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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This past decade has seen a tremendous increase in the concern in our society with the developing younger generation. Many have talked about a "generation gap" -- a great divergence in values and life-styles between the present younger generation and the generation of their parents. The appearance, behavior, values, and attitudes of many of the younger generation seem alien and repugnant to many of their elders. The word "hippie" to many sums up the younger generation.

The youth, on the other hand, often seem completely alienated from their elders and from the society built by previous generations. Society is seen as corrupt, rigid, immoral, prejudiced, unjust, inequitable, decadent, bourgeois, militaristic, and often fascist. "You can't trust anyone over thirty," many youth say.

Both generations, however, agree on one thing. The focus of the youth movement is on the campuses of our nation's colleges and universities. Here the movement began and here it is strongest.

Berkeley seems to have been the start of the current wave of student protest; Kent State and its aftermath is its
peak to date. Yet, this upsurge was unforeseen by all and followed a decade of quiet and tranquility on the campuses. It is true that there had been unrest in the twenties and thirties, but the forties and fifties had been quiet. So too were the sixties—until Berkeley.

The present study concerns college students in particular, the attitudes they hold toward both their society and their own personal life within that society, and how these attitudes affect their behavior. The six specific variables being dealt with are libertinism, religious conservatism, political activism, personal anomie, systemic anomie, and probusiness. These are viewed from the perspective that the attitudes and opinions held by the students will influence their behavior. Specifically, this perspective views feelings of anomie or alienation (the two terms will be used interchangeably throughout) as affecting the religious, political, and libertine views and behavior of the students. This study is an extension of an analysis on the relationship between religious conservatism and libertinism conducted by Jerome E. Johnson.¹

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature will consist of a survey of the most relevant literature on the variables under study. Emphasis will be placed on the literature on anomie, on student activism, and on their relationship. Some attention will be given to perspectives on religion and libertinism as they relate to anomie or activism. Anomie (or alienation, the two terms will continue to be used interchangeably) will be examined first. Afterwards attention will be focused on activism, especially as it is related to anomie, with a short examination of religiosity and libertinism following. The relationship between religiosity and libertinism will not be discussed since that discussion and analysis was previously done by Johnson in his thesis.¹

The concepts of alienation and anomie have been used often and in many different ways, forms, and contexts since the times of Marx and Durkheim. In trying to systematize this usage Seeman found five ways that the concept of alienation had been used in the literature. These five variants he called powerlessness, meaninglessness,

¹Ibid.
normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement. Daniel Bell differentiated between estrangement, a social-psychological category, and reification, a failure of life to meet certain "objective" philosophical standards.

Merton uses cultural goals and institutionalized means to form his well-known typology of modes of individual adaptation to social pressure. The acceptance of both goals and means is conformity. To accept the culturally-prescribed goals while rejecting the institutionalized means of achieving them, he calls innovation. Ritualism is to reject the goals and accept the means. To reject both is retreatism. To reject both and to substitute new goals and means in their place is rebellion. Mizruchi says that Merton's category of innovation, in which cultural goals are desired while the means of achieving them are rejected, is typical of the anomie of the lower class. But he says that middle-class anomie is due to boundlessness, an "aspiring to what is

---


unattainable," a more distinctively Durkheimian concept. 5

Many classifications of types of alienation and anomie have been made over the years. Marvin Olsen classifies political alienation into attitudes of incapability and attitudes of discontentment. A person having attitudes of incapability "feels incapable of participating effectively in social interaction because of the nature of his social environment. Alienation is involuntarily imposed upon the individual by the social system." Guidelessness, powerlessness, and meaninglessness are types of attitudes in this category. Attitudes of discontentment occur when the person believes that "his social world is not worth participating in. Alienation is voluntarily chosen by the individual as an attitude toward the social system." 6

Taviss completed a content analysis of literature of the 1900's and the 1950's to find whether there were any differences in the forms of alienation of those two periods. The two forms she used were social alienation and self-alienation:

Alienation results from disjunctions between social demands and values and individual needs and inclinations. Given tension between self and society, two ideal-type extreme forms of resolution are possible:


(1) social alienation—in which individual selves may find the social system in which they live to be oppressive or incompatible with some of their own desires and feel estranged from it; and (2) self-alienation—in which individual selves may lose contact with any inclinations or desires that are not in agreement with prevailing social patterns, manipulate their selves in accordance with apparent social demands, and/or feel incapable of controlling their own actions.

In social alienation blame is placed on the society; in self-alienation, on the self. Taviss found that social alienation had decreased slightly and self-alienation had greatly increased.7

Two extensive classifications of types of alienation are those of Barakat and Keniston. Barakat sees alienation as a process occurring in three basic stages. The first stage, the source of alienation, is a state of overcontrol or undercontrol in either the social or the normative structure. The second stage is the actual feeling of dissatisfaction and rejection. The third is the consequences of alienation: retreatism, compliance, or active involvement.8

In the appendix to his book on alienated students, Keniston introduces a classification of types of alienation. This classification is based on four criteria. Focus is the


first criterion; from what is the person alienated? From his society as a whole? His work? Or some "deep, vital, and valuable part of himself"? Keniston's second criterion is replacement. What replaces the old relationship? Indifference? Hostility? The mode of expression is a third criterion. Is it autoplastic, an attempt to change the self, or alloplastic, an attempt to change the world? The agent or source of the alienation is the fourth criterion. Was the alienation chosen? Or was it forced on the individual?9

Joachim Israel examines the concept of alienation in depth and finally rejects it in favor of "reification." This term he uses to denote a process in which social relations lose their social character, i.e., they take on the character of "relations between things."10

Having examined anomie let us now turn our attention to activism, specifically modern student political activism. There has probably always been a certain measure of intergenerational conflict. The question now is whether there is any difference between the generational conflict that has always existed and that which is now extant under the names of "youth revolt," or "student rebellion," or "war against the Establishment." Friedenberg gives a strong affirmative


answer to this question. He says that previous generational conflict was over who should control society—should the older give way to the younger? But now many do not consider the present society worth having at all.11

Middleton and Putney found that approximately two-fifths of the students sampled rebelled against what they considered to be their parents' political views. This rebellion was overwhelmingly liberal in direction. Most of the conservatives were merely reflecting a conservative background; whereas, most liberals had rebelled from the more conservative position held by their families.12 These results were disputed by Levitt on the basis of his study at the University of Maryland. He found about the same proportion of "rebels" as Middleton and Putney, but he found that nearly as many had turned in conservative as in liberal directions.13

Westby and Braungart found that left-wing activists come mainly from upper-middle-class backgrounds, whereas

13 Morris Levitt, "Notes on 'Student Rebellion against Parental Political Beliefs,'" Social Forces, XLIII (March, 1965), 429.
those of the right are more likely from lower-middle- or working-class backgrounds. This was interpreted by the "status-politics" theory as being due to the confidence felt by the upper-middle class in having "arrived." Thus, they can afford to be somewhat deviant. The lower-middle and working classes, on the other hand, feel a need to conform due to insecurity. They conclude that "generally, student activists seem to be expressing ideological positions that, though extreme, are in the main consistent with the political orientations of their families."14

Lubell reports that the most critical dividing point between the generations revolves around the matter of career choice. The split is between looking to the private as opposed to the public purse.15

Richard Flacks has been quite active in writing on student protest. He examined the past conditions under which students have been agents of opposition and change—when they were marginal in the labor market due to their numbers exceeding the positions they considered acceptable to one of their status and when they found that the values in which they were reared were no longer appropriate to the changing social reality—and found that these conditions were not


present in the current situation. He found that this is a revolt of the advantaged, of upper- and upper-middle-class students. Most were capable of doing quite well in our society. He sketched the following argument for the development of student protest: First, there is the "increasing rationalization of student life" and the decrease of coherent careers separate from bureaucratic organizations. Second, these two trends converge with child-rearing trends emphasizing democracy, equality, permissiveness, and idealism. Third, young people reared in this manner find the submissiveness, respect, competitiveness, and self-control expected by the institutionalized structures of society to be difficult to accommodate to their own style of life. Fourth, the incentives of the occupational sphere hold little appeal for them. Fifth, the presence of large numbers of such students on the campuses gives them the chance for interaction with others of similar views. Sixth, these expressions of dissatisfaction will spread, as these protesters are the ones who have internalized the values and life-styles which were only advocated in the abstract by the previous generation. He found that activists and their parents share a common, unconventional complex of values emphasizing romanticism, intellectualism, humanitarianism, and moralism.16

In another article Flacks extended his analysis: Humanist youth found a discontinuity between the liberal values they had been taught in their families and the conditions they found existing in the society at large. They also found that though there were careers available for them, these careers were irrelevant to their own desires and values. Finally they saw, as a result of the traumatic events of the sixties, the failure of their parent's generation to solve our national problems through reform and gradualism. To them, "by 1968 American society did seem largely reactionary, authoritarian, and repressive." Flacks sees the student movements as signifying that "a new social and cultural stage is in the process of formation." 17

In a later article Mankoff and Flacks, by comparing veteran with non-veteran protesters, found that the "family socialization" thesis is less adequate for explaining the newer protesters. They indicated the possibility of a developing "class consciousness" among youth. The new recruits are much less pacifist than the old veterans from humanist families. 18


In comparing activists with conventionalists, Block, Haan and Smith obtained results similar to Flacks in regard to their socialization. These differences were found to exist even when educational, occupational, and religious variables were controlled. 19

One factor sometimes presented as leading to student protest is the relationship between the academic-intellectual elite and the political structure. Eisenstadt calls this "intellectual antinomianism." He says this is due to the "close relation between the activities and orientations of intellectuals and the authorities in the formation and crystallization of the specific cultural and social contours" and to "the close relation between . . . the skills and technical knowledge of certain groups of intellectuals and the organizational exigencies of the exercise of power and authority in any society." This antinomianism is an important ingredient in the intellectual orientation of many today. The change of the educational process from an elite to a mass phenomenon, together with the structural and symbolical aspects of modernity, has given rise to cultural and social contradictions having mainly to do with the discrepancy between the promise and the actuality of plenty and equality. These contradictions, together with the vastly different life experiences of the present youth and their parents,

largely explain the alienation present in the contemporary student rebellion.\(^\text{20}\) Lipset says that much of the present upswing in student activity is due to the return of social criticism after Communism lost its monolithic unity. The shift to the left among faculty was largely due to the resentment among "general intellectuals" against the increasing specialization and technological orientation of the present time, in which these generalists have lost much of their prestige and influence to the specialists. Also the faculty are caught in a competitive "publish-or-perish" situation and feel insecure and anxious. They find comfort in student militancy against the system.\(^\text{21}\) Empirical support for these ideas was found by Kahn and Bowers. When they held the quality of the colleges constant, they found that there was no consistent relationship between socio-economic status and activism. They concluded that high quality campuses fostered activism among all categories of students.\(^\text{22}\)


Levy has introduced the theory of reduced alternatives as one explanation of the distinction between the politically active and the politically passive. Systemic punishments occur when the benefits of the society fall short of the wishes of the individual. Frustration results from such punishment. This frustration leads to a "reduction of potential response alternatives," psychological rigidity, and an intolerance of social ambiguity. Identification with authority is a defense mechanism, as is withdrawal (alienation). Possibly alienation, rather than identification, results when the threat from authority is too great or when the authority does not provide sufficient symbols for identification. The theory of reduced alternatives proposes that the politically active have a wider range of cognitive and response alternatives than the politically passive. The active thus have a more flexible outlook and less need to identify with authority. They are therefore more able to see and respond to threats from authority. "The major determinant of the range of available political responses is the amount of past systemic punishment the individual has experienced, though individual and cultural learning is also important." 23

Pinner proposes the idea of viewing students as a marginal elite in politics. They often combine with other

groups to attempt to influence their society. But, having little inherent power, they are the junior partners in such alliances. Thus, they are rarely able to see their aims effected in the long run.\textsuperscript{24}

Keniston makes a distinction between two types of dissenters: the activists and the culturally alienated. The activist accepts parental values, but sees the society as falling short in achieving them. The culturally alienated, on the other hand, rejects the values of his parents and is often attracted to the use of marijuana and drugs. Keniston sees four factors as sources of activism. The first is the discrepancy seen by the student between the humanist values he learned from his family and the actual conditions of society. The second source is the image, characteristics, and recruitment of college students. The size of the college, the number of activist-prone students, the strength of the activist sub-culture, and the amount of gap between student hopes and institutional reality are all factors here. The cultural climate is a third source of activism. Support from the faculty (often a reference group for students), the broad climate of social criticism in America, and socio-cultural conditions promoting psychological flexibility are all part of a protest-favoring cultural climate. The specific historical situation of the day is the

fourth factor. The anti-ideological bias of the students and their sensitivity to world events, due in part no doubt to mass communications, both favor protest. Lipset also differentiates between these two groups, calling them radicals and renouncers.

Laufer considers the conflict of generations in America to be a middle-class phenomenon due to three factors. The first factor is the impact of post-industrial society on the children of the middle class. They are expected to spend more time and effort in intensive training for a position in the occupational structure. Yet, in spite of this long and arduous training, the relative social standing of the highly educated is lower than ever before. This lower status is due to the relative abundance of people with such qualifications. Laufer's second factor is the changed child-rearing patterns to which this generation was subjected. They were reared by parents who put their children's inner needs and demands before the demands of society. They were not reared with the defense mechanisms which the older generation had developed against finding the adjustments demanded by society contrary to their own inner needs. The third factor he gives as leading to the conflict of generations has been the unique historical experience of


of this generation which resulted in its disillusionment with the American dream. This disillusionment has been due to the perceived rigidity of the society on such issues as race, Vietnam, and cultural experimentation. The basic conflict is between an older generation committed to both the present societal institutions and to a more "humane" society and a younger generation that considers the validity of an institution to be determined by its responsiveness to human needs.  

Having covered the literature on anomie and on activism in some depth, let us now briefly examine the literature on some of the other relationships. Hoge says that trends toward religious conservatism are inverse to those toward political activism. He also says that the politically active tend not to be traditionally religious. Hastings and Hoge relate religious conservatism to privatism. Since the fifties the trend has been toward activism, rather than privatism, and has thus been away from traditional religiosity.


29Philip K. Hastings and Dean R. Hoge, "Religious Change among College Students over Two Decades," Social Forces, XLIX (September, 1970), 27.
From his study of Catholics, Henriot recommends caution in equating liberalism in political affairs with religious liberalism.\(^{30}\) Suchman characterizes much of modern youth as having an irreverent "hang-loose" ethic. He found no relationship between marijuana smoking, one characteristic of the "hang-loose" ethic, and alienation. He did find that marijuana users were more likely to believe that students should have a more active role in making decisions about student life.\(^ {31}\)

In this review of literature the relationship between anomie and activism has been emphasized. Theories accounting for a substantial relationship between these two variables were summarized. Probably the most insightful view was the one held by Keniston in that he differentiated between the activists and the culturally alienated as types of dissenters and gave four factors leading to student activism. The concluding chapter of this thesis will help the reader to see the integration of the various factors and theoretical perspectives which have been presented here.


CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODS

Hypotheses

The general hypotheses to be tested by this analysis may be stated formally as follows: There is a significant relationship between the political activism and the libertinism of an individual. There is a significant relationship between his religiosity and his political activism. There is a significant relationship between an individual's anomie and his religiosity, his political activism, and his libertinism. These hypotheses are based on a causal model which sees systemic anomie as prior to personal anomie and which sees both types of anomie as prior to religious conservatism, political activism, and libertinism. The directionality of the various relationships described in the hypotheses and the writer's expectations as to their directionality will be discussed in the last two chapters. The following are the specific null hypotheses:

1. There is no relationship between political activism and libertinism.

2. There is no relationship between religiosity and political activism.

3. There is no relationship between personal anomie and religiosity.
4. There is no relationship between systemic anomie and religiosity.

5. There is no relationship between personal anomie and political activism.

6. There is no relationship between systemic anomie and political activism.

7. There is no relationship between personal anomie and libertinism.

8. There is no relationship between systemic anomie and libertinism.

**Sample**

The hypotheses given above will be tested by means of a secondary analysis of data collected by Roper Research Associates, Inc. and used in "A Study of the Beliefs and Attitudes of Male College Seniors, Freshmen and Alumni." In their report of this study, the Roper researchers gave a description of the sample. During the winter of 1968-1969 a representative nationwide sample of 1002 male college seniors, 500 male freshmen, and 673 alumni of the class of 1964 were interviewed. This present analysis is concerned only with the sample of seniors. The seniors are considered important for study because they have already had the benefit of nearly four years of college life, most have already had to make decisions about their futures, and from them can be expected to come many of the future leaders of our nation.
Method of Data Collection

One hundred colleges were randomly selected from a list containing all the accredited colleges in the United States. The colleges were stratified on the list by type of college (public, independent, religious), size of the student body, and geographic section. Replacements were chosen which were of similar characteristics to the nine colleges that refused to cooperate. Ten seniors were interviewed from each college finally selected. The names of the respondents were randomly chosen from a list of all students at each school. All respondents were interviewed individually by trained interviewers. The interviews included a self-administered questionnaire containing questions that were both personal and sensitive in nature.¹

Operationalization of Variables

Variable One: libertinism.—Libertinism is operationally defined in terms of three questions concerned with one's orientation and attitude toward certain selected social issues. The three questions used were about one's feelings toward the sale of marijuana, one's experience with marijuana, and one's attitude toward premarital sex. Each item was dichotomized into libertine and non-libertine responses. Each item having a libertine response was

scored as one in forming the libertinism index; each item having a non-libertine response was scored as zero. Thus a libertinism index was formed from the three items which varied from a high (strongly libertine) score of three to a low of zero.

**Variable Two: religiosity.**—Religiosity will be considered in terms of the degree of religious conservatism. This is measured by a summated index constructed from three items of religiosity. These items are concept of God, views toward organized religion, and church attendance. Each of these items was dichotomized with conservative responses being scored as one and other responses as zero. Possible scores ranged from zero to three; a high score indicating greater conservatism in religious orientation. The indices for the first two variables were originally developed by Jerome E. Johnson in his study of the interrelationship of religiosity and libertinism.²

**Variable Three: political activism.**—Political activism is operationally defined in terms of three questions dealing with one's political participation. The questions used had to do with one's plans for future political activity, one's activity in student government, and one's activity in student movements. Each item was broken down into active and inactive responses. Each active response was scored one and each inactive response, zero, in order to form a summated

Index of political activism. On this index a high score indicated a high degree of political activity and involvement; a low score indicated less activity and involvement. The range of possible scores was from zero to three.

Variable Four: Personal anomie.—Personal anomie will be considered in terms of degree of alienation observed from the perception of one's own future. This is measured by a summated index constructed from three items measuring this form of anomie. These items are opinion of national future, effect of the individual, and opinion of personal future. Each item was dichotomized into anomie responses, which were scored one, and non-anomic responses, scored zero. Possible scores ranged from zero to three, with high score indicating greater anomie.

Variable Five: Systemic anomie.—Systemic anomie is operationalized in terms of four questions dealing with one's opinion of four institutions of our society: the political system, the judicial system, the economic system, and the system of higher education. The item concerning each system was trichotomized into responses of low, moderate, and high degree. Zero, one, and two points were assigned, respectively, to these responses. The scores for each respondent on each of the four items were combined to form a summated index of systemic anomie. The range for this index was from zero to eight, with a high score denoting a higher degree of anomie.
The fourth and fifth variables, while both were concerned with the same concept of anomie or alienation, differ in the focus of the anomie; i.e., they differ in that from which the individual is alienated. Keniston discusses this concept of the focus of alienation in the appendix to his book on alienated students.  

Variable Six: probusiness.--Probusiness is considered in terms of how favorably or unfavorably one views American business. It is measured by a summated index consisting of nine items evaluating American business and its activities. These items state that American business gives good value, provides job security, is too powerful, is often not honest, is a progressive social force, hoodwinks through advertising, represents U.S. well in foreign countries, is generous to good causes, and has lost sight of human values. All probusiness responses to the items of the index were assigned values of one, while all other responses were scored zero. Thus, a probusiness index was formed with a range of scores from zero through nine, with the higher score indicating a more favorable attitude toward the American business community.

Manipulation of Data

The analysis of the data will be done principally by means of Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients.

\[^{3}\text{Keniston, Uncommitted, p. 453.}\]
These will be used to measure the strength of various relationships; F-ratios will be computed from them to test the significance of these relationships. For purposes of comparison a nonparametric statistic, Kendall's tau, and its test of significance will also be computed. The data will be analyzed on an IBM 360 model 40 computer system.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Construction of Variable Indices

Before discussing the specific hypotheses of this study and deriving a model using the six variables, attention should be given to the operationalization of these variables into specific indices.

The first two indices, those of libertinism and religious conservatism, were developed by Jerome E. Johnson in a study in which he both related these two variables and related them again controlling for a number of other variables. More complete information about these indices is given in his thesis than will be presented here.¹

The libertinism index consisted of three items. These items concerned individuals' feelings toward the sale of marijuana, experience with marijuana, and attitudes toward premarital sex. (See Appendix A for the questions in full.) Of the respondents surveyed, 46.7 percent held libertine positions regarding the sale of marijuana; i.e., they thought marijuana should either be "legally for sale under controlled conditions" or "should be freely sold to all who want it." Twenty-five percent gave a libertine

response regarding experience with marijuana in that they reported that they themselves had used marijuana. Concerning attitudes toward premarital sex, 53.1 percent indicated some degree of permissiveness in their feelings toward premarital sexual behavior.

The internal reliability of this index is quite good. The point-biserial r's of .30 for feelings toward the sale of marijuana, .74 for experience with marijuana, and .78 for attitude toward premarital sex, as well as an alpha coefficient of .57, show that the items that make up this libertinism index are clearly interrelated.²

Three attitudinal statements were employed to form the index of religious conservatism: individuals' concept of God, views toward organized religion, and frequency of church attendance. Of the respondents surveyed, 31.4 percent had a religiously conservative outlook in that they conceived of God as "the supreme being." Fifty-two percent had a conservative view of organized religion; i.e., they either felt that the church is "beginning to 'get with' the mood of the times" or they believed that the church is "a constructive and dynamic movement." A total of 59.9 percent were classified as having a conservative religious orientation in that they said they attended church either occasionally or regularly.

²Ibid., p. 29.
The internal reliability of the religious conservatism index can be shown by the following point-biserial correlation coefficients: .67 for concept of God, .69 for views toward organized religion, and .66 for church attendance. This reliability can be corroborated by the alpha coefficient of .39 for the index.  

As concerns political activism, our third variable, three statements were employed: plans of future activity, activity in student government, and activity in student movements. An examination of the data presented in Table 1 indicates 30.4 percent of the respondents surveyed had a politically active outlook in that they planned to be "very active" in political affairs in the future. Concerning activity in student government, 27.4 percent gave a politically active response in that they indicated that they were or had been "moderately active" or "very active" in student government. Finally as pertains to activity in student movements, a total of 34.5 percent indicated that they were or had been "moderately active" or "very active" in student movements, and were thus classified as being politically active.

The internal reliability of the political activism index, formed by the composite of the three items indicated above, is presented in Table 2. The product-moment inter-item correlation coefficients and point-biserial correlation coefficients, as well as the alpha coefficient, were used.

\[3\]Ibid., pp. 26-29
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans of Future Activity</th>
<th>Activity in Student Government</th>
<th>Activity in Student Movements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack interest</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Moderately active</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Very active</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No response</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Considered as active response

Total 100.0% Total 100.0% Total 100.0%
in assessing the reliability of this index. The point-biserial correlation coefficients were .74 for plans of future activity, .72 for activity in student government, and .81 for activity in student movements. The response yielded an alpha coefficient of .63. Validity of this index and the following indices was based on face-examination of the individual items.

TABLE 2

INTERRELATIONSHIP OF ITEMS IN THE POLITICAL ACTIVISM INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Item (with activist response)</th>
<th>Inter-item Correlation Coefficients</th>
<th>Item Total r's</th>
<th>Number of Positive Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Positive Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Plans of Future Activity (very active)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Activity in Student Government (moderately or very active)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Activity in Student Movements (moderately or very active)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aTotal N=973, not including "no responses" on one or more items (N=29).

bPoint-biserial correlation coefficients. Alpha coefficient=0.63.
In order to measure the fourth variable, a personal anomie index was constructed. This index included items concerning individuals' opinion of our national future, opinion on the effect of the individual, and opinion of their own personal future. Data presented in Table 3 indicate forty percent of the respondents surveyed felt anomie concerning our national future; they felt "a little pessimistic" or "very pessimistic" about it. An anomie response was given by 38.2 percent of the respondents in regard to their opinion that the individual had "very little effect" or "no effect." Finally, as pertains to the third item, opinion of personal future, 57.1 percent indicated some degree of anomie by saying they were "very pessimistic," "a little pessimistic," or only "moderately optimistic" about their own personal future.

To establish the index's reliability, inter-item and point-biserial correlation coefficients, as well as the alpha coefficient, were calculated. With point-biserial r's of .69 for opinion of national future, .72 for effect of the individual, and .62 for opinion of personal future, and an alpha coefficient equal to .40, the items that make up the libertinism index can be seen to be interrelated (see Table 4).

To form the fifth variable, an index of systemic anomie, four items were employed: opinion of the political system, opinion of the judicial system, opinion of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion of National Future</th>
<th>Effect of the Individual</th>
<th>Opinion of Personal Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very optimistic</td>
<td>Substantial effect</td>
<td>Very optimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately optimistic</td>
<td>Some real effect</td>
<td>Moderately optimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little pessimistic</td>
<td>Very little effect</td>
<td>A little pessimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very pessimistic</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Very pessimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Considered as anomic response*
TABLE 4

INTERRELATIONSHIP OF ITEMS IN THE PERSONAL ANOMIE INDEXa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anomie Item (with anomie response)</th>
<th>Inter-item Correlation Coefficients</th>
<th>Item Number of Total Positive r's of Positive Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Opinion of National Future (pessimistic)</td>
<td>- .20 .19 .69</td>
<td>401 40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Effect of the Individual (very little or no effect)</td>
<td>- .16 .72</td>
<td>383 38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Opinion of Personal Future (only moderately optimistic or pessimistic)</td>
<td>- .62</td>
<td>572 57.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

atable N=974, not including "no responses" on one or more items (N=28).

b Point-biserial correlation coefficients. Alpha coefficient=0.40.

economic system (system of business and industry), and opinion of the system of higher education. For each of these items four substantive responses were possible. A response of "basically sound and good" was considered low on anomie. A response of "needs some improvement" was considered moderately anomie. Responses of "needs many improvements"
or "needs fundamental overhauling" were considered as high on anomie. Of the respondents surveyed, 71.5 percent had a moderately anomie view of our political system, and 18.2 percent had a highly anomie view of it. Concerning our judicial system, 54.0 percent of the respondents had a moderately anomie outlook; 23.8 percent had a highly anomie outlook. Of the respondents, 47.8 percent had a moderately anomie view of our economic system, and 10.1 percent had a highly anomie view of it. Concerning our system of higher education, 56.1 percent of the respondents had a moderately anomie outlook; 23.2 percent had a highly anomie outlook. These data are presented in Table 5.

The internal reliability of the systemic anomie index, formed by the composite of the four items indicated above, is presented in Table 6. The inter-item and point-biserial correlation coefficients, as well as the alpha coefficient, were used to assess the reliability of this index. The point-biserial correlation coefficients were .66 for opinion of the political system, .62 for opinion of the judicial system, .68 for opinion of the economic system, and .62 for opinion of the system of higher education. The responses yielded an alpha coefficient of .53. Thus, the items forming this index can be seen to be interrelated.

In order to measure the sixth variable, a probusiness index was constructed. This index was formed from nine statements about American business that the respondents
**TABLE 5**

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES USED IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SYSTEMIC ANOMIE INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Political System</th>
<th>Judicial System</th>
<th>Economic System</th>
<th>Higher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basically sound and good</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Needs some improvement&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Needs many improvements&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Needs fundamental overhauling&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No response</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Considered as anomic response

<sup>b</sup> Considered as very anomic response
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemic Item</th>
<th>Inter-Item Correlation Coefficients</th>
<th>Number of Anomic Item Responses</th>
<th>Number of Anomic Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Anomic Responses</th>
<th>Number of Very Anomic Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Very Anomic Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Political System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Judicial System</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Economic System</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Higher Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a \)Total N=942, not including "no responses" on one or more items (N=60).

\( ^b \)Point-biserial correlation coefficients. Alpha coefficient=0.53.
rated as "largely true" or "largely untrue." Data presented in Table 7 indicate that 80.4 percent of the respondents surveyed held probusiness positions in regard to the statement that American business gives good value; i.e., they

TABLE 7
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES USED IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROBUSINESS INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Largely true</th>
<th>Largely untrue</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American business:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives good value</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides job security</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is too powerful</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is often not honest</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a progressive social force</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoodwinks through advertising</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents U.S. well in foreign countries</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is generous to good causes</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has lost sight of human values</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aConsidered as probusiness response

regarded that statement as "largely true." The statement that American business provides job security was given a probusiness response of "largely true" by 78.2 percent of the
respondents. A probusiness response of "largely untrue" was given by 64.8 percent of the respondents to the statement that American business is too powerful. Of the respondents surveyed, 35.4 percent held probusiness positions in regard to the statement that American business is often not honest; i.e., they regarded that statement as "largely untrue." The statement that American business is a progressive social force was given a probusiness response of "largely true" by 52.8 percent of the respondents. A probusiness response of "largely untrue" was given by 36.8 percent of the respondents to the statement that American business hoodwinks through advertising. Of the respondents surveyed, 54.9 percent held probusiness positions in regard to the statement that American business represents the U.S. well in foreign countries; i.e., they regarded that statement as "largely true." The statement that American business is generous to good causes was given a probusiness response of "largely true" by 66.4 percent of the respondents. A probusiness response of "largely untrue" was given by 44.0 percent of the respondents to the statement that American business has lost sight of human values.

Inter-item and point-biserial correlation coefficients and the alpha coefficient were calculated to establish the internal reliability of the probusiness index. With point-biserials r's of .43 for American business gives good value, .42 for it provides job security, .54 for it is too powerful,
.64 for it is often not honest, .52 for it is a progressive social force, .54 for it hoodwinks through advertising, .62 for it represents U.S. well in foreign countries, .47 for it is generous to good causes, and .64 for it has lost sight of human values, as well as an alpha coefficient of .70, the items that make up the probusiness index can be seen to be interrelated (see Table 8).

Examination of Hypotheses

With these indices it is now possible to test the hypotheses previously formulated. The null hypotheses will be examined first:

1. There is no relationship between political activism and libertinism. With a correlation coefficient of .12 (see Table 9), this null hypothesis can be rejected at the .001 significance level. A positive relationship is found to exist between these two variables.

2. There is no relationship between religiosity and political activism. The correlation coefficient of .01 between these two variables is not high enough to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted; no relationship is found between religiosity and political activism.

3. There is no relationship between personal anomie and religiosity. With a correlation coefficient of -.13, a negative relationship is shown to exist between these two variables that is significant at the .001 level.
TABLE 8
INTERRELATIONSHIP OF ITEMS IN THE PROBUSINESS INDEX\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Item (with probusiness response)</th>
<th>Inter-item Correlation Coefficients A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American business:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Gives good value (true)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Provides job security (true)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Is too powerful (untrue)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Is often not honest (untrue)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Is a progressive social force (true)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Hoodwinks through advertising (untrue)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Represents U.S. well in foreign countries (true)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Is generous to good causes (true)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Has lost sight of human values (untrue)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Total N=714, not including "no responses" on one or more items (N=283).

\(^b\)Point-biserial correlation coefficients. Alpha coefficient=0.70.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Total r's</th>
<th>Number of Positive Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Positive Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.43</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.42</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.54</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.64</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.52</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.54</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.62</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.47</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.64</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9

INTERRELATIONSHIP OF VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libertinism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Conservatism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Activism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Anomie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic Anomie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probusiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable 1 Libertinism</td>
<td>- .42a</td>
<td>.12a</td>
<td>.19a</td>
<td>.27a</td>
<td>.25a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(880)</td>
<td>(943)</td>
<td>(945)</td>
<td>(914)</td>
<td>(686)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable 2 Religious Conservatism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.13a</td>
<td>-.18a</td>
<td>.13b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(881)</td>
<td>(878)</td>
<td>(852)</td>
<td>(642)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable 3 Political Activism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.11a</td>
<td>.17a</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(945)</td>
<td>(916)</td>
<td>(687)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable 4 Personal Anomie</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.24a</td>
<td>-.15a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(915)</td>
<td>(689)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable 5 Systemic Anomie</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.34a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(673)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable 6 Probusiness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aSignificant at .001 level with both correlation coefficients and Kendall's tau.

bSignificant at .001 level with Kendall's tau but not with correlation coefficients (see Appendix B, Table 11).

4. There is no relationship between systemic anomie and religiosity. The correlation coefficient of -.18 is sufficient to reject the null hypothesis at the .001 level. Thus, there exists a significant negative relationship between these two variables.

5. There is no relationship between personal anomie and political activism. With a correlation coefficient of
.11, a negative relationship is shown to exist between these two variables that is significant at the .001 level.

6. There is no relationship between systemic anomie and political activism. The correlation coefficient of .17 is sufficient to reject the null hypothesis at the .001 level. Thus, there exists a significant positive relationship between these two variables.

7. There is no relationship between personal anomie and libertinism. With a correlation coefficient of .19, a positive relationship is shown to exist between these two variables that is significant at the .001 level.

8. There is no relationship between systemic anomie and libertinism. The correlation coefficient of .27 is sufficient to reject the null hypothesis at the .001 level. Thus, there exists a significant positive relationship between these two variables.

The following conclusions can be reached concerning the general hypotheses: There is a significant relationship between the political activism and the libertinism of an individual. There is no significant relationship between his religiosity and his political activism. There is a significant relationship between an individual's anomie and his religiosity, his political activism, and his libertinism.
Evaluation of a Causal Model

Simon⁴ and Blalock⁵ describe a method of using the intercorrelations between variables as the basis of evaluating causal models interrelating these variables. This method was used to build and evaluate a series of causal models culminating in the one shown in Figure 1. This model shows probusiness as a direct cause of systemic anomie \((r=-.34)\) and of libertinism \((r=-.25)\). Systemic anomie is in turn pictured as a direct cause of personal anomie \((r=.24)\), political activism \((r=.17)\), religious conservatism \((r=-.18)\), and libertinism \((r=.27)\). The model shows personal anomie as a direct cause of political activism \((r=-.11)\), religious conservatism \((r=-.13)\), and libertinism \((r=.12)\); so also is religious conservatism pictured as a direct cause of libertinism \((r=-.42)\).

According to the Simon-Blalock method, the accuracy of a given causal model is determined by the closeness of the predicted to the actual correlations. These correlations are the ones which are between the variables not directly linked in the model. There are two ways of arriving at these correlations. The first is to compare the actual correlations between the variables in the model to the predicted correlations.


zero-order correlation coefficients with those generated by the prediction equations appropriate to a given causal model. These are given in the first four pairs of correlations in Table 10. The second way is to control "for all variables that are either prior to one or both of the variables being related or that may be intervening between them." The actual partial correlation is compared to that predicted by the model which would be a .000. The second four pairs of correlations in Table 10 are the predicted

---

6Ibid., p. 67.
TABLE 10
CORRELATIONS FROM PREDICTION EQUATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r_{23}$</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{26}$</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{36}$</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{46}$</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{23.456}$</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{26.45}$</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{36.45}$</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{46.5}$</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hubert Blalock says there is no specific set of criteria for evaluating the goodness of fit of a particular causal model in *Causal Inferences in Nonexperimental Research*, pp. 79-80, and also says that the researcher must "proceed in ex-post-facto manner to look for models that are at least theoretically plausible and that will yield somewhat better predictions."

and actual partials derived in this manner. It should be noted that this method of evaluating causal models does not establish the validity of a model. It merely rejects other models as being inferior to the final one. Using it, one is generally able to distinguish between any two that seem to
be realistic theoretical alternatives. The given model was the best of the several that were examined.

There are three things that need to be noted about the model at this time. First, it should be noted that although personal anomie is an intervening variable between systemic anomie and libertinism, religious conservatism, and political activism, the direct relationship between systemic anomie and each of the three resultant variables is stronger than that between personal anomie and the three.

Second, the greater strength of this relationship might lead one to think that perhaps it is systemic anomie that is the intervening variable. There are two reasons, however, to believe that this could not be the case. The first concerns the relationships among probusiness, systemic anomie, and personal anomie. The relative strengths of the relationships among them ($r_{45} = .24$; $r_{56} = -.34$; $r_{46} = -.15$) indicate that systemic anomie is the intervening variable between the other two. Since probusiness shows little relationship with religious conservatism and political activism, the ordering of these three variables relative to the three resultant variables should not be reversed. The second reason for believing that the relationships among these variables are not simply a matter of systemic anomie intervening between personal anomie and the three resultant variables is that the relationship between

---

political activism and personal anomie is negative, whereas the relationship between activism and systemic anomie is positive. For these two reasons it appears that the present ordering of personal anomie intervening between systemic anomie and the three resultant variables, with a direct connection between systemic anomie and the three also present, is the best arrangement.

The third noteworthy characteristic of this model has already been mentioned. This is the difference in direction between political activism and the two anomie measures. This clearly shows they measure two different aspects of anomie. Some theoretical implications of this will be discussed in the concluding chapter.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

In the preceding pages of this thesis we have seen some of the work and thoughts of previous researchers relevant to this study. We have seen the construction and interrelationship of the six variables used here. In this conclusion the writer will focus attention on the meaning of the results of this study and on how these relate to previous research and to the ongoing life of our society.

But first we must examine the theoretical meaning of the six variables themselves. The three dependent variables, libertinism, religious conservatism, and political activism, need little explanation. However a brief discussion of personal anomie and systemic anomie would be in order. Keniston and Taviss refer to the focus of alienation, i.e., that from which the individual is alienated.¹ This seems to be the distinction between the two anomie indices used in this study. Systemic anomie is the equivalent of social alienation; both refer to a state of disenchantment with our society as a whole. The index of personal anomie seems to be more closely related to

¹Keniston, Uncommitted, p. 453; Taviss, "Changes in the Form of Alienation," pp. 46-47.
the concept of self-alienation. In both the individual is showing his disenchantment with his own personal life.

The sixth variable, probusiness, also has theoretical implications. This index seems to be, more than anything else, a measure of economic conservatism. Lipset makes the distinction between liberalism on economic matters and liberalism on matters concerning civil liberties. Economic liberalism was related to a lower social class position. Civil-liberties liberalism was related to a higher social class position. The probusiness scale could also be considered as a measure of "economic non-anomie" since it has been discovered that right-wingers view themselves as acting within institutions whereas left-wingers view themselves as more often acting against or toward them. This further demonstrates Henriot's finding that different forms of liberalism cannot be automatically equated, nor can different forms of anomie.

With these concepts in mind, it is now possible to examine the results of this study and the model derived from it in order to see the theoretical implications. That the probusiness index is inversely related to systemic anomie

---


is not surprising. The "humanist" youth that make up so many of the dissenters of our society were largely reared in families that stressed non-business and non-achievement values. Also, our society has traditionally been dominated by business interests; our traditional national ethic was a business one; therefore, hostility toward business could easily become hostility toward the larger society.

That anomie toward the society would lead to anomie toward one's life within society is hardly surprising either. Nor is it surprising that personal and systemic anomie have a similar negative relationship to religious conservatism. The traditionally religious are involved in and attached to the conventional, traditional life of our society. That both types of anomie should be positively related to libertinism is not surprising either. The libertines seem to be "turned off" both by the society and by their anticipated life in it. Therefore they turn to this life-style. The negative relationship between probusiness and libertinism seems to be from the same basic cause also. It appears that almost any factor which turns one against the society and its traditional life-style makes that person a more likely recruit to a drop-out, "hang-loose," libertine life-style.

The relationship between the two anomie indices and the index of political activism is quite interesting. Systemic anomie is positively related and personal anomie is negatively related to political activism. This is
exactly what would be theoretically expected from viewing them as parallel to social and self-alienation. The socially alienated would be active in trying to change the society. The self-alienated would not bother.

The strong negative relationship between religious conservatism and libertinism is hardly surprising. It can be interpreted from at least two perspectives. First it can be said that the relationship is due to the application of moral and religious teachings to the actual behavior of these students. Second it can be approached by viewing the religious and the libertines as two different groups, each interacting within itself and having its own norms and standards.

The fairly weak positive relation between activism and libertinism is not surprising either. Both groups are disproportionately from "humanist" backgrounds. Both are somewhat "turned off" by the society. And both have adopted somewhat the same approach and "flavor" to their personal lives.

The absence of a relationship between religious conservatism and political activism raises some interesting questions. Are these two really unrelated? Or is the relationship being masked? Perhaps there are two groups of actives, the new political activists and the old, more traditional type of active students.

The relationship between anomie and social behavior is, as has been seen, hardly a simple one. It is, however,
very important to the understanding of the whole social process, from both a theoretical and a contemporary perspective. It is the writer's opinion that this present time is one of the best, if not the best, time in all human history to see the ongoing, shifting patterns of social change and social stability interweave to form a pattern that is always changing and always the same.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONS USED IN INDEX CONSTRUCTION

Items derived from the following questions were used in the construction of the libertinism index:

How do you feel about the sale of marijuana?

1. It should be freely sold to all who want it—like butter or ginger ale
2. It should be legally for sale under controlled conditions—like beer or liquor
3. It should not be available for sale to the public, but should be highly restricted—like any other powerful or dangerous drug

Please indicate the amount and nature of your experience with marijuana

1. Never tried—don't intend to
2. Never tried—but may very well
3. Tried once—don't plan to again
4. Tried once—may well again
5. Have used 2-3 times
6. Use occasionally
7. Use frequently

There are different attitudes towards sex before marriage. For example, there are those who think sex is and should be a sacred part of marriage. Then there are those who feel it is or should be as natural as eating and drinking and breathing. Which one statement below comes closest to your view of sex?

1. Sex should be reserved solely for your wife—and after marriage
2. Sex is all right before marriage but only with someone you contemplate marrying
3. Sex should be confined to those few women you have very strong feelings for
4. Sex is appropriate with any woman you like who feels similarly inclined.
5. Sex is all right with any woman who seems attractive at the moment and is willing.

Items derived from the following questions were utilized in the construction of the index of religious conservatism:

Which one of the statements below comes closest to describing your concept of God?

1. The supreme being who created the earth and who rewards and punishes everyone in it
2. The governing force that guides the universe and maintains the balance of nature
3. A convenient term to describe the spiritual qualities and conscience of mankind
4. A myth—a figment of the imagination of basically unscientific and superstitious people
5. None of the above come close

Regardless of your definition of God, what is your view of organized religion? Which one statement below comes closest to your view of the people and works of organized religion?

1. A constructive and dynamic movement in keeping with the needs of people and responsive to the mood of the times
2. A basically good and needed movement that is beginning to "get with" the mood of the times and recognize the needs of the present world
3. A movement which, however well intentioned, is sadly lacking in terms of today's problems and out of touch with society's current needs
4. None of the above come close

Do you attend (church, Temple) services regularly, occasionally, very infrequently, or never?

Items derived from the following questions were used in the construction of the political activism index:
(Even if you don't think the individual can have much effect)

Do you plan to take a very active role in the future in trying to solve political and social problems, a moderately active role, or do you frankly lack interest in actively trying to solve political and social problems?

1. Very active
2. Moderately active
3. Lack interest
4. Don't know

I'll call off a number of different student activities. For each one I would like to know whether you have been very active, moderately active, or done very little since you have been here. How about:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very active</th>
<th>Moderately active</th>
<th>Done little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student government?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student political movements—either those directed at national problems or problems here at college?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items derived from the following questions were utilized in the construction of the index of personal anomie:

Looking now at society as a whole—our systems of government and business and education—of the directions we are moving in at home and abroad—are you very optimistic about the future of American society, moderately optimistic, or a little pessimistic, or very pessimistic?

1. Very optimistic
2. Moderately optimistic
3. A little pessimistic
4. Very pessimistic
5. Don't know

How much effect do you think the individual can have in changing the directions in which our country moves in the future? Do you think an individual can have a very substantial effect on the directions America takes, or some real effect even if not a substantial one, or very little effect, or really no effect at all?

1. Substantial effect
2. Some real effect
3. Very little effect
4. No effect
5. Don't know

As you know, there has been a good deal written recently about today's college generation and what it's supposed to believe in. But on one has really found out what's on their minds—what their hopes, goals, and thoughts are. That is the purpose of this study, and we hope you will give us your frank and complete answers to our questions. As far as your own personal future is concerned, are you highly optimistic about the future, moderately optimistic, or a little pessimistic, or very pessimistic?

1. Very optimistic
2. Moderately optimistic
3. A little pessimistic
4. Very pessimistic
5. Don't know

Items derived from the following questions were used in the construction of the systemic anomie index:

I'd like to ask you about four specific aspects of American life: Our political system, our system of administering justice, our system of business and industry, and our system of higher education. First, our political system. Which of these descriptions do you feel best applies to our political system?

1. Basically sound and essentially good
2. Basically sound but needs some improvement
3. Not too sound, needs many improvements
4. Basically unsound, needs fundamental overhauling
5. Don't know

Which of the descriptions on the card do you feel best applies to our system of administering justice?

1. Basically sound and essentially good
2. Basically sound but needs some improvement
3. Not too sound, needs many improvements
4. Basically unsound, needs fundamental overhauling
5. Don't know
Which of the descriptions on the card do you feel best applies to our system of business and industry?

1. Basically sound and essentially good
2. Basically sound but needs some improvement
3. Not too sound, needs many improvements
4. Basically unsound, needs fundamental overhauling
5. Don't know

And which of these descriptions do you feel best applies to our system of higher education?

1. Basically sound and essentially good
2. Basically sound but needs some improvement
3. Not too sound, needs many improvements
4. Basically unsound, needs fundamental overhauling
5. Don't know

Items derived from the following questions were utilized in the construction of the probusiness index:

American business and industry has been both credited and charged with many things. I'd like to know which of these statements you think are largely true, and which are largely untrue. The first one is (READ STATEMENT)

Do you think that is largely true or largely untrue?

Largely Largely Don't
true untrue know

American business and industry:

Has in most instances given good value for the money

Has been progressive in providing job security for their employees

Has become too big and powerful for the good of the country

Is far too often not honest with the public

Is a truly progressive social force in our society

Hoodwinks the public through advertising
Has represented the U.S. well in foreign countries

Has been generous in its contributions to good causes

Has lost sight of human values in the interest of profits
## APPENDIX B

### ANALYSIS WITH KENDALL'S TAU

#### TABLE II

### INTERRELATIONSHIP OF VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable 1 - Libertinism</td>
<td>- .34a</td>
<td>.09a</td>
<td>.15a</td>
<td>.21a</td>
<td>-.21a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(880)</td>
<td>(943)</td>
<td>(945)</td>
<td>(914)</td>
<td>(686)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable 2 - Religious</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11a</td>
<td>-.15a</td>
<td>.10b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatism</td>
<td></td>
<td>(881)</td>
<td>(878)</td>
<td>(852)</td>
<td>(642)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable 3 - Political Activism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.09a</td>
<td>.14a</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(945)</td>
<td>(916)</td>
<td>(687)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable 4 - Personal Anomie</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.19a</td>
<td>-.11a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(915)</td>
<td>(689)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable 5 - Systemic Anomie</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.29a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(673)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable 6 - Probusinessc</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aSignificant at .001 level with both correlation coefficients and Kendall's tau.

*bSignificant at .001 level with Kendall's tau but not with correlation coefficients (compare Table 9). The correlation coefficient is significant at the .01 level. Its lack of significance at the .001 level is probably due to the lower number of respondents to the probusiness index (N=714) rather than to a lack of relationship in the
population since the correlation coefficient is higher than
some that are significant and since the coefficient itself
is very close to being significant at the .001 level
\( F=10.67 \).

A collapsed probusiness index is used throughout
for computing tau rather than the extended index used for
the correlation coefficients.
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