982), " Lay explanations of wealth: attributions for economic success." Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 12, 381-397.
- Frank, J. D., (1974), Persuasion and Healing : A Comparative Study of Psychotherapy, U.S.: John Hopkins.
- Furnham, A. F., Jaspers, J., & Fincham, F. D., (1983), "Professional and naive psychology: two approaches to the explanation of social behavior," in Attribution Theory and Research: Conceptual, Developmental and Social Dimensions, (eds.) Furnham, A. F., Jaspers, J., & Fincham, F. D., pp. 315-342. New York: Academic.
- Furnham, A. F., & Henderson, M., (1983), "Lay theories of delinquency." European Journal of Social Psychology, 13, 107-120.
- Furnham, A. F., & Lowick, V., (1984a), "Lay theories of the causes of alcoholism." British Journal of Medical Psychology, 57, 319-332.

- Furnham, A. F., & Lowick, V., (1984b), "Attitudes to alcohol consumption: The attributions of addiction." Social Science and Medicine, **18**, 673-681.
- Furnham, A. F., (1988), Lay Theories: Everyday Understanding of Problems in the Social Sciences, New York: Pergamon press.
- Gross, M. L., (1978), The Psychological Society, New York: Random house.
- Guimond, S., Begin, G., & Palmer, D. L., (1989), "Education and causal attributions: the development of 'person-blame', and 'system blame' ideology." Social Psychology Quarterly, **52**, 126-140.
- Harris, M., & Smith, S., (1982), "Beliefs about obesity: effects of age, ethnicity, sex and weight." Psychological Reports, **51**, 1047-1055.
- Hewstone, M., (1983), "The role of language in attribution processes," in Attribution Theory and Research: Conceptual, Developmental and Social Dimensions, (eds.) Jaspers, J., Fincham, F. D., & Hewstone, M., pp. 241-260. New York: Academic press.
- Hilton, D. J., (1990), "Conversational processes and causal explanation." Psychological Bulletin, **107**, 65-81.
- Hilton, D. J., & Slugoski, B. R., (1986), "Knowledge-Based causal attribution: the abnormal conditions focus model." Psychological Review, **93**, 75-88.
- Hollin, C., & Howells, K., (1987), "Lay explanations of delinquency: global or offence specific?" British Journal of Social Psychology, **26**, 203-210.
- Howard, J. A., (1984), "Societal influences on attribution: blaming some victims more than others." **47**, 494-505.
- Hume, D., (1955), An Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding, U. S.: Liberal Arts.
- Kahneman, D., & Miller, D. T., (1986), "Comparing reality to its alternatives," Psychological Review, **93**, 136-153.
- LaPiere, R., (1959), The Freudian Ethic, New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce.
- Mannheim, K., (1920), "A Review of Georg Lukacs Theory of the Novel," pp. 3-7, in From Karl Mannheim, (1971), (ed.), Kurt Wolf, New York: Oxford University Press.

- Mannheim, K., (1921), "On the Interpretation of the *Weltanschauung*," pp. 8-58, in From Karl Mannheim, (1971), (ed.), Kurt Wolf, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mannheim, K., (1927), "Conservative Thought," pp. 132-222, in From Karl Mannheim, (1971), (ed.), Kurt Wolf.
- Mannheim, K., (1928), "The Problem of Generations," in Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge, (1952), (ed.), Paul Kecskemeti, New York: Oxford.
- Mannheim, K. (1936), Ideology and Utopia, New York: Harvest.
- McGill, A. L., (1989), "Context effects in judgments of causation," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 189-200.
- Miller, J. G., (1984), "Culture and the development of everyday social explanation," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 961-978.
- Pedhazur, E., (1969), "Pseudoprogressivism and assessment of teacher behavior," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 29, 377-386.
- Rabkin, J. G., (1972), "Opinions about mental illness: A Review of the Literature," Psychological Bulletin, 77(3), 153-171.
- Rieff, P., (1966), The Triumph of the Therapeutic: Uses of Faith After Freud, New York: Harper and Row, pp. 1-78.
- Ryff, C. D., (1987), "The place of personality and social structure research in social psychology," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, 1192-1202.
- Schutz, A., & Luckmann, T., (1973), The Structures of the Life-World, Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Sears, D. O., (1986), "College sophmores in the laboratory: influences of a narrow data base on social psychology's view of human nature," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 515-530.
- Singh, A. K., (1989), "Attribution research on poverty: a review," Psychologia, 32, 143-148.
- Starker, S., (1989), Oracle at the Supermarket, New Brunswick: Transaction publishers.

Tolar, A., & Tamerin, J., (1975), "The attitudes towards alcoholism instrument: a measure of attitudes towards alcoholism and the nature and causes of alcoholism." British Journal of Addiction, 70, 223-231.

Willer, J., (1971), The Social Determination of Knowledge, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Wuthnow, R., et.al, (1984), Cultural Analysis: the work of Peter L. Berger, Mary Douglas, Michel Foucault, and Jurgen Habermas, Boston: Routledge and Keagan Paul, pp. 1-20.

Wuthnow, R., (1987), Meaning and Moral Order: Explorations in Cultural Analysis, Berkeley: University of California Press.

APPENDIX A

LAPIERE'S ANALYSIS

LaPiere's (1959) analysis of the influence of Freudian psychology on American culture is often overlooked. This may be due to the biases that LaPiere shows. First, LaPiere interprets Freudian psychology only in negative terms. Second, LaPiere clearly distorts, or misrepresents some of the Freudian theory. Third, it is clear that LaPiere desired the continuation of a "Protestant Ethic" and a capitalist economic system, and wanted Freudian theory to be destroyed. However, even though LaPiere's presentation is clearly biased, his analysis of the effects of Freudian theory on American culture can be accepted as a reasonably clear and accurate analysis. If his biases are taken into account, his analysis is acceptable.

APPENDIX B

THE QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO
P. S. U. UNDERGRADUATES

Research Questionnaire

Before you begin this questionnaire I would like to reassure you that your answers are anonymous, and that all answers will be held in strict confidence. Additionally, you do not have to fill out this questionnaire if you do not want to. However, I would like to encourage you to do so. Your participation is very important to my research.

The present research is interested in individuals beliefs about the causes of human behavior. You will be asked to state what YOU think causes certain human behaviors. This is not a test of your academic knowledge, but an inquiry into your beliefs. So, please state what you believe to be the cause or causes of the behavior in question. After responding to the questions, be sure to fill out the information sheet on the last page.

If you need more space for your response to a question, please use the back of the page, and indicate, by number, which question you are continuing to answer.

(Please turn to the next page)

1 There are various kinds of juvenile delinquency. One kind, street gang violence, is considered to be a growing problem. What do you think causes juveniles to become members of a street gang?

2. It is not uncommon for people to feel depressed (feel blue). For example, a person may be in the process of a divorce, have a parent die, or lose his/her job. These are obvious reasons for feeling depressed. However, sometimes people feel depressed for no apparent reason. What do you think causes people to feel depressed for no apparent reason?

3. People can be classified as heterosexual, homosexual, or bi-sexual. What do you think causes someone to be heterosexual?

What do you think causes someone to be homosexual?

4. Personality can be defined as the characteristic way in which an individual behaves and thinks. What do you think causes people to have the kind of personality they have?

5. Most people in our society abide by the social laws and rules of our society. What do you think causes people to obey the laws and rules in our society?

6. It is estimated that approximately 5 percent of the American population is alcoholic, that is, alcohol consumption causes problems in their lives. What do you think causes people to be alcoholic?

7. Some people constantly experience extreme anxiety, that is, they feel apprehension and tension, a sense of danger, and have expectations of not being able to cope. Extreme anxiety interferes with a persons normal functioning in everyday life. What do you think causes this kind of anxiety?

8. Some people break social laws and rules, have a total disregard for others, and do so without any guilt. For example, a bank robber may shoot someone while robbing a bank and not feel guilt. What do you think causes someone to be this way?

9. A number of Americans are fat. What do you think causes someone to be fat?

10. Billions of dollars are spent each year on rock concerts and rock recordings. Also, many kids, and young adults, spend additional time listening to and viewing rock music on cable TV. It is not unusual to see these kids trying to be like modern rock stars. What do you think causes many kids to try and be like rock stars?

11. Over the last three decades violence has increased in the United States. Homicides, forcible rape, child abuse, aggravated assault, and robbery, have all increased, for example. What do you think has caused the increase in violence?

12. Where do you think your understanding of the causes of human behavior comes from?

I need to get some additional information from you for statistical purposes. Please turn to the next page.

INFORMATION

1. Age_____
2. Sex_____
3. Years of school completed_____
4. If you have attended college, how many psychology courses have you taken?_____
- How many sociology courses?_____
5. If you attended college, what was your major?_____
- _____
6. Marital status: married () single () divorced ()
7. What is your occupation?_____
8. Parent's occupation: father_____,
mother_____
10. What is your religious

If you have any questions, or concerns, I, David L. Sones, can be reached through the Sociology department at Portland State University.

Thank you for your participation.

APPENDIX C

THE INTRODUCTION TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED
TO NON-COLLEGE RESPONDENTS

Date:

From: David L. Sones, P. S. U. graduate student

I am doing thesis research for a Master of Science degree at Portland State University. My research is interested in people's beliefs about the causes of human behavior. I would like to ask you to participate in my research by filling out a questionnaire. The questionnaire will take only about thirty minutes to complete. I would be grateful if you would participate in my research. You will not only be helping me in my pursuit of a graduate degree, but, may also be contributing to scientific knowledge.

I would like to assure you that your identity is anonymous, and that your responses to the questionnaire will be held in strict confidence. So, if you choose to participate in my research, and I hope you do, please turn to the next page.

Research Questionnaire

Before you begin this questionnaire I would like to reassure you that your answers are anonymous, and that all answers will be held in strict confidence. Additionally, you do not have to fill out this questionnaire if you do not want to. However, I would like to encourage you to do so. Your participation is very important to my research.

The present research is interested in individuals beliefs about the causes of human behavior. You will be asked to state what YOU think causes certain human behaviors. This is not a test of your academic knowledge, but an inquiry into your beliefs. So, please state what you believe to be the cause or causes of the behavior in question. After responding to the questions, be sure to fill out the information sheet on the last page.

Since this is a self-administered questionnaire, I would like to ask you to follow a few guide lines when filling out the questionnaire. First, fill it out without help from anyone. Second, fill it out in a quiet atmosphere. Third, fill it out in one setting. And, fourth, please fill it out today or tomorrow.

After you have completed the questionnaire: 1) seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided; and 2) return it to the person who gave it to you.

(Please turn to the next page)