POLITICAL ALIENATION AND
PARTICIPATION AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Thesis for the Degree Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
BERTRAND YOSHITO KOBAYASHI
1973

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

POLITICAL ALIENATION AND PARTICIPATION

AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

presented by

BERTRAND YOSHITO KOBAYASHI

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

___Ph.D.___ degree in _Political_
Science

Major professor

Ada W. Finifter

Date __May 9, 1973__

O-7639

ABSTRACT

POLITICAL ALIENATION AND PARTICIPATION
AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

By

Bertrand Yoshito Kobayashi

Alienation is a much maligned and misused term.
Its popularity, the differences in its usages, and the
vagueness with which it is often used threaten to make a
cliché out of what would seem to be a very basic and
useful social concept. This study systematically con-
ceptualizes alienation, develops an instrument for its
measurement, and applies this instrument to the analysis
of the style and intensity of political participation
among a diverse sample of college students. The defini-
tional schema for alienation has been borrowed from
Kenneth Keniston (The Uncommitted, Dell, 1965), who
differentiates between the focus, form, and mode of
alienation.

The data for this study were collected by the
author during the spring of 1971 and consist of mail
questionnaires from undergraduate students at Michigan
State University (MSU). In all, 822 usable questionnaires
were collected, representing a return rate of 76.7 percent

of the original sample. The bulk of the data comes from a
weighted, two strata sample of the entire undergraduate
population divided essentially between humanities and social
science majors on one hand and all other majors on the
other. Also included in this study were two special sub-
samples of MSU students--members of the Movement for a
New Congress (MNC), a nation-wide activist reform group
composed and organized largely by college students to
stimulate participation in the 1970 Congressional elections
after the Cambodian and Kent State/Jackson State University
incidents, and the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS),
a radical political group.

The principal hypotheses of this study are derived
from a typology of participation and alienation developed
by Ada W. Finifter ["Dimensions of Political Alienation,"
American Political Science Review, 64, 2 (June, 1970),
389-410]. This typology treats alienation as a multi-
dimensional concept and systematically relates combina-
tions of two types of alienation--political cynicism and
political efficacy--to various styles of political parti-
cipation--complete withdrawal, apathy, conformative parti-
cipation, reform orientation, and separatist-revolutionary
movements. The participation styles cover a wide-range
of activities which in turn reflect some of the dynamics
of political change.

The main findings of this study can be divided into
two categories. The first indicates that the conceptual

distinctions between types of alienation suggested by Keniston have empirical basis. Six types of alienation differentiated along the lines of form, foci, and mode are developed by means of factor analysis. The second set of findings presents evidence that the Finifter typology is a valid conceptualization of the influence of alienation on political behavior.

POLITICAL ALIENATION AND PARTICIPATION

AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

By

Bertrand Yoshito Kobayashi

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Political Science

1973

To

MY PARENTS AND FAMILY

PREFACE

The idea for this paper was conceived in the latter

half of the 1969-70 academic year just prior to the killing

of students at Kent State and Jackson State Universities in

May of 1970. At the time, I was at Ohio Wesleyan Univer-

sity on a teaching fellowship sponsored by Ohio Wesleyan,

the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Great Lakes

College Association, and some of the major universities in

the region, specifically, in my case, Michigan State Univer-

sity. The decision to switch from an earlier dissertation

topic to this one would probably not have occurred were it

not for the opportunities offered by the fellowship men-

tioned above and the close-knit, undergraduate environment

of Ohio Wesleyan. I came to realize that student radicalism

and alienation had intricacies and implications I had not

contemplated.

With the hope of at least enlightening myself, I

sought to differentiate the various types of student

alienation and political radicalism. Of particular interest

was the relationship among the numerous groupings of left-

wing political activists and students of the sub- or

counter-culture. The shocking events of May, 1970, along

with the splintering of the Students for a Democratic

Society (SDS), and a number of related events transformed the entire nature and direction of student politics. Therefore, by the fall of 1970, it was clear that the student Left I had hoped to study no longer existed. This study attempts, in part, to explain some of the changing politics of that period. The ideas and hypotheses in this study are applied to students only because of my interests and resources; they are in fact much more generalizable.

This study could not have been pursued without the cooperation of many hundreds of students. I wish to extend my appreciation to those who responded to my questionnaire, those in the Movement for a New Congress (MNC) and the SDS, and all those who gave of their time and ideas.

During the course of my graduate studies, I was fortunate to have received financial support from the aforementioned institutions as well as the Department of Political Science and the Department of Agricultural Economics, both of Michigan State University. Their support is most gratefully acknowledged.

The data collection and coding for this study, which involved the systematic handling of over 10,000 individual pieces of paper, could not have been accomplished without the assistance of many individuals, especially Dianne Avery, Tom Ferguson, and Denise Kramarz.

at several points during this study, directing me to literature and ideas I otherwise would have neglected.

While all these people and institutions played a part in making this study what it is, they can be held accountable only for its strengths but not for its shortcomings. The substance of this dissertation, such as it is, is my doing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ix

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEMATIC CONCEPT OF ALIENATION:

AN INTRODUCTION

Perhaps the point has already been belabored, but ours is a troubled time.[1] We seem to be beset from all sides by outcries of decay, demoralization, destruction, and doom. As one political scientist has written:

> There is no dearth of pertinent cultural criticism, reformist literature, political polemics, and exposés of American public life. In recent years it has been plausibly intoned that Americans are status seekers (Packard), lonely members of crowds (Riesman), and above all conformists (Fromm). Their income is unfairly distributed (Harrington); they are governed by the higher immorality (Mills); they are burdened by the conventional wisdom (Galbraith). Their class structure is frozen (Warner), their culture inane (Macdonald), their urban life deadly (Mumford), and their politics without purpose (Morgenthau). They grow up absurd (Goodman), pollute their environment (Carson), make their way through God's own junkyard (Blake), cannot achieve communion (Henry), and after death, are handed over to an industry primed to exploit the sentimentality of the survivors (Mitford).[2]

Since the above paragraph was written in 1966, Americans have been told of their pursuit of loneliness (Slater), the unsavory aspects of their professional sports heroes (Bouton, Meggassey, Bolt, and others), the unheavenly nature of their cities (Banfield), and the commercialized

1

selling and packaging of political candidates (McGinnis).
During this time also, Presidential commissions have
investigated civil disorders, obscenity, crime, and campus
unrest. In addition, numerous individuals have warned of
potential "eco-cide" from the ravages we have carelessly
wrought upon our own environment (Commoner, Udall, and
others), the population bomb (Ehrlich, Borgstrom), and
radiation poisoning from nuclear waste-products (Bryer-
ton). Our government leaders have been accused of war
crimes (Russell), arrogance of power (Fulbright), of being
"new mandarins" (Chomsky), and of fashioning police riots
(Walker) and "Pentagonism" (Bosch). On the social scene,
Americans are assaulted with word of a counter-culture
(Roszak), future shock (Toffler), revolution for the hell
of it (Hoffman), radical men (Hampden-Turner), the
"greening" of America (Reich), and a revolution without
Marx or Jesus (Revel). On a more personal note, we are
informed of human sexual inadequacy (Masters and Johnson)
and of numerous and varied sorts of sexual liberations,
castration, and imprisonment (Freidan, Beauvior, Greer,
Mailer, etc.). Meanwhile, our schools, which have tradi-
tionally been regarded as a means of pulling ourselves up
by our bootstraps, are described as leading children to
death at an early age (Kozol), stifling them (Holt), treat-
ing students as "niggers" (Farber), and allowing, and in
some cases even encouraging, teachers to undertake sub-
versive activity (Postman and Weingartner).

In this sort of setting, it is not unexpected that alienation should be a common and recurring theme. Robert Nisbet in The Quest for Community has said that:

> At the present time, in all the social science, the various synonyms of alienation have a foremost place in studies of human relations. Investigations of the 'unattached,' the 'marginal,' the 'obsessive,' the 'normless,' and the 'isolated' individual all testify to be the central place occupied by the hypothesis of alienation in contemporary social science.[3]

On a similar note, Lewis Feuer has stated:

> Every age has its key ethical concepts around which it can best formulate the cluster of its basic problems . . . . Twenty-five years ago, the concept of "exploitation" was the focus of most socialist and liberal political philosophy. Today many thinkers would replace it with the concept of "alienation."[4]

Other writers have called alienation "the central problem of our time,"[5] "the central fact of human existence,"[6] and as nearly equivalent to the history of man.[7]

The literature on alienation is enormous. The range of factors which has been associated with alienation is very broad, extending to such diverse topics as Catholic fertility,[8] marital status among black G.I. veterans,[9] mobility orientations,[10] attitudes on foreign affairs,[11] student intellectualism,[12] legal compliance,[13] hoboism,[14] work situations,[15] and the university social structure.[16]

Social theorists as diverse as Milovan Djilas and R. D. Laing concur in regarding alienation as a natural, if not an essential, condition of humanity.[17] From his

perspective as an important neo-Marxist theoretician, Djilas writes that:

> Man is man in so far as by his actions he moves away--"alienates" himself--from the condition of life which nature has given him.[18]
>
> Every human action which creates something new is, at the same time, an alienation from the old, from the existing . . . . Man becomes man by alienating himself. "I alienate myself" means: "I am man."[19]

Speaking in similar terms, Laing, an influential existentialist psychoanalyst and author-poet, writes that:

> No one can begin to think, feel or act now except from the starting point of his or her own alienation . . . . Our alienation goes to the roots. The realization of this is the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present interhuman life.[20]
>
> The condition of alienation . . . is the condition of the normal man.[21]

These two authors are writing from very different perspectives, to be sure: Djilas is saying that man should not conceive of himself as a "noble savage" indifferent to the idea of actively reshaping his world and society to suit his goals, while Laing is arguing that given the "alienating" condition of the world today, a sane and socially aware man cannot help but be alienated. In spite of their different perspectives and messages, the use of the term alienation by both authors is not coincidental and also not necessarily contradictory. Alienation, after all, serves as the label for a large and versatile _family_ of phenomena.

The idea that alienation is a "natural" state of mankind has been linked with the emphasis on alienation among the youth of today in a variety of commentaries. Often these commentaries on alienation and youth deal with the notion of the "generation gap"--a notion which has been with us at least since Aristophanes 2400 years ago and since then frequently re-emphasized.[22] Some rather persuasive writers have been "inclined to argue that there are profound psychological reasons why this [generation gap] should be a more or less permanent feature of the human situation."[23] The temptation to identify alienation with the "generation gap" will be avoided in this study. I would like to begin this investigation of alienation with as few of the existing connotative biases as possible, conceiving of alienation as neither natural nor anomolous, permanent nor generational, pernicious nor essential to the human condition.

Writing of college students, Robert Lane has said that there seems to be a:

> . . . need to present the self as, if not "bad,"
> at least a little alienated, or as able to see
> the worst in oneself and to tell all, or, in the
> end, as suffering from a sickness of the soul,
> a malaise that can only be suggested.[24] (emphasis
> added)

This phrase "a malaise that can only be suggested" characterizes well what alienation often appears to be: a "sickness" difficult to pinpoint and to describe but nevertheless seemingly ever-present and troublesome. The difficulty of explicitly defining alienation calls to mind

similar problems in the defining of the concept of power.

In attempting to define power, Robert Dahl writes:

> [T]o define the concept "power" in a way that seems
> to catch the central intuitively understood meaning
> of the word must inevitably result in a formal
> definition that is not easy to apply in concrete
> research problems; and therefore, operational equiva-
> lents of the formal definition, designed to meet the
> needs of a particular research problem, are likely
> to diverge from one another in important ways.[25]

A similar statement can, I think, be made for "alienation."
The point is that numerous definitions for alienation have
been put forth, many of them appearing but once in the
literature with specific application to a given contex-
tual situation, making it difficult to equate the usage of
the term in one instance with other instances. The result
is a term with many variations on a theme, some variations
quite unlike others and some not fully developed. So it
is that alienation has been referred to as "a many-sided
malaise . . . (not) a specific and isolable condition
clearly distinguishable from other moral-psychological
states,"[26] "a perspective rather than a concept,"[27] "a
process,"[28] "an omnibus of psychological disturbances hav-
ing similar root . . . (in) modern social organization."[29]

Given the conceptual ambiguity surrounding the
term, it is not unexpected that Joel Aberbach is able to
find empirical research both associating and not associat-
ing alienation with:[30]

    a. Lack of interest in politics
    b. Lack of faith in other people
    c. Failure to vote

d. Low participation in political activities
e. Race (i.e., being black)
f. Low socio-economic status
g. Age

Similar contradictory conclusions concerning alienation and the conditions necessary for the survival of democracy are made by two highly respected social scientists, Sebastian de Grazia and Robert Lane. De Grazia is of the opinion that a nation cannot survive unless it maintains the bonds of interpersonal allegiance that hold together the cultural community.[31] Lane, on the other hand, differs from:

> . . . those like Erich Fromm, William Kornhauser, and Sebastian De Grazia who argue that the loss of community, the Gemeinschaft society, and an integrated and coherent belief system have created malaise, anomie, and alienation. Our findings and theory . . . suggest that it is the very absence of community that makes democracy possible . . . . In a nation-state, some identity diffusion and a touch of anomie is necessary for democracy to survive.[32]

Writing on a more obviously ideological plane than the former two authors, two others also differ in the usage of alienation. Duane Smith writes that "the most characteristic feature of the radical Left is the blatant alienation of its advocates and this alienation has set the general tone of the social and political criticism of the past ten years."[33] Smith believes that the disaffection and opposition of the radical Left arises from personal alienation characterized in terms of "estrangement" and "resentment," which transferred to politics results in expressed opposition and disaffection from the existing

political system. Writing on the same topic, Theodore

Roszak also believes that alienation is "the root problem"

of the new Left:

> But not alienation in the sheerly institutional
> sense, in which capitalism (or for that matter any
> advanced industrial economy) tends to alienate the
> worker from the rewards of production; but rather
> alienation as a deadening of man's sensitivity to
> man; a deadening that can creep into even those
> revolutionary efforts that seek to eliminate insti-
> tutional forms of alienation.[34]

For Roszak, alienation "deadens" a person's receptivity to

new Left positions, while for Smith, alienation is

regarded as the opposite, as an impetus to support new

Left doctrines.

The use of the term alienation by so many researchers

applied to so many different situations and in so many dif-

ferent ways poses a problem for a researcher. But however

differently the term is used, the focus of all its usages

suggests erosion of some kind--either moral, social, per-

sonal, or institutional. Alienation suggests that some-

thing that was, no longer is; that something has been lost.

This sense of loss is not without its social consequences.

As a result of feeling alienated, of the feeling of having

lost something, people are motivated to action, though

not necessarily always, to make amends, to compensate, so

to speak, for their loss. The question of why some people

are motivated to action because of their alienation while

others are not, is a concern that this study will investi-

gate.

That alienation is a motivating force in the political sphere is undeniable given the numerous occasions in recent years in which alienation has been associated with important and disturbing political events--the demonstrations at the 1968 Chicago Democratic National Convention, the 1972 McGovern and Wallace presidential campaigns, the political violence of recent years, which has included assassinations, "trashing" of public buildings, the rise of organized extremist groups both on the left and the right, political civil disobediences, and any number of strikes, marches, and protest demonstrations. Whether alienation is related to participation is not the question here, for I assume that there is a relationship. The question of interest focuses on the nature of the relationship between alienation and participation. If alienation is useful in explaining participation as the frequency of its usage in this connection would suggest, then different types of participation, it seems, would be associated with different types and intensities of alienation.

Objectives of the Study

This study can be described as having two basic objectives. The first deals with the conceptualization and measurement of alienation, in particular political alienation, and the second with the relationship between alienation and participation.

The first objective centers around the fact that because alienation has been used by so many people in so many different guises that unless the term is explicitly defined, it is, as someone has called it, a "mind-softening" concept whose function is to simplify in lieu of an explanation. This initial problem of defining and measuring alienation is difficult because of the breadth and richness of the term, but it is facilitated by a wealth of previous work on the topic. My conceptualization of alienation is guided by a belief, supported by a good deal of both theoretical and empirical literature, that alienation is a multi-dimensional concept, and that the way to operationalize the concept is to first uncover its component parts.

The conceptualization problem is discussed in chapter two of this study, following a definitional schema for alienation laid out by Kenneth Keniston.[35] The Keniston schema is useful because it is a systematic development of alienation readily amenable to empirical application and because it is inclusive enough so that it can be adopted by virtually anyone working with the concept, regardless of his particular focus or emphasis. This latter feature of Keniston's schema allows for the possibility of placing in perspective some of the bewildering number of related concepts frequently used interchangeably with alienation--estrangement, homelessness, frustration, anomie, isolation, powerlessness, maladjustment,

misanthropy, nonconformity, etc. A procedure in line with Keniston's ideas is used to operationalize alienation and is presented in Chapter V.

The data for this study consists of responses to mail questionnaires collected during the spring of 1971 from over 800 Michigan State University undergraduates. A copy of the questionnaire itself appears in Appendix A and the procedures used in distributing and collecting the data are explained in Chapter IV.

The systematic operationalization of alienation enabled me to proceed with my second objective, an examination of the relationship between alienation and political participation. The effect of various types and intensities of alienation on the nature of political participation is of crucial importance especially in a democratic political system, for participation in politics is not only a reflection of the present health and developing pressures on a political system, but is also inseparable from the concept of democracy. Without participation, even if only indirect, a political system cannot be called a democracy.[36] Ideally, I suppose, an effective and legitimate democratic system would be expected to have a high level of participation generally supportive of the regime and marked with a minimum of disruptive, revolutionary activity. Too much participation directed against established authorities or too little participation may be taken as an indicator of governmental failure, popular dissatisfaction or disinterest

in government. More important, besides serving as a baro-
meter of political health and sickness, political partici-
pation is instrumental in fashioning government policies.
Participation is a dynamic force working to maintain or
change the extent, direction, and style of governmental
action. It is the effect of alienation in shaping the
pattern of participation among individuals and the result-
ing effect of participation that makes alienation of
interest to political scientists.

The basic framework for the hypothesized relation-
ship between alienation and participation is introduced in
Chapter III in the form of what I call the Finifter typology.
This typology suggests that a variety of wide-ranging
styles of political participation are associated with dif-
ferent combinations of alienation subtypes. Political
participation, the main dependent variable in this study,
is operationalized in Chapter VI in a manner which encom-
passes more than just the usual, conventional types of par-
ticipation such as voting and keeping informed about
politics. In Chapter VII, the main hypotheses related
alienation to participation are examined, followed in
Chapter VIII by a discussion of some implications relating
to the findings reported.

in government. More important, besides serving as a baro-
meter of political health and sickness, political partici-
pation is instrumental in fashioning government policies.
Participation is a dynamic force working to maintain or
change the extent, direction, and style of governmental
action. It is the effect of alienation in shaping the
pattern of participation among individuals and the result-
ing effect of participation that makes alienation of
interest to political scientists.

The basic framework for the hypothesized relation-
ship between alienation and participation is introduced in
Chapter III in the form of what I call the Finifter typology.
This typology suggests that a variety of wide-ranging
styles of political participation are associated with dif-
ferent combinations of alienation subtypes. Political
participation, the main dependent variable in this study,
is operationalized in Chapter VI in a manner which encom-
passes more than just the usual, conventional types of par-
ticipation such as voting and keeping informed about
politics. In Chapter VII, the main hypotheses related
alienation to participation are examined, followed in
Chapter VIII by a discussion of some implications relating
to the findings reported.

FOOTNOTES--CHAPTER I

[1]Murray Edelman, The Symbolic Uses of Politics
(Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964), p. 13,
states that all times seem troubled, especially since
the popularization of the newspaper.

[2]Henry S. Kariel, The Promise of Politics (Englewood
Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966), p. 98.

[3]Robert Nisbet, The Quest for Community: A Study
of the Ethics of Order and Freedom (New York: Oxford
University Press, 1953), p. 15.

[4]Lewis Feuer, "What is Alienation?: The Career
of a Concept," New Politics, 1, 3 (Spring, 1962), p. 116.

[5]Eric and Mary Josephson (eds.), Man Alone:
Alienation in Modern Society (New York: Dell, 1962),
p. 10.

[6]Erich Fromm, The Sane Society, as cited in
Josephson (eds.), ibid.

[7]Erich Kahler, The Tower and The Abyss (New York:
Braziller, 1957), p. 43.

[8]Arthur Neal and H. Theodore Groat, "Alienation
Correlates of Catholic Fertility," American Journal of
Sociology, 76, 3 (November, 1970), pp. 460-473.

[9]James Fendrich and Leland J. Axelson, "Marital
Status and Political Alienation Among Black Veterans,"
American Journal of Sociology, 77, 2 (September, 1971),
pp. 245-261.

[10]Sumati N. Dubey, "Powerlessness and Mobility
Orientations Among Disadvantaged Blacks," Public Opinion
Quarterly, 35, 2 (Summer, 1971), pp. 183-188.

[11]Charles Farris, "Selected Attitudes on Foreign
Affairs as Correlates of Authoritarianism and Political
Anomie," Journal of Politics, 22, 1 (February, 1960),
pp. 50-67.

[12]Jan Hajda, "Alienation and Integration of Student Intellectuals," American Sociological Review, 26, 5 (October, 1961), pp. 758-777.

[13]Harrell R. Rodgers, Jr. and George Taylor, "Pre-Adult Attitudes Toward Legal Compliance: Notes Toward a Theory," Social Change Quarterly, 51, 3 (December, 1970), pp. 539-551.

[14]Morton Grodzins, The Loyal and the Disloyal (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956), as cited in Dwight G. Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," American Sociological Review, 26, 5 (October, 1961), pp. 735-758.

[15]See, for example, Leonard I. Pearlin, "Alienation from Work: A Study of Nursing Personnel," American Sociological Review, 27, 3 (June, 1962), pp. 314-326.

[16]Robert F. Arnove, "The Impact of University Social Structure on Alienation: A Venezuelan Study" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford, 1969).

[17]This view that alienation is a natural, if not essential, condition of mankind and of a democracy is opposite that implied by Robert E. Lane, who suggests that alienation is an anomolous situation. See Lane, Political Ideology: Why the American Common Man Believes What he Does (New York: Free Press, 1962), p. 162, passim.

[18]Milovan Djilas, "On Alienation," Encounter, 36, 5 (May, 1971), p. 13.

[19]Ibid., p. 14.

[20]R. D. Laing, The Politics of Experience (New York: Ballantine, 1967), "Introduction" [no pagination].

[21]Ibid., p. 28. For a similar statement, see Irving Sarnoff, Society with Tears (New York: Citadel Press, 1966), p. 181.

[22]S. N. Eisenstadt, From Generation to Generation: Age Groups and Social Structure (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1956).

[23]Address by Lionel Robbins, "Present Discontents of the Student Age Group," p. 51, cited in Abraham Kaplan (ed.), Individuality and the New Society (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1970).

[24]Robert E. Lane, Political Thinking and Consciousness (Chicago: Markham, 1969), p. 216.

[25]Robert A. Dahl, "The Concept of Power," Behavioral Science, 2 (July, 1957), p. 202.

[26]Herbert McClosky and John Schaar, "Psychological Dimensions of Anomy," American Sociological Review, 30, 1 (February, 1965), p. 40.

[27]Nisbet, op. cit.

[28]Gwynn Nettler, "A Measure of Alienation," American Sociological Review, 22, 6 (December, 1957), p. 677ff.

[29]Nathan Glazer, "The 'Alienation' of Modern Man," Commentary, 3, 4 (April, 1947), p. 380.

[30]Joel Aberbach, "Alienation and Race" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1967), pp. 23-25.

[31]Sebastian de Grazia, The Political Community: A Study of Anomie (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948).

[32]Lane, Political Ideology, op. cit., pp. 226-227.

[33]Duane E. Smith, "Alienation and the American Dream," in The Radical Left: The Abuse of Discontent, edited by William P. Gerberding and Duane E. Smith (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1970), pp. 354-355.

[34]Theodore Roszak, The Making of a Counter Culture (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1969), p. 14.

[35]Kenneth Keniston, The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in American Society (New York: Dell, 1965), pp. 451-475.

[36]See, among others: Henry B. Mayo, An Introduction to Democratic Theory (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960); and Giovanni Sartori, Democratic Theory (New York: Praeger, 1962).

CHAPTER II

FRAMEWORK FOR THE CONCEPTUALIZATION OF
POLITICAL ALIENATION AND ITS SUBTYPES

This chapter will outline the groundwork for achieving the first of the two main objectives of this study, that of the conceptualization and measurement of political alienation. In this regard, this study seeks (to paraphrase Seeman)[1] to take advantage of the traditional interest and accumulated knowledge on the topic of alienation to make a sharp empirical statement about the nature of the concept. The basis of this effort is a definitional schema developed by Kenneth Keniston.[2] As mentioned earlier, the Keniston schema is empirically oriented, systematic, applicable to a wide variety of circumstances, and conceives of alienation as a multidimensional concept, an orientation with which I agree. In constructing an instrument to measure alienation, an attempt was made to develop one which would have applicability to political alienation in the general American public, in spite of the fact that the instrument is to be applied in this study only to college undergraduates.

Preface to the Conceptualization of
Political Alienation: Limiting
the Scope of the Concept

To avoid possible confusion between political
alienation and related concepts, let me begin by delineat-
ing the scope of what is meant in this study by the term
political alienation. The focus of this study is political,
hence the need to differentiate political alienation from
other types of alienation. Basic to the conceptualization
of alienation is the notion of separation or estrangement
from some social entity or ideal.[3] With political aliena-
tion, individuals are conceived to be in some way separated
or estranged from the political system. This is not to
suggest that political alienation is unrelated to other
types of alienation which involved separation from some-
thing other than the political system, but rather to sug-
gest, as will be seen later, that there is some utility in
distinguishing alienation vis-a-vis the political system
from alienation vis-a-vis other social entities. At the
same time, this is not to suggest that all non-political
types of alienation are unrelated to political behavior.
Indeed, because these associations between political
alienation and non-political alienation, and between non-
political alienation and political behavior are recognized
as deserving of investigation, special care will be taken
to distinguish and isolate various types of alienation
from each other.

A distinction important in this study is that
between political alienation and political radicalism.
As it will be developed in this study, political aliena-
tion will not be used to distinguish between extreme and
moderate political views, either of the left or right.
It is likely that individuals of widely divergent politi-
cal leanings will be found across the range of values for
each of the various political alienation measures. Stated
conversely, it is unlikely that political alienation will
be useful in separating Democrats, for example, from
Republicans, or socialists from right-wing libertarians.
A conscientious effort was made to eliminate from the
measure of political alienation all references to specific
events, issues, and personalities. Furthermore, opposition
or approval of the policies and platforms of the major
political groups in the nation, the political parties
included, will not be the basis for determining the extent
of an individual's alienation. By avoiding reference to
specific events and issues, the measure of alienation
will have the added desirable feature of not being directly
affected by differences in the respondents' level of
information about events and issues.

Political alienation will also not be measured in
terms of political activism or radicalism. It seems to
me unfortunate that studies of college student alienation
have often focused upon specific and very visible forms
of activism such as membership in radical groups,

participation in protest rallies and demonstrations, civil

disobedience, or upon selected opinions about the war in

Southeast Asia or the military draft, relating and, in

some instances, equating varying degrees and forms of

militancy with alienation.[4] In this regard, it will be

the aim of this study to define alienation as a general

attitudinal variable not limited by reference to particular

issues and personalities. It would be woefully misleading

to equate political radicalism or militancy with aliena-

tion, for this would imply, among other things, that

everyone who participates in radical or militant political

activity does so for political reasons. A great many

people, it would seem to me, participate in radical or

militant politics for entirely non-political reasons, such

as for companionship, for excitement, for want of something

better to do, or for social acceptance and even status.

At the same time, the opposite is also true, that a great

many people with radical or militant views may often find

themselves not participating in political activities

because of personal and otherwise non-political reasons.

Another pitfall to avoid in defining alienation is

to define it so ambiguously that it takes on a chameleon-

like character which allows it to assume whatever coloration

the situation requires of it. Keniston writes that:

> It is always possible, like Humpty Dumpty, to have
> words mean what one chooses them to mean. And so
> it is always possible to define "alienation" in
> such a way that the civil rights marcher, the peace
> demonstrator, or Berkeley activists are, by defini-
> tion, "alienated."[5]

To have alienation assume too "plastic" a quality detracts from the specificity required in operationalizing the concept. With its demonstrated capacity to assume a wide variety of guises, alienation often becomes, as noted in Chapter I, an "all-purpose" expediter of numerous plausible and sometimes contradictory explanations.

Alienation's changeable "Humpty-Dumpty" character and its usually pejorative connotation combine to add to the frequency of its use (and misuse) as well as to the difficulty of applying it to quantitative empirical research. One step in making alienation more amenable to operationalization would be to reduce the tendency of attaching a priori connotative judgments to it. It must be understood that alienation cannot be judged apart from the society that produces it.[6] Connotations placed upon alienation reflect society and our views ot it. Though alienation is usually associated with undesirable social conditions, in a good many cases, it can be plausibly argued that alienation may have positive consequences both for society and for individuals. For example, it has fre-quently been associated with individual creativity and with possibilities for renewing and transforming social institutions.[7] In this spirit, this study will be sympathetic to an approach which seeks to:

. . . understand alienation . . . to be better
able to understand some of the most perceptive
students---not in order to "cure" them, for
alienation is a condition that in itself neither

seeks nor needs cure, but in order to help them
find personally meaningful and culturally protec-
tive ways of focusing and expressing their
alienation.[8]

Another important conceptual distinction is that
between alienation and anomie. Though the two terms are
frequently used synonymously,[9] a useful distinction between
them is widely recognized. Nettler has stated the distinc-
tion well:

> Anomie . . . refers to a societal condition of
> relative normlessness, alienation to a psycho-
> logical state of an individual . . . . Aliena-
> tion and anomie are undoubtedly correlated; at
> least it is difficult to conceive of any
> notable degree of anomie that would not result
> in alienation but this seems poor reason for
> confusing the two.[10]

I shall adhere to this distinction, using anomie to refer
to societal conditions and institutions, and alienation
to refer to individuals.

Related to both alienation and anomie is the
concept of reification, a concept resurrected a few years
ago by Daniel Bell and described by him as follows:

> The idea of alienation as derived from Marx, and
> employed by intellectuals today, has a double
> meaning which can best be distinguished as
> estrangement and reification. The first is essen-
> tially a socio-psychological condition in which
> the individual experiences a sense of distance,
> or a divorce from his society or his community;
> he cannot belong, he is deracinated. The second,
> a philosophical category with psychological over-
> tones, implies that an individual is treated as
> an object and turned into a thing and loses his
> identity in the process; in contemporary parlance,
> he is depersonalized. The two shades of meaning,
> of estrangement and depersonalization, are socio-
> logically quite distinct.[11]

Estrangement is a subjective feeling on the individual level, while reification is a judgment, not necessarily directed at himself, that an observer makes about a whole society or segment of society. Estrangement, being a subjective feeling which arises from within a person, does not demand from each individual an explicit and elaborate conceptualization of what man is and what he ought to be; a person simply feels estranged or not. Even without being able to articulate precisely how or why he is estranged, a person can validly claim he is estranged because like sorrow or joy, estrangement is a feeling which is not necessarily intersubjective. Reification, on the other hand, requires a greater degree of explication of what man is and ought to be, because those who speak of reification speak not only of themselves but of a mass of people. Their claim is that they observe something about human society which differs from their conception of how man ought to live. This difference, if it does indeed exist, is external to the individual and hence supposedly observable to others and can be communicated to others.

Occasionally the difference between estrangement and reification is stated in terms of "subjective" and "objective" alienation, respectively. Reification is said to be objective because "'objective' standards about the quality of human life established by the investigator"[12] are used to determine whether or not a society is "reified."

What a person feels has nothing to do with whether or not society is "reified," so long as an investigator can point to societal conditions that indicate reification as he defines it. Individuals in a reified society who don't feel alienated are sometimes accused of "false conscious-ness."[13] Such individuals are said to be blind to their "true" needs and circumstances--in a sense, "brain-washed" into believing that they are happy and content when really they shouldn't be and would so realize if only they would wake up to be "realities" of their situation. Under these circumstances, reification may be "objective" but only to those who share certain basic value assumptions about the human condition. Because it may be defined differently by each person who has a different vision of man and society (and what person does not have his own views of man and society?), reification must be carefully distin-guished from other concepts with a more empirical grounding.

Though difficult, it is possible that reification in spite of its normative overtones might be developed into a useful empirical concept capable of providing a means for comparing the condition of different societies or communi-ties.[14] While intriguing, the appeal of this line of investigation is outside the focus of this study. Reifica-tion is of concern because the terms alienation and anomie are sometimes used in situations in which reification might be more appropriate. For example, when Erich Fromm writes that "alienation . . . in modern society is almost total,"[15]

we should recognize that he is really talking about reifica-
tion. He is assuming that alienation can be evaluated by an
"objective" criterion which stipulates that when certain
conditions are met, alienation is total or near total.
Fromm's criterion for judging alienation is based on his
normative conception of what the world should be like and
his comments are compelling to the extent that we agree
with his value assumptions. Used in this sense, alienation
defined as reification, to quote Feuer, "remains too much a
concept of political theology which bewilders rather than
clarifies the direction of political action."[16] The fact
that reification is recognized as a concept with definite
though usually hidden normative biases does not obviate
the fact that biases of one sort or another are present in
all types of research, empirical research included. Facts,
after all, as Easton has reminded us, are merely particular
renderings of reality according to given theoretical frame-
works.[17] Our awareness, however, of what reification is
may make us more cognizant of the framework within which
we may be operating at any given time.

A further explanation for alienation's conceptual
nebulousness is our human ineptness for describing our own
inner feelings and motivations.

> What a gulf between impression and expression!
> That's our ironic fate---to have Shakespearian
> feelings and (unless by some billion-to-one
> chance we happen to be Shakespeare) to talk
> about them like automobile salesmen or teenagers
> or college professors. We practice alchemy in

> reverse---touch gold and it turns into lead;
> touch the pure lyrics of experience, and they
> turn into the verbal equivalents of tripe and
> hogwash.[18]

If Shakespeare's ability to capture in verse the essence

of human feelings could be transferred to some contemporary

social scientist, then perhaps we might begin to capture

the subtleties of alienation inherent in our "feel" of the

concept. But our verbal craftsmanship not being Shakes-

peare's, we suffer with what we have: an approximation,

albeit imperfect, of a human "feeling," which we call

alienation. What we call alienation then is a stand-in for

what we are all too often at odds to describe adequately,

"a distinctive emotive-dramatic metaphor to experiences of

social frustration."[19] To quote Keniston:

> In practice, . . . "alienation" has become an
> increasingly rhetorical and at times entirely
> emotive concept, often synonymous merely with
> the feeling that "something is wrong somewhere,"
> and that "we have lost something important."[20]

Conceived of in such vague and all-encompassing terms, it

becomes easy to suggest that:

> Alienation lies in every direction of human
> experience where basic emotional desire is
> frustrated, every direction in which the
> person may be compelled by social situations
> to do violence to his own nature.[21]

To accept alienation as such a nebulous concept is to do an

injustice to its potential utility in empirical research and

to disregard the work of those social scientists who have

demonstrated that alienation can be systematically opera-

tionalized so as to take into account its many applications

and nuances.

Alienation as an Attitude

Alienation in this study will be described as an attitude, "a relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner."[22] Since an attitude by definition is integrated into a cognitive system in which a change in any part affects other parts, a particular attitude may be said to affect all other attitudes and values held by an individual.[23] As such, it is understandable that alienation may be said to elude "fixed dimensions because it is as multipotential as the varieties of human experience."[24] Fortunately, its multipotential character can be delimited when examined systematically within given frameworks of analysis. One such framework is provided by the massive psychological literature on attitudes. The study of attitudes has long been prominent in the field of psychology[25] and as early as 1935, Gordon Allport was able to state that:

> The concept of attitude is probably the most distinctive and indispensible concept in contemporary American psychology. No other term appears more frequently in experimental and theoretical literature.[26]

Before progressing further, consideration of the concept of alienation as an attitude would be useful. In this regard, Melvin Seeman's approach to alienation merits attention because of its widespread influence among those interested in the study of alienation, even though it

represents a line of thinking less acceptable today than

in 1959 when Seeman wrote his article, "On the Meaning of

Alienation." In this seminal article, Seeman repeatedly

defines his various types of alienation in terms of

"expectancies." This term is specifically used by Seeman

in defining four of his five types of alienation, i.e.,

powerlessness, isolation, meaninglessness, and normless-

ness.[27] For example, in defining isolation, Seeman states

that his definition was developed in a context "in which

we seek to maintain a consistent focus on the individual's

expectancies or values . . . ."[28] Elsewhere in this

article, Seeman reiterates that he has "chosen to focus on

expectancies."[29] My objection to the use of the term

expectancy is that Seeman, in spite of his avowedly

"distinctly socio-psychological view" of alienation, seems

to be saying that alienation is solely the result of a

calculated, rationalistic, and unemotional view of the

world and denying the role of affective feelings and

desires. He seems to be trying to deny the notion that

alienation is not only the realization that one is, for

instance, powerless, but that one also feels frustrated

and disillusioned by that realization. On this point,

Seeman is quite explicit:

> . . . this version of powerlessness does not take
> into account, as a definitional matter, the frus-
> tration an individual may feel as a consequence
> of the discrepancy between the control he may
> expect and the degree of control he desires---
> that is, it takes no direct account of the value
> of control to the person.

> In this version of powerlessness, then, the
> individual's <u>expectancy</u> for control of events
> is clearly distinguished from . . . the
> individual's sense of a discrepancy between
> his <u>expectancies</u> for control and his desire
> for control.[30] (emphasis added)

In believing it is possible to distinguish and

separate a person's cognitive expectancies and his affec-

tive desires for power, Seeman was in keeping with the

scholarship of his time which did emphasize the distinc-

tion between the cognitive and the affective aspects of

attitudes. Beliefs or cognitive aspects of thought, at

that time, were differentiated from attitudes on the

basis that beliefs were perceptually linked judgments

about matters of fact, while attitudes involved not only

beliefs but also value judgments and affective evaluations

on matters of personal preference or taste. Today this

once widely held distinction between beliefs and attitudes

on the basis of cognitive and affective components is no

longer generally accepted. Rokeach[31] points out that even

such psychologists as Krech, Crutchfield, and Fishbein,

who once held to this distinction between beliefs and

attitudes, have over the years changed their minds.

According to Rokeach,

> . . . any belief considered singly, representing
> as it does a predisposition to respond in a
> preferential way to the object of the belief, can
> be said to have an affective as well as cognitive
> element.[32]

Seeman's distinction between cognitive <u>expectancies</u> and

affective <u>desires</u> with regard to alienation might best be

set aside then, in light of more contemporary psychological literature on attitudes.[33]

This melding of cognitive and affective elements in attitudes allows the definition used in this study to remain consonant with other definitions of alienation which have described the term as a "feeling" or "feeling state,"[34] a "mental state,"[35] "a mode of experience,"[36] or "an emergent response to social structure . . . a reaction."[37] By defining the term as an attitude and given the massive literature on attitudes, alienation is placed in an arbitrary, perhaps, but nevertheless helpful context which provides guidelines as to what characteristics of the concept need to be studied to make it more fully understood.

Two characteristics of attitudes--attitude focus and salience--will be mentioned first only in passing and discussed more fully later.* Attitudinal focus is the idea that attitudes are organized around objects or situations of one sort or another. In this study, the chief objects of focus for the attitude of alienation are the political system, the self, and school, with primary attention given to the political system. Attitude salience

---

*The idea of attitudinal focus will be discussed more fully later in this chapter when discussing Keniston's approach to the conceptualization of alienation and also in Chapter IV on the measurement of alienation. Attitude salience will be discussed more fully in this chapter in the section on the concept of political relevance.

is the degree to which an attitude is central to a given
individual's priority of values. For purposes of this
study, an attempt will be made to determine how salient
or important the political system is to the respondents.
It will be assumed that if respondents do not regard the
political system as salient to their needs and aspirations,
this will be reflected in their political participation
patterns.

As an attitudinal variable, an aspect of alienation
we are reminded of is whether or not it will be "directive"
or "dynamic" in nature.

> As directive only, they (attitudes) would channel
> the existing level of energy into one kind of
> behavioral outlet rather than another, or toward
> one target rather than another. If attitudes are
> dynamic also, they affect the absolute level of
> energy as well as determine its channel of
> expression.[38]

In this study, alienation will be regarded as a dynamic
attitude affecting both the level and channel of the
behavioral response. Treating alienation as a dynamic
attitude is to choose the more complex of the two alterna-
tives and to make it desirable that the dependent variable
being related to alienation be able to reflect this differ-
ence of quality and quantity. The main dependent variable
in this study is political participation and an attempt
will be made to measure it in such a way so as to reveal
both its qualitative and quantitative variations.*

---

*This attempt to develop a satisfactory measure for
political participation will be dealt with more fully in
Chapter VI on the nature of political participation.

As a motivating or energizing influence, alienation
can be regarded as creating in the individual a predisposi-
tion to respond "with the understanding that a response
may be either verbal expression of an opinion or some form
of nonverbal behavior."[39] This does not stipulate that a
response will be made, only that there will be a "pre-
disposition" to respond or, for that matter, not to respond--
failure to respond being a kind of response in itself. It
is reasonable, I think, to assume as Rokeach has done that
"all attitudes are here assumed to be 'agendas for action'
or to have a behavioral component. . . ."[40] This should
not lead one to expect that all attitudinal predispositions
will lead to readily observable responses or that we will
be keen enough to recognize and accurately record these
responses. The crucial point is that attitudes can be
thought to have behavioral manifestations whose intensity
and likelihood of occurrence is based at least in part on
the intensity of the attitude held.[41]

The utility of this examination of some of the
characteristics of attitudes is to guide our thinking about
what alienation as an attitude is and how it might best be
investigated. From this examination, we are reminded of
some of the more important features of attitudes which
apply to this study of alineation. We are reminded that
attitudes have foci and different degrees of salience,
the latter characteristic hypothesized to be related to
the pattern of behavioral responses. We are also informed

that as an attitude alienation can be expected to have a
variety of verbal or nonverbal, directive or dynamic
behavioral ramifications.

A Framework for the Conceptualization
of Political Alienation

Of the several attempts to conceptualize alienation
systematically,[42] the schema offered by Kenneth Keniston
seems particularly well suited for ease of empirical appli-
cation and wide-ranging adaptability. As Aberbach notes:

> The Keniston schema is valuable for empirical and
> theoretical purposes because it stimulates defini-
> tional and measurement refinements (i.e., looking
> at alienation in terms of form [subject] and
> focus [object], and emphasizes the place of the
> various types of alienation in a chain of sources
> and consequences.[43]

The schema basically consists of four questions:[44]

1. Focus: Alienation from what?

2. Replacement: What replaces the old relation-
    ship? (This might more crisply be referred
    to as the form of the alienation.)

3. Mode: How is the alienation manifest?

4. Agent: What is the agent (cause) of the
    alienation?

The first question (though the order here is some-
what arbitrary) to ask about alienation according to
Keniston is that of focus. As stated earlier, implicit in
the notion of alienation is the idea of separation.[45] As
Keniston has said, "the concept of alienation in every
variation suggests the loss or absence of a previous or
desirable relationship."[46] The principal focus of this

study is the political system, with attention also being given to types of alienation whose foci are the self and school. By the political system, I mean the collective sum of all political powers, regardless of level or function, which affect the individual citizen's life. Generally speaking, the study will proceed on the assumption that most citizens, students included, when asked about politics, do not differentiate consistently and clearly between politics as a general phenomenon and politics of a particular governmental level, such as the national or the local level, or politics as rooted in any set of governmental institutions, differentiating here between the legislative, for example, and the executive level. It is difficult to imagine that most citizens would have distinct impressions and attitudes of each of the various levels and types of political units.

However, since it seems desirable in the long run to specify more concretely the object of political alienation in terms other than "the political system," let me pinpoint the focus of alienation in this study as the national political system, for that, I think, is what most people would point to if asked to designate "the political system." There are several reasons for this choice, three of which stand out. First, national politics presents the most visible and evocative image of politics today. It stirs the highest and most extreme form of patriotism and obligation, as well as the most intense

varieties of hate and sedition.[47] It furthermore encom-
passes the broadest range of political behavior and hence
in terms of applicability of this study's findings, allows
for the widest theoretical application. Secondly, it
offers a common ground for individual comparisons among
respondents in this study. Since respondents in this
study identify with numerous different state and local
governments, the designation of the national government
provides a common focus. Finally, the national political
system is the predominant unit of government in American
politics. It is generally recognized as ultimately
responsible for the overall regulation and coordination of
the mechanisms of justice, security, and economic well-
being.

The next item on Keniston's investigative outline
is the _form_ of alienation. _Form_ refers to the nature of
the relationship between the alienated individual and the
focus of alienation, in this case, the political system.
This aspect of alienation has been widely discussed in
the literature. One of the most inclusive and perhaps the
most frequently cited discussion of the forms of alienation
is Seeman's five-fold delineation of powerlessness,
meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-
estrangement.[48] Recently this five-fold delineation was
enlarged by Seeman to include a sixth form of alienation,
cultural estrangement, which is to be distinguished from
self-estrangement.[49] These forms of alienation as developed

by Seeman have been focused upon the political system by
Finifter and in the process, reduced to four in number:
political powerlessness, political meaninglessness, per-
ceived political normlessness, and political isolation.[50]
Of these forms, two--political powerlessness and perceived
normlessness--are of particular pertinence to this study.
For purposes of this study, I have chosen to use the terms
political efficacy and political cynicism in place of
political powerlessness and perceived political normless-
ness, respectively, in an attempt to use what seems to be
the more common terminology.

On this point, it is worth noting that political
efficacy and political cynicism, though labelled variously--
e.g., powerlessness, mistrust, potency, normlessness,
incapability, discontent--have been used together in one
manner or another in at least 15 different, largely
empirical political science studies,[51] practically to the
exclusion of the other forms of political alienation. In
spite of this rather overwhelming consensus among political
scientists that these two forms of alienation are of
particular value in explaining political behavior, sur-
prisingly little has been done to examine the interrelation-
ships between these two forms of alienation and to suggest
how interaction between them is related to political events
and behavior.

An illustration of the conceptual fuzziness sur-
rounding these forms of alienation is found in a study by

McDill and Ridley,[52] who, paraphrasing very closely the words of Thompson and Horton,[53] leave nebulously defined the relationship between political inefficacy, apathy, political alienation, and political distrust.[54] McDill and Ridley state that:

> A feeling of political inefficacy . . . is
> linked to a feeling of political alienation
> . . . . Political alienation involves not
> only apathy as a response to political power-
> lessness but also a general distrust of
> political leaders who are wielders of this
> power.[55]

Compare the remarkable similarity of this statement to that of Thompson and Horton, who write that:

> The suggestion is that political inefficacy
> may result in political alienation which
> involves not only apathy or indifference as
> a response to awareness of powerlessness, but
> also diffuse displeasure at being powerless
> and mistrust of those who do wield power.[56]

While the above two statements make it fairly clear that political alienation is the most inclusive phenomenon and that it involves feelings of inefficacy and cynicism, it is not clear whether or how apathy is related to cynicism and how inefficacy and cynicism are related to each other, other than that their additive effect makes negative voting more likely. No attempt is made to suggest whether efficacy or cynicism is the dominant factor in determining voting pattern or turnout.

Since the time of these two articles, there have been efforts seeking to clarify the relationships among efficacy, cynicism, and voting. In one such effort, Janda

found that efficacy and cynicism are helpful in explaining different aspects of voting behavior--efficacy being related to voting turnout and cynicism to the direction of the vote--but that the combination of efficacy and cynicism offer "no improvement in the explanation of voting turnout and voting choice . . . ."[57] In this study, attention will be directed toward the effect of the combination of efficacy and cynicism, not on voting since most of the respondents could not vote at the time of the survey, but on political participation.

Political efficacy will be defined as an individual's belief that he can influence government decision-making and affect the course of government policy-making. An inefficacious individual sees himself distant and often even cut off from the sources of political power. He perceives himself lacking access to political power and regards the resources at his personal disposal insufficient to affect the powers that be. In other words,

> Political decisions, which determine to a great
> extent the conditions under which the individual
> lives, may appear to be happening to the indi-
> viduals who feel powerless, independent of or in
> spite of their own judgment or wishes.[58]

Political inefficacy produces the feeling that a barrier separates the individual from government and that the government is no longer his since he cannot influence it. Consequently, the person's feelings toward government are likely to be filled with suspicion, hostility, and dis-approval.

Political efficacy or, more specifically, the <u>lack</u> of efficacy, is perhaps the most frequently used indicator of alienation in political science research.[59] Efficacy as described above has been used in numerous studies in the discipline. One of the most frequently cited and reproduced measures of political efficacy is the University of Michigan Survey Research Center's "political efficacy" scale.[60] Among political alienation studies, it has been adopted by Litt, who called it "political effectiveness"[61] by Jaros and Mason, who called it simply "alienation,"[62] and by Olsen as "political incapability."[63]

In this study, the SRC political efficacy scale was adopted as the basis for a measure of one type of political alienation largely for two reasons. One reason is the scale's wide usage and proven reliability. If political science is to be an orderly, cumulative endeavor, it would seem advisable to take advantage of knowledge and experience from previous research whenever possible. In this case, not only can we benefit from use of a previously tested instrument but such an instrument would make the findings of this study more comparable with previous research.

Another and, for me, the decisive reason for using the SRC political efficacy scale is cited by Olsen in comparing two very similar items from the Srole anomia scale[64] and the SRC scale:

Srole: "Most public officials are not really
         interested in the problems of the average
         man."

Campbell et al. (SRC): "I don't think public
         officials care much about what people
         like me think."

Although on the surface the two items appear to be
tapping identical feelings, they contain one cru-
cial difference: the Srole item invites the
respondent to make a more or less rational appraisal
of political norms and behavior, whereas the Campbell
item attempts to measure more personal attitudes
toward public officials.[65]

How crucial the difference between the two items is diffi-

cult to say, but it seems likely that a person might

believe that public officials are interested in the

abstract problems of the "average" man, but are not

interested in his own real and personal problems. The

SRC item with its "like me" emphasis allows for a more

personalistic, affective response, while the Srole item,

I would suggest, fosters an outward looking societal

perspective, more cognitively judgmental in nature. The

difference between these two items is reflected throughout

the two respective scales and may be likened to the differ-

ence discussed earlier between (personal) alienation and

(societal) anomie. The Srole scale in asking about the

"average" man tends to focus more on a societal level,

while the SRC scale takes on a more personal focus.

     In adapting the SRC political efficacy scale for

use in this study, several modifications were made. Per-

haps the most important modification was to convert the

usual agree-disagree response options to a four-point

Likert-type response. The object of this modification is

to allow respondents to express their sentiments more

fully and accurately than the agree-disagree categories

allow, to encourage separation of opinion groupings, and

to develop a more refined measure given the possibility

that students as a group might cluster toward the more

alienated end of the measurement scale. Other modifica-

tions included the elimination of the following question

from the original 1954 SRC Scale:[66]

> Voting is the only way people like me can have
> any say about how the government runs things.

The question was dropped because most of the students in

this study were not eligible voters. The question which

reads "I don't think public officials care much about

what people like me think" was changed to read "I believe

public officials don't care about what people like me

think," because it was felt that the "I don't think"

clause tends to be misleading. Precedent for this change

can be credited to Olsen in his Ph.D. dissertation done

at the University of Michigan.[67] In addition, two new

questions which adhere to the personalistic "like me"

emphasis were added to break up the affirmative response-

set bias built into the SRC scale.

Political cynicism, the other form of alienation

central to this study, like political efficacy, has been

used extensively in political research by, among others,

Agger, et al., Dean, Gamson, Janda, Horton
and Thompson, Litt, and Lyons.[68] Though perhaps less
frequently used than efficacy, political cynicism or
political trust, as it is sometimes called, cannot be said
to be any less central to the concept of alienation.
Keniston, in both clinical and statistical studies on
alienated college students, found "distrust," a concept
very much related to political cynicism as used in this
study, a primary variable in what he calls the aliena-
tion syndrome.[69]

Political cynicism or perceived normlessness is a
variable with a range of intensities. Basic to the idea
of cynicism, regardless of intensity, is the notion that
government policies fail to abide by recognized social
and legal norms. In Finifter's words, "the norms or
rules intended to govern political relations have broken
down and departures from prescribed behavior are common."[70]
Government is seen as untrustworthy, not doing what is
"good" for the community. As conceived here, a government
that fails to do everything the citizen might want it to
do for him personally is not necessarily normless, for
that citizen may recognize that he is not entitled to
special privileges, for example, that he be exempt from
all taxes and criminal arrest. Crucial to the idea of
political cynicism is that the citizen has a conception of
what government should be doing for the citizenry as a whole

and within that conceptualization judges whether or not the government is doing what is expected of it.

Ideas about what these norms of government should be and how citizens perceive government living up to them vary among citizens. In measuring political cynicism, an attempt will be made to record these distinctions. At one end of the cynicism scale are those who perceive government as norm-abiding, doing a satisfactory job of caring for the needs and interests of the citizenry. Then there are those who recognize something which I shall call political inefficiency. These people regard governmental policy-making as basically sound and norm-abiding, but they recognize also that in spite of the best intentions and policies of public officials, internal inefficiency, mistakes, mix-ups, and instances of misjudgment do occur. For these individuals, the normlessness of government is largely bureaucratic, administrative, random, and some-what uncontrollable because government officials are, after all, "only human" and can be expected to make mis-takes. These people regard the political system as basically good, but perhaps in need of better management.

A more critical type of cynicism would suggest that the trouble with government goes beyond bureaucratic inefficiency and bungling, that the violation of standards of performance is at least partially due to deliberate and conscious acts of dishonesty, malicious negligence and "evil" on the part of politicians and government personnel.

People who believe that this is the crux of government failure may be said to see political cynicism, in Lane's terms, as <u>political cabalism</u>.[71] This type of cynicism distinguishes between error and evil--the notion of error being predominant in the perception of political ineffi-ciency, and evil, the characterizing feature of political cabalism. Political cabalists would agree that govern-ment is being misdirected by evil individuals who, if not primarily concerned with promoting their own or other special, non-public interests, are at least unmindful or negligent of their public responsibility. When the notion of evil supplants that of error, the failures of government assume a willful and morally repugnant cast. Those responsible for these failures are more directly blame-worthy since their actions are not accidental or unavoid-able, or committed because they did not know any better. As Lane states:[72]

> In the place of evil, there is error, people who
> make mistakes in judgment, who are more selfish
> than they should be, less kind than they should
> be, chiefly <u>because they haven't been properly</u>
> <u>educated.</u>

With political cabalism, this is not so--mistakes of evil people are not seen as mistakes attributable to lack of education, a disadvantaged upbringing, or improper social-ization. Rather, the mistakes associated with cabalism are seen as involving conscious deliberation on the part of culpable people who have betrayed their positions of public trust.

For cabalists, the problems of government are
deeper and more debilitating than those caused by error
or incompetence. The failures of government are not
random and accidental, but result from deliberate action
by supposedly responsible public officials. With cabalism,
responsibility for government failure can be laid to rest
on certain specific individuals or definable groups of
individuals, not to nameless, faceless white-collar workers
and administrators. Because the causes of political
cabalism are traceable to the individuals responsible, its
evils are less tolerable than those of political ineffi-
ciency since these evils can, it seems, be corrected by
seeking out the individuals responsible and replacing
them with better men. This idea that evil can be located
has been attributed to the new Left by Hitchcock,[73] and
applies also, I would suggest, to the radical right. Both
the radical right and the radical left need targets for
vilification; unless responsibility for blame can be
located, they do not have any basis for programs of action.
The moralism of evil and definable loci for blame for
governmental failure injects passionate conviction into
cabalist politics and has the "power to move (citizens)
to sacrifice, to forego immediate personal gain for long-
term group gains, to subordinate themselves to leadership
and discipline."[74]

According to Lane, Americans, or, at least
the men of Eastport whom he studied, have lost the sense

of evil which makes for cabalist politics. The result is
unmoralized, "low tension" politics without much of a
sense of commitment and involvement.[75] While the sense
of evil in politics may be lost or dying among Americans
generally,[76] it is experiencing a resurgence of sorts,
according to some social commentators, among the young
people of America.[77]

Keniston, among others, observes in student radicals
a sustaining and energizing "inner sense of rightness."[78]
Both he and Flacks find among college activists a sense of
commitment to ideals and causes, reinforced often by their
parents.[79] Among peace demonstrators, Soloman and Fishman
note a moralistic and idealistic "striving for purity."[80]
Paulus in his study of campus activists also speaks of
their high social consciences.[81] However described, some
sense of moral ideals is basic to the motivation of
cabalists.

> Something more (than a grasp of reality) is
> needed in order for them to recognize a grievance
> worth mentioning. They must have a comparison,
> a standard; nothing is "wrong" unless there is a
> concept of how it might be right.[82]

Without a coherent sense of what is evil and what is moral,
critiques of politics tend to be no more than isolated
grumblings.

The last and most critical category of cynicism
will be labelled political revisionism. This type of
cynicism incorporates the sentiments of cabalism but does
not stop there. Beyond believing that some people in

government are morally corrupt, political revisionists
believe that government has basic structural deficiencies.
Unlike cabalists who suspect the motives and veracity of
the power wielders but who essentially still believe in
the soundness of the system, revisionists believe that
even if the system were to rid itself of all its corrupt
men, it would, because of its fundamental structural and
even constitutional inadequacies, still fail to fulfill
the functions of government in an acceptable manner. This
evil political structure is seen as the crux of the problem
because not only does it harbor evil men, but it also
allows them to continue in politics and to an extent even
nurtures their survival. As revisionists see the situa-
tion, to rid government of all its evil men would only
temporarily and superficially alleviate the problems of
government. So long as the structure itself is evil,
evil men though ousted from government would be replaced
by other men not much different from those ousted, men
with similar inclinations who in time would become as
uncaring and corrupt as the men they replaced. The solu-
tion to government failure from the revisionists' view-
point would be some sort of massive restructuring of
government, a revision of the basic organization and
possibly even constitutional structure of government.

This conceptualization of political cynicism sug-
gests four distinct gradations of cynicism--the three
outlined above as well as a fourth image of government as

norm-abiding. In constructing the measure of political

cynicism used in this study, the aim was to develop a

measure applicable to a broad range of respondents and so

questions representing each of these gradations were

included in the questionnaire. Further details of the

operationalization of political cynicism follow in Chapter

V.

Keniston's third organizing variable for the con-

ceptualization of alienation is the mode of alienation

or the manner in which alienation is expressed. Keniston

suggests two general modes of alienation:

> . . . we can usefully classify the way in which
> alienation is expressed according to whether
> it is primarily alloplastic or autoplastic.
> Alloplastic alienations are those expressed
> primarily as attempts to change the world;
> autoplastic alienations are expressed through
> the mode of self-transformation.[83]

As examples of the differences between the two modes of

alienation, Keniston suggests that individuals of the

alloplastic mode direct more of their energies into

politics, while their autoplastic counterparts are more

preoccupied with their individual growth and interpersonal

relations. Differences in modes of alienation lead to

outward-reaching social organization and activity for the

alloplastic type, and internalization and withdrawal for the

autoplastic type.[84] This conceptualization of alienation

suggests that those of the alloplastic mode are generally

activists, extroverted, and problem-oriented, while those

of the autoplastic mode are basically passive, introverted,

and self-centered. These differences in orientation obviously have great importance in considering the <u>effects</u> of alienation on the political system. An example is provided in the work of Finifter.

In her typology, presented more fully in the next chapter, Finifter suggests that a condition of "extreme disengagement" is likely given the existence of high political cynicism and low political efficacy, or to use her terminology, high perceived normlessness and high powerlessness. Since extreme disengagement as outlined by Finifter consists of two types of activities, "complete withdrawal" and "separatist and revolutionary movements," two highly dissimilar kinds of behavior, it seems more than likely that they are not the result of identical attitudinal predispositions. Surely at least one variable, exogenous or endogenous, must be operative in discriminating between the emergence of these two behavioral reactions.

Finifter has suggested that tendencies toward either complete withdrawal or revolutionary activity "will likely depend on opportunities for political activism or on certain personal characteristics."[85] She suggests the possibility of using "ego strength" as a variable to differentiate between withdrawal and revolutionary activity. This idea has, I think, some plausibility. Certainly ego strength however defined would seem to be a central characteristic of the personality and can be influential in determining tendencies toward activism or passivity, or

variables influencing them, such as skill acquisition, and
development, extroversion, and motivation. However, as a
variable, ego strength is a rather vague and generalized
concept, difficult to operationalize. For this reason
and because I think there is a better explanation for the
difference between these two patterns of behavior, ego
strength was not used to differentiate between complete
withdrawal and revolutionary activity.

The chief reason for not discussing the difference
between withdrawal and revolutionary behavior in terms of
ego strength is the observation that these two forms of
behavior correspond closely to the autoplastic-alloplastic
distinction of Keniston and to illustrations Keniston uses
in his discussion of this point. In his books, The
Uncommitted and Young Radicals, Keniston discusses at
length the difference between radical activists and cul-
turally withdrawn individuals, a distinction which closely
resembles the difference between the two types of partici-
pants which Finifter groups under the heading "extreme
disengagement." Keniston notes that the culturally
alienated are politically less optimistic than the activists
and that the activists, unlike the culturally alienated
and in spite of their strong antipathy toward American
political institutions, cling strongly to a basic commit-
ment to "ancient, traditional, and credal American values
like free speech, citizen participation in decision-making,
equal opportunity and justice."[87] He notes that:

The activist attempts to change the world around him, but the (culturally) alienated student is convinced that meaningful change of the social and political world is impossible . . . .[88]

. . . the culturally alienated student is far too pessimistic and too firmly opposed to "the System" to wish to demonstrate his disapproval in any organized way. His demonstrations of dissent are private . . . he shows his distaste and disinterest in politics and society.[89]

(On the other hand) . . . the activist, no matter how intense his rejection of specific American policies and practices, retains a conviction that his society can and should be changed.[90]

The activist and the culturally alienated differ only slightly, if at all, in their political cynicism; both are likely to have a profound disillusionment with the status of American politics. The crucial difference between the two seems to be not so much a matter of political cynicism, but a basic difference in life orientations. The activist, in spite of his negativistic perceptions of politics and society, remains interested and involved in political and social affairs, while the culturally alienated tends to be apolitical and asocial in the conventional sense, sometimes even to the point of being anti-political and anti-social. The culturally alienated withdraws into his own subculture, "a kind of hidden underground, disorganized and shifting in membership, in which students can temporarily or permanently withdraw from the ordinary pressures of college life."[91]

Both the activist and the culturally alienated are looking for a new and better world, but each in a different

manner and in a different direction. The activist wants

to remake the present world into something better; the

world out there, as bad as it may be, is the focus of his

attention. For the culturally alienated however, "American

society is beyond redemption (or not worth trying to

redeem)."[92] Neuhaus has remarked that some alienated

individuals

> . . . will not show up at the barricades
> because they are too radical for revolution.
> The change they want is not contained in any
> political ideology of Left or Right nor sus-
> ceptible to any political program. They are
> not apolitical so much as anti-political. The
> goal is personal and communal fulfillment, and
> politics in all its incarnations the enemy.[93]

This type of need-gratification directed toward

"personal and communal fulfillment" corresponds to the

need-gratification of the two men Lane describes as

"political alienates" in his Eastport study. Lane writes:

> The source of their (Rapuano and Ferrera's)
> pathology is not in personal alienation but
> in homelessness, which does not lead men
> away from society; it makes them seek closer,
> more intimate, more intense relationships.[94]

Lane compares this "homelessness" type of alienation with

that of "political divorcement" of three other men in his

study. In terms vaguely similar to Keniston's descrip-

tion of autoplastic individuals, Lane describes this

latter group of politically divorced men as "quite

oblivious of all government, apparently aware neither of

its benefits or of its burdens."[95] Though they somehow

believed that government was run in their behalf, they

"failed completely to see how government affected their

lives . . . ."[96] The descriptions of the two types of

homeless and politically divorced men contain hints of

the elements of the inward-turning autoplastic mode of

alienation described by Keniston.

Many social observers have recognized among college

students a kind of alienation leading to social and poli-

tical withdrawal, similar to what might be expected with

an autoplastic mode of alienation. The mood described as

that of "tuning out and turning inward"[97] seemed particularly

noticeable after the height of radical student activism

of 1970 and 1971.[98] As described by James Reston, this

mood was one of largely unexpressed but deep-seated anger

with the political system:

> They (the students) seldom express any alle-
> giance to either major political party, have
> very little to say about any of the Democratic
> Party's presidential candidates, but say a
> great deal about President Nixon and Vice
> President Agnew, most of it critical and some
> of it unpublishable. In short, for the moment,
> a lot of them still seem to be saying that
> national politics is not very relevant to
> their lives, but they are muttering about it
> rather than shaking their fists and spoiling
> for physical confrontations . . . .[99]

Disillusioned and disappointed with the system, some students

have given up on politics, becoming very cynical about

possibilities of reform and thinking that the system is

so beyond redemption that it is not worth even trying to

revise. Among these students, there exists a willingness

to let the system deteriorate from within, while hoping

that a completely new system untainted by association with the old can somehow be built. For these students, revising the system by its present rules and procedures is to acknowledge something worth preserving about the system. Rebelling against the system is tacitly to acknowledge involvement, even if only negative involvement, with it. By not attempting either rebellion or revision, these students, according to one observer, seem to "presuppose that the system doesn't merit the consideration required in outright, active rebellion."[100]

These young people who try to disavow the system by avoiding and ignoring it are the people Keniston described as "culturally alienated." They tend to withdraw and otherwise disassociate themselves from the social institutions and practices of "the Establishment" and to search within themselves and within their immediate subculture for the basis of a new and better world. Their orientation tends to be inward-looking, emphasizing self-rejuvenation, personal and personalistic goals such as warm brotherly love, artistic and creative expression of feelings, purging the self of "hang-ups." In this context, it does not seem accidental that the youth culture has given rise to a number of slogans reflecting personalistic, autoplastic orientation, such as "make love, not war," "dropping out," "getting my head straight," "love is all you need" (a title from a Beatles' song), "doing your own thing."

This autoplastic orientation was recently outlined in a best-seller by Yale law professor, Charles Reich, in his book The Greening of America. Reich forecasts the coming of what he calls "a revolution by consciousness," a revolution which, he says, "will originate with the individual and with culture, and it will change the political structure only as its final act."[101] His thesis is that the world can be saved by a new kind of transcendent, cultural non-political revolution arising today largely from our young people and that this revolution can best be fostered by each individual transforming his own personal life into something good and beautiful without "waiting for the world to be right." With individuals transformed, the world, Reich reasons, cannot help but be transformed. What is significant about Reich's "revolution by consciousness" is that the major vehicle and focus of the revolution is individual, non-organizational, and totally non-institutional.

This distinction between the so-called "Hippie, Yippie, Zippie," "flower people" and the radical activists corresponds, I think, to the distinction between the autoplastic and the alloplastic modes of alienation, which in turn corresponds to the distinction Finifter makes between the categories of complete withdrawal and separatist-revolutionary movements. To explain the choice made by individuals between the alloplastic and the autoplastic

modes of alienation, a concept which I call political relevance will be developed. By political relevance, I am suggesting an idea very much like the notion of attitude centrality or salience.[102] Attitude centrality suggests that concerns important or salient to the individual are most likely to motivate the individual to action. For example, those who regard politics as central to their world orientation would be expected to be politically active. Conversely, those who regard politics as irrelevant or peripheral to their central concerns would be expected to be rather inactive politically.

This idea of political relevance or salience captures the essence of the difference between those who withdraw completely from politics and the revolutionary activists, better, I think, than does ego strength as suggested by Finifter. The problem with ego strength as an explanatory variable in this situation, aside from the problems of definition and operationalization, is that it cannot account for those individuals with high ego strength who withdraw from politics in order to engage in something non-political which in their estimation is more rewarding and productive, activities such as artistic creation, church activities, or family and job responsibilities.

Keniston's fourth classificatory referent, that of the cause or agent of alienation, is the most difficult to handle empirically, for it raises complex problems such

56

as multi-causality, and measuring and testing for causal

variables which in all except longitutidinal studies lie,

at least partially, in the irretrievable past. Methodolo-

gically, it is difficult to determine the origins of alien-

ation because the causal sequence leading to alienation is

not a straightforward one-way process--a condition which

is a necessary assumption in most methods of testing for

causal relationships.[103] Alienation may be characterized

as the result of interaction--continual and reciprocal--

between the individual and society. While this relation-

ship between the individual of society can be thought of as

being harmonious at a given point in time and then later

to have become discordant so as to lead to alienation,

the question of precisely when and under what conditions

alienation develops is really quite difficult to answer.

Since the interaction between the individual and society

is continual and constantly changing, the point at which

the interaction changes from harmonious to discordant is

difficult to identify.

In this respect, Olsen distinguishes between two

forms of alienation, one which he calls "incapability,"

which he says is "involuntarily imposed upon the individual

by the social system," and another form which he calls

"discontentment," which he says is "voluntarily chosen by

the individual as an attitude toward the social system."[104]

That is, alienation may originate either from the

individual or from society. Keniston also speaks of

alienation in a similar manner:

> Formerly imposed upon men by the world around
> them, estrangement increasingly is chosen by
> them as their dominant reaction to the world.[105]

In a similar vein, another researcher, Hajda, speaks of

alienation in terms of rejection of and by society.[106]

The problem that must be handled by someone doing a causal

analysis of alienation is that once we agree that aliena-

tion is the result of an interaction between the individual

and society, we acknowledge the existence of a cause-

effect-cause spiral in which pressures are reciprocal as

well as simultaneous. The complexities involved in

unravelling the origin of these pressures are truly

formidable, and for that reason, as well as for others, no

explicit attempt will be made in this study to analyze in

depth this fourth referent of Keniston. Rather, following

Olsen, I would say that:

> All the currently existing social theories of
> alienation . . . might be interpreted as causal
> explanations, but should not be viewed entirely
> in this light. If alienation is conceived of
> as an attitudinal aspect of on-going social
> relationships, and not as simply a reaction to
> social influences, it is a gross over-simplifi-
> cation to assume that estrangement is caused by
> social factors in any sort of direct sequence.
> . . . The only realistic way to view this pro-
> cess is as a continuing spiral of interaction
> between alienated attitudes and social situations,
> not as a direct cause-and-effect sequence. A
> social theory of alienation, then, can explain
> which social factors are particularly associated
> with attitudes of estrangement, and perhaps why
> these relationships occur, but it cannot give an
> unequivocal answer to the question of "what
> causes alienation?"[107]

Chapter Summary

Political alienation in this study will be treated as a multi-dimensional, attitudinal concept devoid of value connotations as much as possible. As an attitudinal variable, alienation may be regarded as having the effect of predisposing individuals to react, either verbally or non-verbally, to given stimuli in certain, identifiable patterns. The basic schema for the conceptualization of alienation is drawn from Keniston and emphasizes the focus, form, and mode of alienation.

Keniston provides a behaviorally grounded construct for conceptualizing alienation in a systematic and comprehensive manner. Its use as a definitional schema can be helpful, I think, avoiding some of the conceptual problems associated with alienation discussed earlier. In addition, the schema is a classification for various forms of alienation and their behavioral manifestations. As such, it has been said to be "actually a beginning of an entire theory of alienation."[108]

The first main hypothesis of this study involves the testing of Keniston's schema. For our purposes here, the schema will be considered validated if conceptual distinctions between focus, form, and mode of alienation as suggested by Keniston are empirically discernible. The test will be handled as follows: A number of questions written to correspond to various types of alienation differentiated from each other according to elements in

Keniston's definitional schema will be factor analyzed. If the conceptual distinctions proposed by Keniston are operative empirically, they should be identifiable in the factor structure. Specifically, the hypothesis (#1) is that the questionnaire items when factor analyzed will group themselves according to their high loadings into different dimensions representing different foci, forms, and modes of alienation. A description of the items used and the details of the test of this hypothesis are presented in Chapter V.

FOOTNOTES--CHAPTER II

[1]Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation,"
American Sociological Review, 24, 6 (December, 1959), p.
783. In writing this article, Seeman had hoped "to make
the traditional interest in alienation more amenable to
sharp empirical statement."

[2]Kenneth Keniston, The Uncommitted: Alienated
Youth in American Society (New York: Dell, 1965), pp.
451-475.

[3]Among others, see Keniston, Ibid., p. 454.

[4]For examples of this tendency, see the reports of
surveys by Louis Harris, Detroit Free Press, July 19, 1970;
the University of California's Center for Research and
Development in Higher Education, San Francisco Examiner,
September 18, 1970; Fortune magazine, "What They Believe:
A Fortune Survey," 79, 1 (January, 1969).

[5]Kenneth Keniston, Young Radicals: Notes on
Committed Youth (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World,
1968), p. 341.

[6]Ibid., p. 342.

[7]Among others, see Kenneth Keniston, Youth and
Dissent: The Rise of a New Opposition (New York:
Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1971), esp. introduction.

[8]Keniston, Young Radicals, p. 342.

[9]For an example, see Elwin H. Powell, "Occupation,
Status, and Suicide: Toward a Redefinition of Anomie,"
American Sociological Review, 23, 2 (April, 1958), pp.
131-139.

[10]Gwynn Nettler, "A Measure of Alienation," American
Sociological Review, 22, 6 (December, 1957), pp. 671-672.

[11]Daniel Bell, "The Debate on Alienation," in
Revisionism: Essays on the History of Marxist Ideas, ed.
by Leopold Labedz (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1962),
p. 195, emphasis as in original.

[12]Joel D. Aberbach, "Alienation and Political Behavior," American Political Science Review, 62, 1 (March, 1969), p. 86.

[13]W. G. Runciman, "False Consciousness," Philosophy, 44 (1969), pp. 303-313.

[14]It seems possible that what Christian Bay did in his book, The Structure of Freedom (New York: Athenum, 1965) to make the concept of freedom more amenable to empirical investigation might be possible with the concept of reification. In an endeavor patterned somewhat after Bay's analysis of freedom, B. Guy Peters, "The Development of Social Policy: A Longitudinal Analysis of Social Expenditures and their Impacts in the United Kingdom, France, and Sweden" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970) rendered the concept of security more responsive to empirical investigation.

[15]As quoted in Eric and Mary Josephson, eds., Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society (New York: Dell, 1962), p. 11.

[16]Lewis Feuer, "What is Alienation?: The Career of a Concept," in Sociology on Trial, ed. by Maurice Stein and Arthur Vidich (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963), p. 146, which originally appeared in New Politics, 1, 3 (Spring, 1963), pp. 116-134.

[17]David Easton, The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science (New York: Knopf, 1953), p. 53.

[18]Aldous Huxley, The Genius and the Goddess (New York: Bantam, 1955), pp. 36-37.

[19]Feuer, op. cit., p. 145.

[20]Keniston, The Uncommitted, op. cit. p. 452.

[21]Feuer, op. cit., p. 143.

[22]Milton Rokeach, Beliefs, Attitudes and Values (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969), p. 112.

[23]Ibid., p. ix.

[24]Feuer, op. cit., p. 140.

[25]For a review of how the concept of attitude has been used in psychology, see, among others, William J. McGuire, "The Nature of Attitudes and Attitude Change,"

and William A. Scott, "Attitude Measurement," both in The Handbook of Social Psychology, ed. by Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson, 2nd ed. (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969); and also Milton Rokeach, "The Nature of Attitudes," in the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (New York: Macmillan, 1968).

[26]Gordon Allport, "Attitudes," in The Handbook of Social Psychology, ed. by C. Murchinson (Worcester, Mass.: Clark University Press, 1935), p. 798.

[27]Seeman, op. cit., pp. 784, 786, 788, respectively, defines powerlessness "as the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements, he seeks," meaninglessness in terms of "a low expectancy that satisfactory predictions about future outcomes of behavior can be made," and normlessness as a situation "in which there is a high expectancy that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve given goals." (emphasis added)

[28]Ibid., p. 788.

[29]Ibid., p. 785.

[30]Ibid., p. 784.

[31]Rokeach, Beliefs, Attitudes, . . ., op. cit., p. 115.

[32]Ibid.

[33]Marvin E. Olsen, "Political Assimilation, Social Opportunities, and Political Alienation" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1965), Chapter II, sees a difference between Seeman's "expectancy" approach to the conceptualization of alienation and his own "interaction" approach but does not describe their differences as having to do with cognitive and affective aspects of thought.

[34]Erik Allardt, "Types of Protest and Alienation," in Mass Politics: Studies in Political Sociology, ed. by Erik Allardt and Stein Rokkan (New York: Free Press, 1970), pp. 45-63.

[35]Herbert McClosky and John Schaar, "Psychological Dimensions of Anomy," American Sociological Review, 30, 1 (February, 1965), pp. 14-40.

[36]Erich Fromm, <u>The Sane Society</u> (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955), pp. 110-120.

[37]Wayne E. Thompson and John E. Horton, "Political Alienation as a Force in Political Action," <u>Social Forces</u>, 38, 3 (March, 1960), p. 191.

[38]McGuire, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 147.

[39]Rokeach, <u>Beliefs, Attitudes</u>, . . ., <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 120; McGuire, <u>op. cit.</u>, pp. 147-149.

[40]Rokeach, <u>Ibid.</u>

[41]As Allport, <u>op. cit.</u>, noted, attitudes affect a person's "readiness to respond"--"readiness" here used to indicate that attitudes serve as a mechanism for arousal or triggering of behavioral responses.

[42]For examples of attempts to systemize the conceptualization of alienation, see Keniston, <u>The Uncommitted</u>, <u>op. cit.</u>, appendix, "The Varieties of Alienation: An Attempt at Definition," pp. 449-475; Seeman, <u>op. cit.</u>; Marvin B. Scott, "The Social Sources of Alienation," in <u>The New Sociology</u> (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 239-252; Olsen, <u>op. cit.</u>; Finifter, <u>op. cit.</u>; Arthur G. Neal and Salomon Rettig, "Dimensions of Alienation among Manual and Non-Manual Workers," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, 28, 4 (August, 1963), pp. 599-608.

[43]Aberbach, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 87.

[44]As quoted, these statements come from Aberbach, <u>Ibid.</u>, but were originally from Keniston, <u>The Uncommitted</u>, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 454.

[45]Marvin Gold, "Juvenile Delinquency as a Symptom of Alienation," <u>Journal of Social Issues</u>, 25, 2 (Spring, 1969), p. 121, states that:
   "Not part of" lies at the core of the meaning of
   "alienation" etymologically and connotatively,
   and this dangling phrase brings us immediately
   to the differential question ". . . of what"?

[46]Keniston, <u>The Uncommitted</u>, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 454.

[47]Murray Edelman, <u>The Symbolic Uses of Politics</u> (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964), p. 11, notes that:
   Psychological distance from symbols that evoke
   perceptions and emotions heightens their
   potency rather than reducing it. Few princi-
   ples are more centrally involved in the working
   of government.

[48]Seeman, op. cit.

[49]Melvin Seeman, "Alienation: A Map," Psychology Today, 5, 3 (August, 1971), p. 82+.

[50]Finifter, op. cit.

[51]Aberbach, op. cit.; Finifter, op. cit.; McClosky and Schaar, op. cit.; Olsen, op. cit.; Kenneth Janda, "A Comparative Study of Political Alienation and Voting Behavior in Three Suburban Communities," Studies in History and the Social Sciences: Studies in Honor of John A. Kenneman (Normal: Illinois State University Press, 1965), pp. 53-68; Dwight G. Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," American Sociological Review, 26, 5 (October, 1961), pp. 753-758; Edgar Litt, "Political Cynicism and Political Futility," Journal of Politics, 25, 2 (May, 1963), pp. 312-323; Allardt, op. cit.; Robert Agger, Marshall N. Goldstein, and Stanley A. Pearl, "Political Cynicism: Measurement and Meaning," Journal of Politics, 23, 3 (August, 1961), pp. 477-506; John E. Horton and Wayne E. Thompson, "Powerlessness and Political Negativism: A Study of Defeated Local Referendums," American Journal of Sociology, 67, 5 (March, 1962), pp. 485-493; S. J. Kenyon, "The Development of Political Cynicism Among Negro and White Adolescents," paper presented at the 65th Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York, September, 1969; Kenneth P. Langton and M. Kent Jennings, "Political Socialization and the High School Civics Curriculum in the United States," American Political Science Review, 62, 3 (September, 1968), pp. 852-867; Schley R. Lyons, The Political Socialization of Ghetto Children: Efficacy and Cynicism," Journal of Politics, 32, 2 (May, 1970), pp. 288-304; Joel Aberbach and Jack Walker, "Political Trust and Racial Ideology," American Political Science Review, 64, 4 (December, 1970), pp. 1199-1219; Jeffery M. Paige, "Political Orientation and Riot Participation," American Sociological Review, 36, 5 (October, 1971), pp. 810-820; Brett W. Hawkins, Vincent L. Marando, and George A. Taylor, "Efficacy, Mistrust, and Political Participation: Findings from Additional Data and Indicators," Journal of Politics, 33, 4 (November, 1971), pp. 1130-1136.

[52]Edward L. McDill and Jeanne Clare Ridley, "Status, Anomie, Political Alienation, and Political Participation," American Journal of Sociology, 68, 2 (September, 1962), pp. 205-213.

[53]Thompson and Horton, op. cit.

[54]Janda, op. cit., p. 55, makes this same observation of the similarity between the McDill and Ridley definition and the Thompson and Horton definition.

[55]McDill and Ridley, op. cit., p. 206-207.

[56]Thompson and Horton, op. cit., p. 190.

[57]Janda, op. cit., p. 66.

[58]Finifter, op. cit., p. 390.

[59]Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," p. 184, notes that powerlessness is the most frequently used form of alienation in sociological studies.

[60]See John P. Robinson, Jerrold G. Rusk, and Kendra B. Head, Measures of Political Attitudes (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Institute for Social Research, 1968), pp. 459-462.

[61]Litt, op. cit.

[62]Dean Jaros and Gene L. Mason, "Party Choice and Support for Demagogues: An Experimental Examination," American Political Science Review, 62, 1 (March, 1969), pp. 100-110.

[63]Olsen, op. cit.

[64]Leo Srole, "Social Integration and Certain Corrollaries," American Sociological Review, 21, 6 (December, 1956), pp. 709-716.

[65]Olsen, op. cit., p. 7.

[66]Angus Campbell, Gerald Gurin, and Warren E. Miller, The Voter Decides (Evanston: Row Peterson and Co., 1954), pp. 187-189.

[67]Olsen, op. cit.

[68]Agger et al., op. cit.; William A. Gamson, Power and Discontent (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey, 1968); Janda, op. cit.; Finifter, op. cit.; Aberbach, op. cit.; Horton and Thompson, op. cit.; Lyons, op. cit.

[69]Keniston, Young Radicals, op. cit., p. 329.

[70]Finifter, op. cit., pp. 390-391.

[71]Robert E. Lane, Political Ideology (New York: The Free Press, 1962).

[72]Ibid., p. 324.

[73]James Hitchcock, "Revolution in the University," The Yale Review, 60, 2 (Winter, 1969), p. 161.

[74]Lane, op. cit., p. 344.

[75]Ibid., Chapters 21 and 22.

[76]The question of whether or not America has lost its sense of evil is a vital focus of the "end of ideology" debate. An excellent compilation of this debate is presented by Chaim I. Waxman, ed., The End of Ideology Debate (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1968).

[77]A recent and, for me, memorable example of the dedication of youth to moralistic politics was the involvement of youth in the 1968 Eugene McCarthy presidential campaign. In a report on the McCarthy campaign, a McCarthy staff member wrote this about a scene in Chicago after the convention had nominated McCarthy's opponent, Hubert Humphrey: "The staff then ritually thanked each other for working so hard . . . . The older leaders thanked the young staff for hours of selfless labor. The Senator was not there. I don't know when or whether he ever thanked any of the staff, young or old. Of course he did not need to. We had worked for peace, for burned children in Vietnam, for black children in ghettos; not for McCarthy."-- Ben Stavis, We Were The Campaign: New Hampshire to Chicago for McCarthy (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), p. 190.

[78]Keniston, Young Radicals, op. cit., p. 42, passim.

[79]Ibid. and Richard Flacks, "The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest," Journal of Social Issues, 23, 3 (July, 1967), pp. 52-75.

[80]Frederic Soloman and Jacob Fishman, "Youth and Peace: A Psychological Study of Peace Demonstrators in Washington, D.C.," Journal of Social Issues, 20, 4 (October, 1964), pp. 54-73.

[81]George S. Paulus, "A Multivariate Analysis Study of Student Activist Leaders, Student Government Leaders, and Non-Activists" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967).

[82]Lane, op. cit., p. 455.

[83]Keniston, The Uncommitted, op. cit.,
p. 466.

[84]Ibid., appendix, "The Varieties of Alienation."

[85]Finifter, op. cit., p. 408.

[86]The distinction between radical activists and
culturally withdrawn individuals is not explicitly formu-
lated by Keniston in either The Uncommitted . . . or
Young Radicals . . ., though the difference between the
two types of individuals is frequently noted in both books.

[87]Keniston, Young Radicals, op. cit., p. 301.

[88]Ibid., p. 302.

[89]Ibid., pp. 301-302.

[90]Ibid., p. 304.

[91]Ibid., p. 302-303.

[92]Ibid., p. 304.

[93]Richard J. Neuhaus, "A Revolutionary Conscious-
ness," in The New Politics: Mood or Movement?, ed. by
James A. Burkhart and Rank J. Kendrick (Englewood Cliffs:
Prentice-Hall, 1971).

[94]Lane, Political Ideology, op. cit., p. 451.

[95]Ibid., p. 172.

[96]Ibid., p. 173.

[97]Fred M. Hechinger, "New Mood is 'Tune Out and
Turn Inward,'" New York Times, December 13, 1970.

[98]See, for instance, an article by Douglas E.
Kneeland, "Youth Rebellion of Sixties Waning," New York
Times, October 24, 1971.

[99]James Reston, "U.S. Students Desert Arena of
Politics," Detroit Free Press, November 27, 1970.

[100]J. L. Simmons and Barry Winogard, It's Happening:
A Portrait of the Youth Scene Today (Santa Barbara, Calif.:
McNally and Loftin, 1966), p. 138.

[101]Charles A. Reich, The Greening of America (New
York: Random House, 1970), p. 4, passim.

[102]Rokeach, _Beliefs, Attitudes,_ . . ., _op. cit._

[103]Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., _Causal Inferences in Nonexperimental Research_ (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1964).

[104]Marvin E. Olsen, "Two Categories of Political Alienation," _Social Forces,_ 47, 3 (March, 1969), p. 291, emphasis his.

[105]Kenneth Keniston, "Alienation and the Decline of Utopia," _American Scholar,_ 29 (Spring, 1960), emphasis his, as cited in Olsen, 1965, pp. 30-31. Also see Keniston, _The Uncommitted, op. cit.,_ p. 464.

[106]Jan Hajda, "Alienation and Integration of Student Intellectuals," _American Sociological Review,_ 26, 5 (October, 1961), pp. 758-777.

[107]Olsen, "Political Assimilation . . ., _op. cit.,_ pp. 42-43.

[108]Ada W. Finifter, "Introductory Notes," p. 7, in her _Alienation and the Social Sciences_ (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1972).

CHAPTER III

HYPOTHESES RELATING ALIENATION

TO PARTICIPATION

The main hypotheses of this study are derived from

a typology developed by Ada W. Finifter,[1] suggesting a

systematic relationship between two types of political

alienation--political powerlessness and perceived political

normlessness, or as labeled in this study, political

efficacy and political cynicism--and various types of

political participation. Finifter does not empirically

test the typology she developed nor does she explicitly

state the hypotheses to be tested in this study, though

these hypotheses are quite evident to anyone studying her

typology.

The typology is based on the idea, accepted at the

outset of this study, that alienation is a multi-dimen-

sional concept with the capacity to be both dysfunctional

to the cohesion and stability of a political system as

well as "orthofunctional," i.e., having effects which,

while initially disruptive, may "generate increasing system

integration by the modification of conditions that violate

widely-shared norms or otherwise inhibit intra-system

cohesion."[2]   What Finifter suggests in her typology is that
the combined effects of different types of alienation are
associated with political behavior which is different from
the behavior that might be associated with each type of
alienation taken separately. A consequence of her perspec-
tive is that Finifter is able to relate how two types of
alienation, taken in combination, are associated with a
diverse variety of participation styles which may have a
broad range of consequences for a political system.

Framework for the Main Hypotheses: The Finifter Typology

Finifter's study begins with a definitional exami-
nation of various forms of political alienation using
Seeman's five forms of alienation as the point of depar-
ture,[3] and empirically establishes the existence of two
clusters of items which she calls "perceived political
normlessness" and "political powerlessness." These two
forms of alienation correspond to what I am calling poli-
tical cynicism and political efficacy, respectively. She
notes that these two forms of alienation "may be a useful
basis for the development of more specific hypotheses
regarding the effects of attitudes on political behavior"[4]
and hypothesizes that they are related to political
behavior in the following manner, as seen in Table III-1.
In presenting this schema, Finifter states that it is
"intended to suggest some directions and hypotheses for

TABLE III-1.--Finifter's Typology of Political Behavior Associated with Combinations of Two Types of Political Alienation (Hypothetical).[5]

| | | Political Powerlessness | |
		High	Low
Perceived Political Normlessness	High	Extreme Disengagement -Separatist & Revolutionary Movements -Complete Withdrawal	Reform Orientation -Protest groups working with institutional framework
	Low	Apathy -Very low level of political involvement	Political Integration -Conformative participation

future research on the relationship between alienation and political activation."[6]

Basically, Finifter's typology suggests that combinations of high and low political powerlessness and perceived normlessness predispose individuals to different patterns of political participation. Four major patterns of participation are dealt with--a) extreme engagement as manifested in two very different types of behavior: separatist and revolutionary movements, and complete withdrawal; b) reform orientation; c) political integration or conformative participation; and d) apathy. These behavioral styles cover most of the range of political behavior one might expect to find in a political system.

Before outlining the main hypotheses of this study, which flow directly from this typology, it will be useful to compare Finifter's typology with Robert K. Merton's typology of modes of individual adaptation to anomie.[8] The Merton and Finifter typologies have somewhat different orientations and do not coincide in every respect, but they are similar enough in format and substantive content to make a comparison helpful in further understanding Finifter's typology.

Merton's typology is based on two contrasting elements of society and culture which, he notes, "are analytically separable although they merge in concrete situations."[9] Merton's first element "consists of culturally defined goals, purposes and interests, held out as legitimate

objectives for all or for diversely located members of society," the goals representing "a frame of aspirational references . . . the things 'worth striving for.'"[10] The second element is that aspect of culture that "defines, regulates and controls the acceptable modes of reaching out for those goals" and hence determines the "allowable procedures" for achieving culturally defined goals.[11] Using these two elements, Merton outlines a five-fold typology of individual adaptations to social pressures:

TABLE III-2.--Merton's Typology of Modes of Individual Adaptation.[12]

Modes of Adaptation	Cultural Goals	Institutional Means
I. Conformity	+	+
II. Innovation	+	-
III. Ritualism	-	+
IV. Retreatism	-	-
V. Rebellion	±	±

(+) signifies "acceptance"

(-) signifies "rejection"

(±) signifies "rejection of prevailing values and substitution of new values"

In this context, anomie for Merton, who acknowledges the influence of Durkheim,[13] refers to:

> . . . a breakdown in the cultural structure,
> occurring particularly when there is an acute
> disjunction between cultural norms and goals
> and the socially structured capacities of
> members of the group to act in accord with them.[14]

Finifter speaks in very similar terms:

> . . . it is in the <u>incongruities between cultural patterns and social organization</u> that "we shall find some of the primary driving forces in change."
>   Applying this <u>culture-structure differentiation</u> to the results of the present research, I have suggested that to those scoring high on perceived normlessness, important aspects of the political culture (such as equality of citizens and responsibility of office holders) appear to be violated by the political structure, that is, by actual behavior of office holders as aspects of the political process itself. Systemic stresses that may be created by the behavior of persons who so perceive the political system (such as protest marches, strikes, etc.) are frequently directed toward reducing the <u>inconsistency between political culture and the structure by which it is implemented</u>.[15] (emphasis added)

The typologies of Merton and Finifter have a formal similarity in that each has five categories of behavioral response which are in turn related to their two major independent variables--for Merton, cultural goals and institutional means and for Finifter, powerlessness and perceived normlessness.

These two sets of terms bear similarities to each other but differ in part along the lines that differentiate anomie and alienation. That is, Merton, in talking about "cultural goals" and "institutional means" assumes a societal perspective as compared to Finifter's more individual perspective. Merton is interested in whether a person accepts or rejects social norms and on the basis of that information suggests that individuals can be placed into various role categories. These role categories differentiate between those who are conformative, innovative,

ritualistic, etc. with respect to societal norms. What these societal norms are is important in this classification scheme and an assumption by Merton is that these norms can or already have been defined as one means or another. Finifter's perspective, on the other hand, is much more individualistic, referring to individual feelings and perspectives.

Aside from these differences of perspective, Merton's and Finifter's terms do have substantive similar-ities to each other. "Cultural goals" and "perceived norm-lessness" both refer to societal norms or standards. One can talk about "perceived political normlessness" only if one implicitly, at least, accepts certain norms or "cultural goals" as those which are "intended to govern political relations."[16] There is a similar correspondence between "institutional means" and "powerlessness," though the similarity here is less precise. Nonetheless, we can think of power as an "institutional means" par excellence by which given goals within the political system can be achieved and in that sense both terms are concerned about the means of goal attainment. There is a difference how-ever between Finifter's perspective which inquires as to whether or not a person feels powerful and Merton's per-spective which is concerned with the individual's acceptance or rejection of given institutional means regardless of whether he feels that he controls or has access to these means.

Perhaps the most striking similarity between the typologies is to be found in the similarity of the terminology used to describe the behavioral responses within each typology. This similarity can be most effectively demonstrated by putting the two typologies into similar formats, displaying them side by side and using their original terminology. (See Table III-3.) In comparing the two sets of labels for the five behavioral responses in each typology, the terms seem, for the most part, quite interchangeable. In fact, the outward similarity of the terms conceals important differences.

The two typologies differ in at least two important respects. The first has to do with the difference between the "signs" (i.e., "-" and "±") for Merton's rebellion and Finifter's separatist and revolutionary movements. This difference is partly the result of the fact that Finifter, given the format of her typology, is restricted to a dichotomous distinction of signs, rather than having the possibility of a third sign as Merton does. This difference in signs for their respective typologies provides reason to reflect on at least two considerations which can help give us a better overview of their typologies. The first has to do with Merton's use of a sign (±) denoting rejection with subsequent substitution of social norms. By this device, Merton calls attention to the creative aspects of rebellion and of alienation. This idea of creativity is an underlying notion in Finifter's suggestion

TABLE III-3.—Comparison of the Merton and Finifter Typologies.

Merton			Finifter		
				Orientation toward:	
Cultural Goals	Institutional Means	Modes of Personal Adaptation	Styles of Political Behavior	Norms	Power
+	+	Conformity	Conformative participation	+	+
+	−	Innovation	Reform orientation	−	+
−	+	Ritualism	Apathy	+	−
−	−	Retreatism	Complete withdrawal	−	−
±	±	Rebellion	Separatist & revolutionary movements	−	−

(+) - acceptance

(−) = rejection

(±) = rejection and substitution

(+) = supportive on dimension, i.e., person feels powerful or that norms are observed.

(−) = alienated on dimension, i.e., person feels powerless or that norms are not observed.

that we pay attention to the "ortho-functional" aspects of protest in addition to its "dysfunctional" qualities.

The second important respect in which the two typologies differ provides another and, I think, even better example of how comparison of these two typologies can provide a fuller understanding of each. The difference is a major one involving the difference between Merton's behavioral categories of innovation and ritualism on one hand and Finifter's reform orientation and apathy on the other. It was suggested earlier that there is a correspondence between Merton's use of "cultural goals" and Finifter's "normlessness" and between Merton's "institutional means" and Finifter's "powerlessness." If this is so, we would expect that two seemingly similar types of behavior such as Merton's "innovation" and Finifter's "reform orientation" would have similar relationships to corresponding variables; i.e., "innovation" and "reform orientation" would both be "+" related to cultural goals and normlessness, respectively. As can be seen in Table III-3, that is not the case. The reverse is true-- "innovation" is associated with "acceptance" (+) of cultural goals while "reform orientation" is associated with low (-) feelings of norm observance, that is, perceiving a state of normlessness to exist. In fact, all the "signs" for these four behavioral categories of Merton and Finifter are the opposite of what would be expected if we assume a correspondence between cultural goals and normlessness and between institutional means and powerlessness.

The obvious explanation for this disparity is that either
the behavioral categories which definitionally seem so
much alike are not comparable at all or that the relation-
ship between goals-norms and means-power is not what we
assume it to be.

Considering the definitional similarity of the
behavioral categories and the earlier discussion which
explained how the two sets of goals-norms and means-power
categories have different perspectives, one might initially
opt for the latter alternative. Upon reflection, I see the
the disparity stemming from both alternative explanations
to an extent, but with the former alternative as the key
factor in the disparity. In spite of their ostensible
definitional similarity, Merton and Finifter are referring
to different types of behavior when they talk about
"innovation" and "reform orientation" on one hand and
"ritualism" and "apathy" on the other.

The rationale behind this conclusion goes back to
an extension of Merton's typology by Dubin.[17] Dubin begins
his extension of Merton by suggesting a "substantive
revision of Merton's model based on his own discussion of
it,"[18] a revision which Merton, by the way, accepts with-
out objection.[19] The suggestion is that an "interpretation
of Merton's paradigm requires that for innovation the
simple rejection of institutional means [-] be replaced by
an active rejection (rejection and substitution) [±]."[20]

Having made this one substantive change, Dubin is able to

suggest the following extention of Merton's typology (see

Table III-4):[21]

TABLE III-4.--Dubin's Extension of the Merton Typology of
Deviant Behavior.

Mode of Adaptation	Cultural Goals	Institutional Means
Behavioral Innovation (Merton)	+	±
Value Innovation (New)	±	+
Behavioral Ritualism (Merton)	-	+
Value Ritualism (New)	+	-
Retreatism	-	-
Rebellion	±	±

+ = acceptance

- = rejection

± = rejection and substitution (active rejection)

Note that the pattern of acceptance of cultural goals (+)

and rejection of institutional means (-) originally related

to innovation by Merton is now associated with Dubin's new

category of value ritualism. Note also that Dubin's new

categories of value innovation and ritualism have signs

opposite from those of Merton's original categories, just

as Finifter's categories corresponding to Merton's innova-

tion and ritualism have opposite signs.

An analysis of the substantive meaning of Finifter's

behavioral categories suggests that her categories have

more in common with Dubin's new categories than Merton's

original ones. Finifter's reformer, for instance, does not

seem to conform to Merton's description of the behavioral

innovation of a criminal who seeks wealth and respect

through illegal means. Finifter's reformer is, in fact,

more like Dubin's value innovator who seeks reform because

his view of the appropriate goals for society differs from

that which presently guides social behavior. Unlike Merton's

behavioral innovator whose goal, that of wealth and respect,

is within the bounds of acceptable cultural norms. Finifter's

reformer is more easily pictured as one whose value-goals

depart from the cultural norms of his peers and involve him

in activities that set him apart from the larger community.

To be sure, not everyone who participates in political

reform does so because of particular value motivations.

Some individuals might participate in reform because of the

novelty and "glamour" of the events and people involved or

some other non-value-goal end. Generally speaking however,

when we think of a political reformer, we think of someone

motivated because of value differences with the current

trend in government policies and the desire to effect

changes in those policies.

Turning to Finifter's apathetic individual, we

find that this individual, like her reformer, seems to

fit more into Dubin's new category than into Merton's old

one. Finifter's apathetic is low on both cynicism and

efficacy and in this sense like Dubin's value ritualist

who accepts the predominent cultural goals of his community

while at the same time rejects institutional means for achieving those goals. Finifter's apathetic and Dubin's value ritualist are both low intensity do-nothings because they have two strikes, so to speak, against them: they are complacent because they are satisfied with or at least not in active disagreement with the status quo and they are also unsure about their ability or in disagreement with the means available to influence government. This is in contrast to Merton's behavioral ritualist who rejects the predominent goals of society but fails to act on his con- victions except to go through the motions of participating in politics in a hum-drum, low intensity fashion.

It is within this particular context, using these styles of participation, that the main hypotheses will be developed. Aside from systematically interrelating alienation with participation, the Finifter typology does us the service of placing this study amid much of the rich and diverse literature on alienation.

The Relationship between Alienation and Participation

The various types of political participation to which the Finifter typology refers differ from each other in two ways--in intensity or frequency of participation and in style or manner of activity involved. Two of the five participation types, "apathy" and "complete with- drawal," quite clearly differ from each other and the other types of participation on the basis of intensity or

frequency of participation. As for the three other types of participation, their distinguishing mark involves both a certain style of participation as well as differing intensities of participation. While it is not quite certain that all the stylistic aspects of these participation types can be translated into quantitative terms, an attempt in that direction will be made for purposes of testing the hypotheses in this study.

Since the three more intense forms of participation differ from each other in large part on how stridently they demonstrate opposition to government policies and structure, a set of questions differing from each other in Guttman-scale fashion will be used to examine the frequency of participation along a range of activities of differing "stridency." The questions differ from the usual Guttman-scale questions in that there is more than a dichotomous yes-no or high-low response option. Instead, each of the questions has four response options designed to capture both the differences of style and intensity which distinguish these participation types from one another. If this measure of participation works as is hoped, and there is evidence that it does, a quantitative rank-ordering of participation types will be produced with the various types ordering themselves in the following manner, from the most active to the least active:

1) Separatist-revolutionaries -- most active
2) Reformists
3) Conformative participants
4) Apathetics
5) The completely withdrawn   -- least active

It is hypothesized that these participant types
will be related to the combinations of cynicism and effi-
cacy postulated in Finifter's typology. The hypothesis
(#2) is that the combinations of high and low political
cynicism and efficacy will be related to participation
as follows:

1) High participation -- high cynicism and low efficacy
2)   high cynicism and high efficacy
3)   low cynicism and high efficacy
4) Low participation -- low cynicism and low efficacy

Although Finifter hypothesizes that high cynicism/low
efficacy individuals would be either very active (revolu-
tionary) or completely withdrawn, I am hypothesizing that
they, as a group, will have highest participation scores.
Partly this is an artifact of the methodology used in this
study. The completely withdrawn are not expected to be very
prominent in the sample since they are probably over-
represented in the group which did not return the question-
naires. Secondly, I have postulated that the variable of
political relevance differentiates between the high and low
participators in this cynicism-efficacy combination. Since
politics is probably more relevant to college students than
the population at large (to which the Finifter typology
refers), participation should tend to be high.

It should be noted that these hypotheses differ somewhat from one advanced by Gamson. Gamson hypothesizes that "a combination of high sense of political efficacy and low political trust is the optimum combination for mobilization--a belief that influence is both possible and necessary."[22] Jeffery Paige's study of rioters in Newark, New Jersey in 1967, which uses a measure of political information to approximate the concept of efficacy, purports to support Gamson's hypothesis.[23] But two other studies by John Fraser and Brett W. Hawkins et al. using more conventional measures of efficacy and cynicism indicate that among the politically efficacious, the politically mistrustful are not more active than the trustful.[24] It should be noted that Paige used as his measure of mobilization self-reported participation in some phase of rioting, while Fraser and by Brett W. Hawkins et al. used more commonplace measures of participation:

> (Fraser used Matthews and Prothro's composite scale consisting of items on discussion and electoral activities beyong discussion.) In the Georgia sample [of Hawkins et al.], political participation is indexed by presidential voting, registration, and political interest. In the Carolina sample [of Hawkins et al.], the indicators of participation are discussion of politics with other adults, current political interest, and future political interest.[25]

Bearing this in mind, Hawkins et al. state that:

> It may be that some version of Gamson's theory, or a sub-theory of it, would find empirical support if it altered the content of one of the constructs to include "un"acceptable and anti-system participation as well as the more

86

conventional types of activity. Rejective
discussion, street protesting, and rioting
might then be observed for their association
with other important indicators to test the
generality of the theory that the politically
mistrustful do participate more, even though not
in conventional ways.[26]

By comparison, the measure of participation in this study

uses questions ranging from low intensity activity, such

as discussing politics and keeping informed about politics,

to activities such as participation in protest action and

support of the 1970 student "strike," which reflect a

rather high level of involvement as well as opposition to

the political system. None of the questions in this study

however went as far as Paige's in inquiring about involve-

ment in such blatantly anti-system activity as rioting.

A comprehensive test of the Finifter typology

involves taking into account the individual's style of

participation rather than just the level or frequency of

his activities. Such a test is possible if one were to

sample from groups with known patterns of participation.

Because one of the concerns of this study was to include

in the sample a wide range of participant types, the samp-

ling design was formulated so that each sample subgroup

represents a rather different and well-defined pattern of

participation. The sample subgroup and their respective

participation styles are as follows:

1) Students for a Democratic Society (SDS)--
   radical, revolutionary-minded activists
1) Movement for a New Congress (MNC--militant,
   organized, reform-minded activists

3) Selected social science and humanities
   majors (Stratum I)--liberal, politically
   oriented students, unorganized and
   undoubtedly less militant than the MNC
   group
4) Majors other than those in Stratum I (Stratum
   II)--less liberal, inclined toward low
   levels of political interest and activity

Further details about the sample and its subgroup charac-
teristics are presented in Chapter IV on the sample and
collection of data.

On the basis of this known pattern of political
participation among the individual sample subgroups, a
general hypothesis (#3) was developed that <u>each of these</u>
<u>sample subgroups will have, relative to the other groups,</u>
<u>a disproportionately large number of its members in the</u>
<u>participation style category of the typology most descrip-</u>
<u>tive of itself</u>. More specifically, it is hypothesized
that:

Hypothesis #3a--A group such as the SDS would
   be expected to have a disproportionately
   large number of its members in the high
   cynicism/low efficacy (extreme disengage-
   ment) category.

Hypothesis #3b--A group such as MNC would be
   expected to have a disproportionately
   large number of its members classified in
   the high cynicism/high efficacy (reform
   oriented) category of the sample.

Hypothesis #3c--A generally non-politically
   oriented group such as Stratum II would
   be expected to have a disproportionately
   large number of its members classified
   as low cynicism/low efficacy.

Hypothesis #3d--A generally liberal, politically
   oriented group such as Stratum I would be
   expected to have a large number of its

members in the low cynicism/high efficacy
category. They are also expected to be
prominent in the high cynicism/high
efficacy category, though in this latter
category, they would not be expected to
have as strong representation as the MXC
group.

Within each of the four categories of cynicism/

efficacy alienation types, it is hypothesized (#4) that

those with high political relevance will be more politi-

cally active than those low in political relevance. Among

one of these alienation categories, that of high cynicism/

low efficacy, it is hypothesized that (#4a) the difference

in political activism due to relevance will be greater

than that found in the other three categories of cynicism

and efficacy. That is, those in the high cynicism/low

efficacy (extremely disengaged) category who are low in

political relevance would be expected to resemble what

Keniston has described as "culturally alienated" and be

far less politically active than those in the high

cynicism/low efficacy category who are high in political

relevance. Stated in Finifter's terms, those in this high

cynicism/low efficacy (extremely disengaged) category can

be divided into two categories according to high and low

political relevance so as to differentiate, respectively,

between those inclined to activist separatist-revolutionary

activity and inactive people who completely withdraw from

politics.

These hypotheses incorporate the essence of the

Finifter typology and attempt to test all its major

dimensions. The hypotheses call for a differentiation between various types of alienation and suggest that different styles of political participation are related to different combinations of these types of alienation, not just to different intensities of one type of alienation. The styles of participation included in the hypotheses cover the extremes of the political participation spectrum and suggest to us that alienation can be related to the full scope of dynamics that shape and change the politics of a nation.

FOOTNOTES--CHAPTER III

[1]Ada W. Finifter, "Dimensions of Political Aliena-
tion," American Political Science Review, 64, 2 (June,
1970), pp. 389-410.

[2]Ibid., p. 407.

[3]Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation,"
American Sociological Review, 24, 6 (December, 1959), pp.
783-791.

[4]Finifter, op. cit., p. 406.

[5]Ibid., p. 407.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Ibid., p. 390.

[8]Robert K. Merton, "Social Structure and Anomie,"
Social Theory and Social Structure (New York: Free Press,
1968), enlarged ed., pp. 185-248.

[9]Ibid., p. 186.

[10]Ibid., pp. 186-187.

[11]Ibid., p. 187. Just how Merton's cultural goals
and institutional means relate to Keniston's discussion
of alienation having, among others, "a focus on behavioral
norms as contrasted with a focus on cultural values" is
not quite clear, but interesting enough to bear mention.
Keniston, The Uncommitted, op. cit., p. 466.

[12]Ibid., p. 194.

[13]Ibid., p. 189.

[14]Ibid., p. 216.

[15]Ibid., pp. 406-407. Quote on "primary driving
forces in change" from Clifford Beertz, "Ritual and Social
Change," in System, Change and Conflict, ed. by N. J.
Demarath, III and Richard A. Peterson (New York: Free
Press, 1967), p. 233.

[16]Finifter, op. cit., pp. 390-391.

[17]Robert Dubin, "Deviant Behavior and Social Structure: Continuities in Social Theory," American Sociological Review, 24, 2 (April, 1959), pp. 147-164.

[18]Ibid., p. 148.

[19]Robert K. Merton, "Social Conformity, Deviation, and Opportunity Structures: A Comment on the Contributions of Dubin and Cloward," American Sociological Review, 24, 2 (April, 1959), pp. 177-189.

[20]Dubin, op. cit., p. 148.

[21]Ibid., pp. 148-149.

[22]William A. Gamson, Power and Discontent (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey, 1968), p. 48.

[23]Jeffery M. Paige, "Political Orientation and Riot Participation," American Sociological Review, 36, 5 (October, 1971), pp. 810-820.

[24]John Fraser, "The Mistrustful-Efficacious Hypothesis and Political Participation," Journal of Politics, 32, 2 (May, 1970), pp. 444-449; Brett W. Hawkins, Vincent L. Marando, and George A. Taylor, "Efficacy, Mistrust, and Political Participation: Findings from Additional Data and Indicators," Journal of Politics, 33, 4 (November, 1971), pp. 1130-1136.

[25]Ibid., p. 1132.

[26]Ibid., p. 1135.

CHAPTER IV

SAMPLING AND THE COLLECTION OF DATA

The sampling design for this study was determined, as with probably most social science research, more by theoretical and practical dictates than by statistical exigencies prescribed by defined limits of tolerable sampling error. Since the principal focus of this study is the testing of the Finifter typology, the chief consideration in developing the sampling scheme was to incorporate a wide-range of political participants as defined by the typology, balanced with the need for sufficient number of respondents in each category so as to allow for subgroup analysis. This consideration meant that the sample for all practical purposes could not be that of a simple random design (unless prohibitively large), for a simple random design would make it unlikely that sufficiently large numbers of individuals would be contacted that would fall into the categories of "extreme disengagement" and "reform orientation" since it might be expected that these two categories would comprise a minority in most populations.

An early decision was made to focus on the college
student population. In recent years, particularly since
the 1964 Berkeley Free Speech Movement, college students
have been frequently described as being "alienated."
Whether accurate or not, "(t)he milieu in which the stu-
dent generations of the 1950's and 1960's came of age is
characterized by what is now fashionably called alienation."[1]
From the frequency of the term's usage in connection with
college students, it seems to me unfortunate that those
who have commented on the alienation of students have not
been more prudent in their use of the term. Its usage with
reference to college students has been so overdone that
the term has taken on all the amorphous descriptive
(im)potency of such overworked adjectives as "nice,"
"terrific," and with successive generations of young peo-
ple, as "cool," "groovy," "heavy," and "far-out"--terms
which seem somehow so "right" yet so trite. But over-
used or not, its frequent usage with reference to college
students would seem to leave little doubt that the college
population would serve as an appropriate setting for a
study on alienation. Moreover, if the college population
is as alienated as we are often led to believe, then the
college setting would seem to be a fertile environment in
which to study the varieties of alienation that there is
reason to believe exist.

The decision to study the college population of
Michigan State University in particular was based on

grounds of practicality and feasibility: convenience,
availability of facilities, time, cost, and knowledge of
the "terrain." Involved in this decision was the know-
ledge that a "megaversity" in the 40,000+ student range
such as Michigan State University contains an enormous
range of student types. It was felt that by judicious
selection a sample could be drawn that would approximate
almost any drawn from a number of smaller colleges.

A more difficult decision was the question of
whether or not graduate students should be included in
the sample. Two considerations were influential in
resolving that question in favor of excluding graduate
students. The first consideration was that of the general-
izability of the study's findings. Ideally, it would be
desirable to have findings that could be generalizable to
all college students in the country, but to legitimately
achieve such a goal would require a study of fantastic
scope and size with a correspondingly fantastic financial
outlay. While the resources available for this study
were limited, it was felt that the sample should neverthe-
less be designed in such a way as to allow the study's
findings to be generalizable to as broad a population as
possible. In this regard, it was felt that the undergrad-
uate population at MSU has more in common with the universe
of undergraduates in the nation than the MSU graduate
student population has with its peers across the country,
and hence to include graduate students in the study would

make for more restrictive findings. The rationale behind this conclusion was admittedly impressionistic, based on ideas about the specialized nature of graduate schools, the particular strength and size of the graduate program here at MSU, and not on any specific set of figures profiling the graduate student population in the United States. The second consideration as to whether or not graduate students should be included in the sample had to do with their anticipated cooperation in returning questionnaires. Specific empirical evidence of what might be expected from graduate students proved to be negligible, but almost unanimously, the people I solicited for information felt that graduate students would be generally more uncooperative than undergraduates. So, on the basis of two sets of impressionistic judgments about the representativeness of the MSU graduate population and their anticipated uncooperativeness, it was decided that graduate students be excluded from the study.

Limiting the sampling universe to MSU undergraduates still left unresolved the original problem of obtaining a sample which incorporated a wide-range of political participants with sufficient numbers in each category to allow for subgroup analysis. This problem was partially solved when fortuitous circumstances gave me the opportunity to acquire a listing of persons in the MSU branch of the Movement for a New Congress (MNC). The Movement was a nationwide activist group organized

largely around and by college students after the Cambodian and Kent State/Jackson State University incidents[2] to stimulate student participation in the 1970 Congressional election with an aim to help elect representatives favorable to policy orientations that would change the conditions that led to and allowed these incidents to occur. The availability of this list provided a ready-made pool of individuals who by their presence on that list might be readily considered "reform oriented." With MNC sample secured, the category of reform orientation was felt to be well represented in the study.

The original MNC list as I received it in the fall of 1972 was 289 names long. This list was much shorter than that which existed the previous spring. It included only those individuals whose commitment to political reform had sustained itself over the summer, plus individuals who indicated interest in MNC for the first time during the fall of 1970. It was estimated by MNC leaders that about half of the persons on the list participated in one or another MNC activity during fall, 1970. To bring this fall list up-to-date and to make it comparable to the rest of the sample, all non-students, graduate students, and former students not enrolled at MSU during the spring term of 1971 were excluded from the sample. The result was an MNC sample of 189, all undergraduates registered in school during the academic term of the survey. From this list of 189 names, to which the

questionnaires were sent, 155 questionnaires were returned

for a raw response rate of 82.0 per cent. Of these 155

questionnaires, 148 were usable for an adjusted response

rate of 78.3 per cent. (For information on how and why

seven questionnaires were declared unusable, see Appendix

B--Part 1.)

To secure respondents for the category of "extreme

disengagement," I was fortunate to have an acquaintance

who was actively involved in the MSU chapter of Students

for a Democratic Society (SDS). Through this individual

I was able to elicit the cooperation and confidence of

the members of SDS and eventually was able to secure from

them a set of 14 completed questionnaires, which repre-

sented what I would estimate from my attendance at SDS

meetings to be virtually the entire active contingent of

the local chapter. With respect to the small size of the

SDS sample, it might be noted that SDS at Harvard, which

had 300 students at its 1969-1970 inaugural meeting,

attracted only 25 to its initial 1970-1971 meeting.[3]

The fact then that SDS at Michigan State has an active

membership in the neighborhood of 14, while only a few

years ago it had perhaps a 100 or so members, is a reflec-

tion of a national pattern and not a reflection of this

particular chapter's vitality.

The SDS questionnaires were handled differently

from the other questionnaires in the study in that they

were not mailed to the respondents. Because of the

compactness of the group and the fact that it seemed

undesirable in terms of maintaining a good working rela-

tionship with the group to ask for a listing of the names

and addresses of the SDS membership, the questionnaires

were circulated to the SDS membership by several individ-

uals in the group who were considered trustworthy. The

questionnaires were circulated during the same week that

the other questionnaires in the study were being mailed.

Instructions for the return of the questionnaires were

the same for the SDS and non-SDS groups. The SDS ques-

tionnaires however were plainly marked "SDS" by two of

the group members before the questionnaires were circu-

lated and hence easily identified. The SDS questionnaires

were to be given only to those who in the school year had

participated in more than one SDS activity or meeting and

who might be expected to participate again in the future.

In explaining the study to members of SDS, special care

was given not to use the word alienation and in spite of

their curiousity, SDS members were not given any informa-

tion about the study that was not available to other

participants. The SDS participants were also not informed

about how many and who would be in the study, only that

they were one of the "special groups" asked to participate

in the study. One further point about the SDS sample

should be noted--two people who indicated they were graduate

students were retained in the study because of the small

size of the SDS subset. These two graduate students are the only graduate students in the entire study.

As valuable as they might be in representing their respective categories, the SDS and MNC samples would allow for only a partial testing of the Finifter typology. For a fuller testing, it was necessary to secure respondents for the other two categories of political participants in the typology and also to increase the total number of respondents in the study to give it a wider base as well as to make it more feasible to do subgroup analysis for each participant type. With this in mind, a systematic sampling of the entire undergraduate population was devised that incorporated in its design a stratification factor which over-represented selected departments and colleges in the humanities and social sciences. As a hedge on the possibility that the SDS and MNC samples would not yield sufficient numbers of individuals in the categories for which these groups were sampled, (i.e., individuals high in cynicism), the plan was to include in the sample selected units which according to the literature on student activism[4] contribute disproportionately to those here classified as "extremely disengaged" and "reform oriented." In this way, not only would the two remaining categories of apathy and conformist behavior be represented but additional respondents could be gathered that might fit into the extremely disengaged and reformist categories.

For sampling purposes, the undergraduate population
was divided into two strata. The first stratum consisted
of those in the social sciences and the humanities, speci-
fically undergraduates registered as majors in the follow-
ing departments and colleges:

1) In the College of Social Science: Enrollment,
                                             Spring of 1971

    --Department of Anthropology   129 students
    --Department of Political Science   356   "
    --Department of Psychology   934   "
    --Department of Sociology   240   "

2) In the College of Arts and Letters:

    --Department of Art   752   "
    --Department of English   909   "
    --Department of History   445   "
    --Department of Philosophy   59   "

3) Justin Morrill (Humanities) College: 770   "

4) James Madison (Policy Sciences)
   College, no field of concentration: 179   "

   Total Number in Base Population for
   Stratum I   4773 students

Stratum two (II) consisted of students from those units not
included in Stratum one (I) and in total had a base popu-
lation of 24,261 students.

The actual drawing of the sample was done by the
data processing section of the registrar's office after
clearance from the University Research Committee. A system-
atic sample based on university assigned student identifi-
cation numbers was drawn. According to information from
the admissions and registrar's office, student numbers are

101

assigned upon admission to the university in more or less random manner except for the fact that students in each succeeding year will generally have higher numbers than those entering before them. According to Moser, taking every nth person on a list is not equivalent to simple random sampling, "strictly speaking" unless the list itself is randomly ordered. Nor does the selection of a random starting point, although important, make a list of every nth person random, but such a sample "is generally justified by the argument that the list can be regarded as arranged more or less at random, or that the feature by which it is arranged is not related to the subject of the survey. Thus, selecting at regular intervals from a list is often reasonably accepted as equivalent to random sampling."[5]

In this study, every 13th person in Stratum I was accepted into the sample, while for Stratum II, every 85th person was selected. This meant that the students in Stratum I were about 6.5 times as likely to be surveyed as students in Stratum II. The 1/13 and 1/85 ratios were selected because they would produce lists for the two strata approximately equal in length and together containing about 800 names. The rationale for a list about 800 names long was two-fold: one, it was thought that such a list would provide sufficient numbers of individuals in each category of participant types as outlined by the typology to allow for meaningful subgroup analysis; and

two, it was estimated that a list of 800 names was about
all that could be handled given the resources available
for tracking down non-respondents. Because of the expected
low return rate for mail questionnaires, especially for
one of this length, the idea of using a tolerable limit
of sampling error to determine the size of the total
sample seemed inappropriate since the expected return rate
was initially estimated around 50 to 60 per cent. The
figure of 800 then was selected as a compromise between a
list short enough for effective follow-up and a longer
list which would yield a greater number of questionnaires
but at a lower return rate because of limited follow-up.
Of the 864 persons in Strata I and II, 687 returned ques-
tionnaires for a raw return rate of 79.5 per cent, of
which 660 were usable for a return rate of 76.4 per cent.
(For elaboration of how this part of the sample was drawn
and for information on unusable questionnaires, see
Appendix B--Part 2.)

Overall then, excluding the 14 in the SDS sample,
1053 questionnaires were sent out, of which 842 were
returned for a raw return rate for the entire study of
80.0 per cent. Of these 842, 808 questionnaires were
usable, giving a usable return rate of 76.7 per cent. The
unusable questionnaires were divided among the following
classifications:

    a. Blanks or "jokers"   --15 questionnaires
    b. Graduate students   -- 4 questionnaires
    c. Missing data   --15 questionnaires

In addition, of these 1053 questionnaires, 25 were returned undelivered. If these 25 undelivered questionnaires were considered as never having been sent, there would be a corrected raw return rate of 81.9 per cent and a corrected usable return rate of 78.6 per cent.

As high as this return rate might be for a mail questionnaire, there is still considerable margin for error due to self-selection. To compare the usable questionnaires with the population from which they were based, figures on the sex and class level distribution of Strata I and II were gathered from the registrar's office. Corresponding figures for the MNC mailing list of 189 names were also gathered. A comparison of the sample and population profiles of the various groups show that the two correspond very closely with each other.

		Sample Profile	Population Profile
Sex Distribution			
--MNC	Male	41.9%	44.4% **
	Female	58.1%	55.5%
		100.0%	99.9%
--Stratum I	Male	55.4%	54.6% *
	Female	44.6%	45.4%
		100.0%	100.0%
--Stratum II	Male	44.1%	43.9% *
	Female	55.9%	56.0%
		100.0%	99.9%

		Sample Profile	Population Profile
Class Level Distribution			
--MNC	Freshmen	23.6%	20.6**
	Sophomores	13.5%	14.8
	Juniors	23.0%	22.7
	Seniors	39.9%	41.8
		100.0%	99.9%
--Stratum I	Freshmen	18.2%	17.5%*
	Sophomores	22.0%	23.0%
	Juniors	30.0%	28.8%
	Seniors	29.8%	30.7%
		100.0%	100.0%
--Stratum II	Freshmen	17.8%	20.9%*
	Sophomores	20.9%	22.8%
	Juniors	33.0%	26.1%
	Seniors	28.3%	30.1%
		100.0%	99.9%

*From figures of MSU undergraduates enrolled during the spring of 1971, received from the school registrar.

**From the roster of the MNC at Michigan State University updated to include only those undergraduates enrolled during the spring of 1971.

The respective sample and population profiles compare quite closely with each other. With only a few exceptions, the two profiles are within one or two percentages of each other. The largest difference between any two sample and population figures is 6.9 percent for the juniors in Stratum II. In this case, this deviation of the sample from the population profile does not seem particularly disturbing because there is nothing else about the general pattern for Stratum II which seems unusual. In fact, in

spite of this relatively large deviation of the two figures, the other Stratum II figures are quite acceptable.

An interesting set of figures is that for the MNC class distribution. The MNC sample and population figures follow each other rather closely. The point to be noted here has nothing to do with a sample-population discrepancy; it is that the MNC group has a rather large number of seniors--41.8 percent, in fact, of the survey population. The reason for all these seniors is a mystery to me. Perhaps it has to do with the recruitment of the MNC or the political consciousness of seniors vs. that of their fellow undergraduates. It could have something to do with the fact that the MNC supporters in this study are according to their grade-point averages, better than average students and that it is not too difficult at all for a good student to achieve senior standing by the end of his third year. (For details on this point, see Appendix B--Part III.) Whatever the reason for this concentration of seniors, the overall impression given by these figures is that the sample subgroups seem closely representative of the populations from which they were drawn, in spite of, or perhaps, because of, the usable return rate of 76,7 percent.

[1]Steven Warnecke, "American Student Politics," The Yale Review, 60, 2 (Winter, 1971), p. 189. This sort of statement characterizing our age in terms of alienation is not at all uncommon. Here are two other similar statements:

> The decade of the 60's was the era in which alien-
> ation emerged as a preeminent social and psycholo-
> gical fact. The crescendo of protest seemed to
> confirm the wisdom of that word in the intellec-
> tual's diagnosis of our condition; and it was
> popularly adopted as the signature of the present
> epoch. It has been routine to define our troubles
> in the language of alienation and to seek solutions
> in those terms. --Melvin Seeman, "The Urban
> Alienations: Some Dubious Theses from Marx to
> Marcuse," Journal of Personality and Social
> Psychology (August, 1971), p. 135.

> Previously, we wondered whether what's happening
> to large portions of our younger generation is a
> reflection of revolt against the authority of
> elders or whether it is a general symptom of a
> sickly society--the revolution or the rotten
> apple. Disaffection and rejection seem to be the
> key words, and alienation the crucial concept.
> --J. L. Simmons and Barry Winogard, It's Happen-
> ing: A Portrait of the Youth Scene Today (Santa
> Barbara, California: McNally and Loftin, 1966),
> pp. 136-138.

[2]In reaction to the announcement of President Nixon on April 30, 1970, that American and South Vietnamese troops were moving against the enemy targets in Cambodia and thus widening the battlefront in Southeast Asia, a wave of protest broke out in colleges and universities throughout the nation. At Kent State University in Ohio on May 4, protesting students and National Guard soldiers precipi-tated a violent confrontation that left 13 students shot, 4 fatally. A few days later on May 14 at Jackson State University in Mississippi after two days of campus demon-strations there, state and city policemen shot and killed

2 students and wounded 12 others. The story of these
killings of unarmed students can be found in numerous
writings, including the following: The Report of the
President's Commission on Campus Unrest, chaired by
William W. Scranton (New York: Avon, 1971); James A.
Michener, Kent State: What Happened and Why (Greenwich,
Conn.: Fawcett, 1971); I. F. Stone, The Killings at
Kent State: How Murder Went Unpunished (New York:
Vintage, 1970).

3Newsweek, October 19, 1971, p. 79.

4Among others, see: William A. Watts and David
Whittaker, "Free Speech Advocates at Berkeley," Journal
of Applied Behavioral Science, 2 (1966), pp. 41-62;
Frederic Soloman and Jacob Fishman, "Youth and Peace:
A Psychological Study of Peace Demonstrations in Washing-
ton, D. C.," Journal of Social Issues, 20, 4 (October,
1964), pp. 54-73; S. M. Lipset and Philip G. Altbach,
Student Politics (New York: Basic Books, 1967); George
S. Paulus, "A Multivariate Analysis Study of Student
Activist Leaders, Student Government Leaders, and Non-
Activists" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan
State University, 1967).

5C. A. Moser, Survey Methods in Social Investiga-
tion (London: Heninemann, 1958), p. 76.

CHAPTER V

THE MEASUREMENT OF ALIENATION

This chapter will show that empirical distinctions

among a number of questionnaire items substantively related

to the concept of alienation coincide with the conceptual

distinctions of alienation specified in Chapter II.

Factor-analytic evidence will be presented to indicate that

the conceptual distinctions related to forms, foci, and

modes of alienation are distinctions which exist empiri-

cally. Measures of alienation consisting of distinctive

groupings of items will be developed that will distinguish

between:

    a) forms of alienation, i.e., cynicism and
       efficacy;

    b) foci of alienation, i.e., the political
       system, self, and school;

    c) modes of alienation, i.e., political and
       apolitical orientations.

The application of factor analysis to develop

measures of alienation is by no means new. Factor analysis

has been used by several researchers to demonstrate the

value of conceptualizing alienation as something other than

a single unified conceptual domain.[1] The empirical

dimensionalizing of alienation complements the work of,

notably, Seeman and Keniston, who provide ample conceptual justification for conceiving alienation as a multi-dimensional phenomenon.[2] In applying the term alienation to students, the fact that the term "alienated youth" has been applied to "such diverse groups as young nihilists, hedonists, retreatists, creative expressionists, and of course, the militant revolutionaries"[3] is an illustration of the implicit acknowledged multliplicity of meanings of the term. While there is mounting recognition that alien-ation is a multi-dimensional phenomenon, there is according to one author, "still no universal agreement among (social scientists) as to whether alienation is a unidimensional or multidimensional phenomenon."[4] In this study, I do not propose to extract "universal agreement" from social scientists about the multi-dimensionality of alienation, but I do propose to show that there is convincing evidence to support the multi-dimensional conceptualization.

Factor analysis is a useful mathematical technique by which multi-dimensionality can be analyzed, for it is capable of reducing complex interrelationships among variables to a more limited set of underlying dimensions or factors. In drawing up these underlying dimensions, it also indicates the relationship between each variable and each factor. Hence, if alienation is a multi-dimensional phenomenon, factor analysis should be able to help differ-entiate its various underlying dimensions as well as indicate how each of the variables relate to given dimensions.

These properties of factor analysis help to establish homogeneous measurement scales.

The idea of homogeneity or purity is one of the most crucial aspects of scale development, for "(o)nly by these procedures can the analyst properly separate the apples, oranges, and coconuts from the salad of items he has put together."[5] Without knowing the homogeneity or, factorial purity of his scales, an analyst is not able to stipulate with assurance that he is measuring a single class of phenomena; he is not able to stipulate that his measure of apples excludes coconuts from being counted as apples. Scalar homogeneity aids in determining that the tests for a particular measure have reference to the same concept for all respondents.

This property of scalar homogeneity or purity is an essential prerequisite of test validity--validity being defined as measuring what is thought is being measured. One of the most enthusiastic and respected advocates of the use of factor analysis in determining test homogeneity is psychologist J. P. Guilford, who has written that:

> It is one of the definite convictions of this
> writer that factorial conceptions of tests
> give us the most illuminating and useful basis
> for drawing conclusions regarding the issues
> involved in test practice. This conviction goes
> so far as to maintain that the most meaningful,
> economical, and controllable type of test battery
> is one that is composed of factorially pure or
> unique tests.[6]

> Much more important than either reliability or
> validity by themselves is the factorial composi-
> tion of the test. I predict a time when every
> test author will be expected to present informa-
> tion regarding the factor composition of his
> tests.[7]

By this statement, Guilford is suggesting that even if

predictive validity is established (i.e., affirming that a

measure can be used to predict accurately how an individual

will score or rank on another trait), it still has not been

demonstrated that all the items for that measure have the

same object reference. A measure's predictive ability for

any single instance may be a chance relationship. We

would have much more confidence in a measure if the items

comprising a measure interrelate in a theoretically mean-

ingful and cohesive manner and indicate by their substan-

tive content that they have a common referent. If items

interrelate in such a manner, the measure is said to have

"face validity." Face validity while basic to any good

attitudinal measure is but one mark of a good measure. It

is also desirable that a measure have what is generally

called "construct validity." According to Kerlinger,

> In order to study the construct validity of any
> measure, it is always helpful to correlate the
> measure with other measures . . . . How better to
> learn about a construct than to know its corre-
> lates. Factor analysis is a refined method of
> doing this. It tells us, in effect, what measures
> measure the same thing and to what extent they
> measure what they measure. In fact factor analysis
> may almost be called the most important of construct
> validity tools.[8]

The alienation measures developed in this chapter will be

shown to have both face validity and construct validity.

Factor analysis, it may be concluded, is a valuable tool for determining whether a phenomenon has meaningful underlying dimensions because it reduces the interrelationships between variables to a smaller number of organized, intercorrelated subsets. In so doing, it helps establish the homogeneity of these underlying dimensions and in this sense, "(f)actor analysis may loosely be considered a multidimensional generalization of Guttman scaling analysis."[9] However, the ability of factor analysis to group items into separate dimensions while useful in developing meaningful measures is not a substitute for careful consideration of the theoretical and conceptual grounds for any particular measure.

In applying factor analysis to the data at hand,[10] a rather demanding strategy of analysis was chosen. It was hoped that it would be possible in this study to develop a measure of alienation specifically applicable to American college students but also applicable to the general adult American population and, if possible, cross-nationally as well. While this may seem overly ambitious, it was essential that an instrument be developed with wide applicability for use in covering the range of political participants described in the Finifter typology. With this in mind, the measures of alienation were constructed in accord with what might be considered a variation of the "cross-validation method" of scale construction. A cross-validation test is "a test to which very

few attitudes scales have been subjected," a test "still

more definitive"[11] than a known group test of discrimina-

tion.

> A test of cross-validation requires two different
> samples and measures of some criterion on each
> sample. The question to be answered by the test
> is whether the combination of items for sample A
> that best correlates with the criterion variable
> in sample A will also work for sample B's criter-
> ion, and whether the best set of sample B items
> works on the sample A criterion.[12]

In this case, three subsamples were used--the

MNC group, Stratum I, and Stratum II--the SDS sample

having been discounted because of its small size (N=14)

and potential instability.[13] The criterion used to judge

whether an item has "cross-sample validity" was whether

it had its highest factor loading on the same dimension

(that is, with the same subset of items) in each of the

three subsamples. In order for a political cynicism item,

for instance, to meet this criterion, it had to have its

highest loading on the same dimension as the other poli-

tical cynicism items and this high-loading configuration

for each of the political cynicism items had to be

repeated within each of the factor analyses of the three

subsamples. Involved then were three separate factor

analyses, one for each of the three different subsamples,

each using the same set of items. On the basis of the

highest loading for each item, it was possible to develop

three factor matrices, one for each subsample, with

identical configurations of high loadings. Since the

criterion used was the grouping configuration of high load-
ings and was thus integral to the set of items used rather
than being a separate, external criterion, the method
used here must be considered a variant of and not identi-
cal with the cross-validation method described above.
This technique, though it may be a variant, serves the
same function as the method it is derived from: to sub-
stantiate that a set of items bears the same relationship
to a given criterion in one sample as it does in another,
thus helping to reassure us that the set of items applied
to one population has similar substantive meaning when
applied to another population. The fact that identical
groupings of high-loading items were developed using such
diverse populations gives reason to believe that a similar
or near similar configuration of items conforming to the
same criterion would result if the same items were applied
to another population.

This rather stringent criterion was applied ori-
ginally to the 53 items in the questionnaire dealing with
alienation. The most gratifying aspect of this criterion
was not merely that there was a coincidence in the con-
figurations of the high loadings across each of the factors
in each of the three subsamples (see Tables V-1 to V-3),
but that these configurations of items matched the con-
ceptual categories used to write the items initially. The
school alienation items in each of the three subsamples

Table V-1.--Varimax Rotation Analysis for Alienation Items; Rotated Factor Loading, MNC (N=148).

	Political Cynicism	Political Efficacy	Personal Cynicism	School Alienation	Personal Efficacy	Political Irrelevance	Comm.
Var. 1	.0913	.2593	-.0697	.6961*	-.0674	-.0548	.5725
Var. 2	.1768	.0225	.0549	.7352*	-.0007	-.0278	.5761
Var. 3	-.3392	.0720	.0614	-.6139*	-.0767	-.0919	.5152
Var. 4	-.1557	-.1993	-.1949	-.3829*	-.1367	-.2473	.3285
Var. 5	.2167	-.0021	.0077	.6189*	-.0089	.0356	.4314
Var. 6	.1864	.2501	-.0882	.6790*	-.0451	.0374	.5696
Var. 7	-.1826	.3533	-.0525	-.4149*	.1631	-.0087	.3598
Var. 8	-.2130	.0002	-.0657	-.6225*	-.1081	.0349	.4500
Var. 9	.3796	.1400	.0492	-.4153*	-.0290	-.2174	.3867
Var. 10	-.0343	-.0398	-.6879*	.0297	-.0938	-.0232	.4862
Var. 11	.2142	-.0242	-.6396*	.0309	.0713	-.1236	.4775
Var. 12	.0056	.0665	.7389*	.0479	.0853	.0503	.5626
Var. 13	.0765	.0907	.5745*	.2990	-.1618	-.0531	.4625
Var. 14	-.0709	.0171	-.5600*	-.1267	.0534	-.0825	.3453
Var. 15	-.6432*	.0599	.0181	-.0027	-.0782	.0733	.4293
Var. 16	-.5280*	.0523	.0540	.2579	-.1788	.2970	.4711
Var. 17	.5162*	.0518	-.1448	-.1149	-.2332	-.1085	.3695
Var. 18	.6136*	.2673	-.0942	-.0601	.0451	.1343	.4805
Var. 19	.6313*	.3138	.0369	-.2288	-.0418	.2171	.5996
Var. 20	-.5367*	.4538	.0296	-.1883	.1225	-.0668	.5498
Var. 21	.5170*	.0851	-.1168	-.1954	.2830	-.0946	.4154
Var. 22	-.1689	.0540	.0818	.1482	.0794	-.6909*	.5437
Var. 23	-.1292	.1126	.0359	.2071	.1462	-.6540*	.5353
Var. 24	-.2656	.1398	.0879	.0593	.1048	-.6034*	.4763
Var. 25	-.0532	-.0786	-.0749	.3298	.0492	-.6837*	.5932
Var. 26	-.0723	-.7742*	-.0305	.0073	-.0313	.0130	.6068
Var. 27	.2180	.7540*	-.0464	.1403	.1772	.0053	.6693
Var. 28	.0412	.5781*	-.0146	.3319	.1081	.0022	.4580
Var. 29	.0007	.6176*	-.1003	-.0147	.0865	.3506	.5221
Var. 30	-.1448	-.0799	-.0994	-.2038	-.5722*	.0628	.4102
Var. 31	.2604	-.0584	-.3337	-.0286	.6009*	.1060	.5557
Var. 32	-.0596	-.0046	-.0944	-.1083	.7062*	.0012	.5229
Var. 33	-.0330	.2315	.0647	.0775	.5310*	.0315	.4641
Var. 34	-.6835*	.2132	.0385	-.1506	-.0046	.0195	.5397
Var. 35	-.6604*	-.1993	.0877	-.2072	-.0347	.0301	.5142
Var. 36	-.6169*	-.0254	-.0584	-.1703	.0189	.1433	.4346
Var. 37	-.5131*	-.0275	.2491	-.2578	-.0698	.0776	.4035
Var. 38	.4697*	.0310	-.1079	.2371	.0250	-.0938	.3044
Var. 39	.4704*	-.0991	-.1092	.1858	.1255	-.0258	.2540
Var. 40	.4719*	.4189	.1159	.2191	.1321	.1127	.4497
Hi.Load.	.6835	.7742	.7389	.7352	.7062	.6909	
Prop.Var.	.1327	.0745	.0617	.1028	.0508	.0569	
Cum.P.V.	.1327	.2072	.2689	.3717	.4225	.4794	

TABLE V-2.--Varimax Rotation Analysis for Alienation Items; Rotated Factor Loading, Stratum I (N=363).

	Political Cynicism	Political Efficacy	Personal Cynicism	School Alienation	Personal Efficacy	Political Irrelevance	Comm.
Var. 1	.2583	.0424	.0605	.7543*	.0216	.1679	.6698
Var. 2	.1966	-.0679	.0375	.7535*	-.0577	-.0094	.6162
Var. 3	-.3915	.0639	-.0836	-.5877*	.0753	-.0450	.5175
Var. 4	-.1130	-.0625	-.1858	-.5316*	.0170	.0967	.3437
Var. 5	.1551	-.0073	.0176	.7336*	-.0222	.0107	.5633
Var. 6	.2925	.0437	-.0475	.7060*	.0014	.1934	.6255
Var. 7	-.3618	.0216	.1911	-.5290*	-.0616	-.2276	.5033
Var. 8	-.3813	-.0018	.0716	-.5723*	.0619	-.0056	.4819
Var. 9	.3030	-.0265	-.1332	.4011*	.0883	.3012	.3697
Var. 10	.1010	-.7669*	-.0419	.0033	.0118	.1151	.6136
Var. 11	.0718	-.7025*	-.0055	.1143	.0607	.0009	.5156
Var. 12	-.0109	.7879*	.1025	.0026	.0103	-.0358	.6328
Var. 13	-.0463	.6852*	-.1102	.0075	.0519	-.0329	.4877
Var. 14	.0059	-.6769*	.1154	-.0280	-.0846	.0948	.4884
Var. 15	.7494*	-.0606	.0188	.2075	.0820	.1112	.6279
Var. 16	-.7361*	.0030	.0005	-.1732	-.1208	-.0841	.5935
Var. 17	-.7289*	-.0233	.0034	-.1060	-.0273	-.0385	.5454
Var. 18	.6110*	-.0201	-.0479	.2252	.0143	.2121	.4719
Var. 19	.7141*	-.0485	.0017	.2850	-.0601	.1433	.6177
Var. 20	-.7136*	-.0066	.0068	-.2898	-.0216	-.2243	.6495
Var. 21	-.6696*	-.0495	-.0867	-.1468	.0152	.0243	.4807
Var. 22	-.0905	-.0564	.6219*	.1847	.0773	.0806	.4447
Var. 23	.0261	-.0246	-.6244*	.0583	-.0385	.0720	.4012
Var. 24	-.0390	-.1495	.5276*	.0547	-.1305	.1195	.3364
Var. 25	-.0072	-.0942	-.7413*	.1261	-.1008	-.0213	.9850
Var. 26	-.2304	.0541	.3260	-.0804	.1312	.6035*	.5502
Var. 27	.3998	-.0010	.1642	.0946	.0780	.6846*	.6704
Var. 28	.2278	-.0257	.0082	.2319	.0111	.7189*	.6233
Var. 29	.1696	-.0428	.4098	-.1386	-.0636	.5882*	.5678
Var. 30	-.3271	-.1222	.1461	-.1944	.5638*	.1925	.5359
Var. 31	.0928	-.0680	.0991	.0068	-.6590*	-.1801	.4898
Var. 32	.0110	-.0947	-.1250	.0522	.7019*	.2841	.6008
Var. 33	.0357	-.0287	.1542	-.0037	.5194*	-.2513	.4723
Var. 34	-.7614*	-.0077	-.0202	-.1642	.0417	-.2002	.6490
Var. 35	-.7363*	-.0290	.0834	-.1446	.0369	0.0793	.5785
Var. 36	-.7322*	-.0262	.0532	-.0824	-.0751	-.0718	.5578
Var. 37	-.6454*	-.0752	.1592	-.1022	-.0294	-.0855	.4660
Var. 38	.5025*	-.1700	.0430	.0711	-.0287	.0421	.2909
Var. 39	.6780*	-.0232	-.0051	.1445	-.1296	.0616	.5007
Var. 40	.6736*	-.0763	.0313	.3140	-.1247	.1041	.5896
Hi.Load.	-.7614	.7879	-.7413	.7543	-.7019	.7189	
Prop.Var.	.1976	.0692	.0543	.1070	.0450	.0600	
Cum.P.V.	.1976	.2668	.3211	.4282	.4731	.5331	

TABLE V-3.--Varimax Rotation Analysis for Alienation Items; Rotated Factor Loading Stratum II (N=297).

	Political Cynicism	Political Efficacy	Personal Cynicism	School Alienation	Personal Efficacy	Political Irrelevance	Comm.
Var. 1	.2273	.0095	.1462	.7467*	-.1344	-.0427	.6505
Var. 2	.1755	-.0048	.0539	.7861*	-.1310	-.0702	.6737
Var. 3	-.3837	-.0332	-.1148	-.5635*	-.0346	-.0248	.4809
Var. 4	-.2208	.0471	-.0338	-.5444*	-.0071	.2105	.3922
Var. 5	.1105	-.0623	.0234	.6597*	.0106	.0848	.4592
Var. 6	.3194	.0515	.1241	.7009*	-.2057	-.1367	.6724
Var. 7	-.4615	-.0359	.0023	-.4770*	.1002	.0102	.4520
Var. 8	-.3578	.0828	.0292	-.6062*	-.1215	-.1442	.5388
Var. 9	.3811	-.1674	-.0018	.4083*	.0525	.0293	.3436
Var. 10	-.0372	-.7150*	.1411	.0509	-.0515	.0052	.5378
Var. 11	.0091	-.7237*	.0848	.0429	-.0067	-.0440	.5348
Var. 12	.0619	.7705*	.0085	.0867	.1644	.0395	.6337
Var. 13	-.0269	.5987*	.1661	.0725	.1450	-.0942	.4219
Var. 14	-.0355	-.5999*	.0307	.1426	-.0557	.0028	.3855
Var. 15	.7132*	.0829	.1323	.1226	-.1260	.0081	.5641
Var. 16	-.7480*	.0626	.0723	-.1116	-.0334	-.1134	.5954
Var. 17	-.6274*	.0083	.0892	-.1060	-.0109	-.0720	.4182
Var. 18	-.6835*	-.0016	.0435	.0807	-.0831	-.0223	.4830
Var. 19	-.6949*	-.0051	.0648	.1695	-.1701	.0654	.5490
Var. 20	-.5987*	-.1101	.0909	.2800	.2320	-.0476	.5133
Var. 21	-.6533*	-.0183	.1947	.0090	.0089	-.1147	.4865
Var. 22	-.1049	-.0744	-.5786*	.0976	-.2153	-.0498	.4097
Var. 23	.0406	-.0094	.7486*	.0303	-.0646	-.0433	.5691
Var. 24	-.1821	-.0454	.4735*	-.0973	-.1326	.0201	.2859
Var. 25	.0402	-.1198	.7773*	.0569	-.1607	-.0316	.6502
Var. 26	-.2680	.1497	.2512	-.1170	.5109*	-.0503	.4345
Var. 27	-.2730	-.1182	-.0849	.0566	-.7386*	-.0100	.6446
Var. 28	.0988	-.1795	.0265	.1575	-.6535*	-.0403	.5041
Var. 29	.0757	-.0914	-.1353	-.0354	.7193*	.1876	.5862
Var. 30	-.2651	-.0309	.0121	.2729	-.1140	-.5656*	.4787
Var. 31	-.1050	-.0483	.0972	.0397	.0739	.7226*	.5520
Var. 32	-.0369	-.0095	.1905	-.0620	.3700	.5838*	.5251
Var. 33	-.0303	.0219	.0365	-.0471	.2402	-.5267*	.3400
Var. 34	-.7270*	.0581	-.0403	-.2404	.0142	-.0327	.5925
Var. 35	-.6677*	.0634	.0123	-.2750	.0558	-.0410	.5303
Var. 36	-.6814*	-.0399	-.1070	-.1938	-.0158	-.0527	.5179
Var. 37	-.5155*	-.1469	-.1917	-.2524	.1096	-.0394	.4010
Var. 38	-.4255*	-.1820	-.0750	.1437	-.0357	.2122	.2868
Var. 39	.6024*	-.0213	.0351	.1404	-.1480	.1518	.4293
Var. 40	.6151*	.0144	.0447	.2711	-.2843	-.0421	.5365
Hi.Load.	-.7480	.7705	.7773	.7861	-.7336	.7225	
Prop.Var.	.1751	.0646	.0524	.1043	.0613	.0435	
Cum.P.V.	.1751	.2397	.2925	.1268	.4501	.5016	

loaded high on the same factor with the other school alien-
ation items, and low on the other factors. Similarly, all
the other questions load high on the factors associated
with their own conceptual categories.

To achieve an identity of configurations between
samples, there was a cost to be paid and a good many items
had to be selectively eliminated. The initial factor
analysis incorporated 53 items associated with alienation.
Over the three subsamples for this initial set of analyses,
there were 26 specific instances (out of a possible 159,
i.e., 53 x 3) involving 18 items where there were discre-
pancies in the high loading configurations between sub-
samples. Reduced to 47 items, there were 9 instances of
discrepancy involving 7 items. Reduced further to 45
items, there were only 4 instances of discrepancy involving
4 different items. To make these last 4 recalcitrant
items conform to the criterion, it was necessary to
eliminate not just 4, but 5 items, leaving 40 items
divided among six dimensions of the general domain of
alienation.

The factor analysis model used was the principal
components model with unities in the main diagonal of a
product-moment correlation matrix. Orthogonal (varimax)[14]
rotation was used to determine the final solution. All
factors rotated had positive eigenvalues greater than
unity. The Kiel-Wrigley criterion was used initially to
determine how many factors should be rotated. This

criterion was set, as recommended,[15] at three, so that rota-
tions would stop when they arrived at a point at which any
factor had less than three high loadings from among the
items analyzed. After some exploration of the data, the
Kiel-Wrigley criterion was no longer used and attention was
focused upon the six-factor solution. However, no final
dimension had less than three high loadings.

Turning to the three final six dimensional solu-
tions (see Tables V-1 to V-3), it is apparent that the
pattern of high loadings is identical between subsamples.
In each of the three subsamples, the same set of items
have their highest loadings in the same dimension. The
loadings themselves are uniformly and moderately high,
generally in the .40 to .70 range with only 1 loading out
of a possible 120 in the .30's range. These loadings
compare favorably to those of Neal and Rettig, who in
their powerlessness scale had 10 of 12 items loading over
.30, 7 of which had loadings over .50.[16] As to the
strength of factor loadings, Rummel states that:

> What the investigator deems moderate--whether
> loadings are above an absolute .50, .20, or
> even .10--depends on the assessment of error
> in his data, the overall interrelationship
> between the variables, and the findings of
> other factor studies in his substantive domain.[17]

Given this statement, it is clear that it is not easy to
determine what is a technically satisfactory factor solu-
tion because the criteria for an acceptable simple
structure have not been standardized. Even Thurstone's

guidelines for simple structure call for a certain amount
of subjective judgment,[18] so that in practice, as Harman
has said, the application of simple structure principles
remains "more an art than a science."[19] "Arbitrary deci-
sions are still required to determine 'significant' factor
loadings, 'large' or 'near 'zero' factor loadings, 'sub-
groups' of variables and the like."[20]

In observing that the factor loadings coincide with
the conceptual schema outlined by Keniston, we would do
well to remember that this coincidence might be the result
of chance or elements unrelated to the analytic validity
of the conceptual schema. For example, in this study, the
fact that the questions are arranged in the questionnaire
by substantive content may help account for the coincidence
of high factor loadings for various substantive subsets.
It may be that what is being measured is not so much a
response to the content of the questions but a response-set
built into the layout of the questions.

The arrangement of questions according to substan-
tive content is recommended procedure in questionnaire con-
struction and built into this and most carefully constructed
questionnaires, and on those grounds, this problem is, to
an extent, unavoidable. While the influence of the ques-
tionnaire layout on the factor arrangement cannot be easily
established, it is obvious that the questionnaire layout
used did allow for numerous combinations of loadings far
less favorable than those that did result. The school

alienation items, for instance, because they were the very

first questions on the questionnaire were arranged as they

were largely for esthetic reasons--the "short and easy

look" and arousal of respondent interest in the content

of the questionnaire--in a non-contiguous series on the

first two pages of the questionnaire. The political

cynicism questions were likewise placed on two separate

pages but nevertheless grouped themselves together on the

same factor dimension according to their factor loadings.

The questions on political irrelevance, political efficacy,

and personal efficacy respectively are grouped together

in sets but occur on one page with each set following the

other without benefit of any sort of layout separation;

these questions were separated from each other into their

respective groupings by the factor analyses.

Another reason for discounting the effect of ques-

tionnaire layout on factor loadings is the content of the

various items eliminated from the original list of 53

items. In most cases, as discussed below, the substantive

content of the items eliminated seem to differentiate them

from items that were retained, leaving groupings of items

that are homogeneous in content. Given these considera-

tions, there is reason to believe that content, not lay-

out arrangement, is the chief basis for differentiation of

factors.

The next step in assessing the results of the
analyses is to examine this substantive content. In the
discussion below, the dimensions will be discussed in the
following order:

1. Dimension representing political cynicism,
   consisting of 14 items.

2. Dimension representing school alienation,
   consisting of 9 items.

3. Dimension representing political efficacy,
   consisting of 4 items.

4. Dimension representing personal cynicism,
   consisting of 5 items.

5. Dimension representing political relevance,
   consisting of 4 items.

6. Dimension representing personal efficacy,
   consisting of 4 items.

1. Political Cynicism

In the initial factor analyses of 53 items, there
were a total of 19 items which in terms of their substan-
tive content seemed prime candidates for inclusion in a
measure of political cynicism as discussed in Chapter II.
Seven questions (labeled #15a, b, c, d, e, f, and g) were
written to appraise the respondent's attitude toward the
"U.S. Government," while another group of questions (#19a
b, c, d, e, f, g, and h) were written with the idea of
trying to incorporate the notion of a hierarchy of

intensities with regard to political cynicism, as discussed in Chapter II. Finally, 4 questions, modified from a measure of "American chauvinism" developed by Litt,[21] were included in the analysis. These 4 questions relating to "American chauvinism," while in some ways related to the other questions on political cynicism, were very early in the analysis also shown to be very much different from them. All 19 questions seemed to load rather consistently on the same dimension, but when a preliminary political cynicism score consisting of the summated responses of these 19 questions was developed and correlated with each of the items, a remarkable distinction was evident. The average product-moment correlation of the four "American chauvinism" questions to the summated political cynicism score was .33 while the average correlation of the other 15 items to political cynicism was .66. Because of this disparity, these 4 questions were excluded from this series of factor analyses and later used to develop a separate measure of "American chauvinism" which proved to have a relatively high internal reliability coefficient.[22]

The final set of factor analyses included all remaining 15 cynicism items except one. The one question excluded (#19h) asked about the need for "fundamental priority changes" in government policy. This question did not load on the same dimension with the other political cynicism questions for each of the three subsamples. The reason for this seems to be related to the fact that

the response pattern for this question was extremely
skewed, much more so than any other question in this
set, with over 61 per cent of the 822 respondents strongly
agreeing that fundamental priority changes are needed in
government policy.

After the factor dimensions were mathematically
formulated, there is the problem of labelling them to desig-
nate what they stand for. Labelling is a subjective
procedure, so much so that some factor analysis purists
prefer to label dimensions with arbitrary alpha-numeric
designations. More generally, however, the dimensions are
labelled in accordance with the content of the highest
loading items in each dimension. The problem of labelling
in this study was simplified by the fact that the highest
loading items in each dimension were substantively similar.
The item with the highest loading in this dimension in two
of the three subsamples was the question (#19a) which
asked if government served in the best interest of the
majority of the people. In the third subsample (Stratum
II), the highest loading item was question (#15b), which
is very similar in content with question #19a, asking
whether the U.S. Government served public or private
interests. The two other questions which by virtue of
their high loadings serve as defining criteria for this
dimension ask about the advancement of the public welfare
through government policy and about whether the government

treats citizens equally or unequally. Overall, these 14
questions listed below serve admirably well, I think, to
operationalize political cynicism as conceptualized in
Chapter II:

15. Please mark the space (e.g., :_X_:) between pair of words which
best describes your feelings toward the U.S. Government.

U.S. GOVERNMENT

Treats citizens equally :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Treats citizens unequally

Serves private interests :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Serves public interests

Spends funds wastefully :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Spends funds wisely

Permissive :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Restrictive

Democratic :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Undemocratic

Deserves no respect:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Deserves respect

Needs restructuring :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Needs no restructuring

19. Please mark [x] your answer for each of the following questions.

Strongly agree-[]
Mildly agree-[]
Mildly disagree-[]
Strongly disagree-[]

a. Government usually does what is in the best interest
of the majority of the people.
[] [] [] []
SD MD MA SA

b. The public's welfare is generally advanced by the
government's policies.
[] [] [] []

c. All in all, the government makes good use of our
tax money.
[] [] [] []

d. Government is doing as efficient a job as can be
expected given its scope of responsibility, size,
and complexity.
[] [] [] []

e. Elected public officials think more about getting
themselves re-elected than about doing what is best
for the community.
[] [] [] []

f. Government is often more attentive to special private
interests of the rich and powerful than to the
general public.
[] [] [] []

g. Government is so hopelessly bad that it should be
thoroughly reorganized from the ground up.
[] [] [] []

2. School Alienation

The questions for this dimension were written to
assess the student's perception of the quality of education
received at Michigan State University. The general focus
of the questions was two-fold: a focus on one's affinity
with MSU as an educational institution and secondly, on
one's assessment of the quality of education received at
MSU. A conscious effort was made to exclude questions
about the quality of auxiliary programs and specific
departments at MSU. No questions asked, therefore, about
the housing situation, the athletic program, the social
atmosphere, the school's administrative personnel, and the
like. Questions were also not asked about the respondent's
support for the general idea of mass higher education, nor
about how MSU compared in specific respects with other
institutions of higher education. Without defining educa-
tion or the goals of an educational institution of higher
learning, the questions were directed toward determining
what students thought about MSU as an institution at which
to be "educated."

Looking at the rotated factor matrices for the
three subsamples, we find that the same two questions
have the highest loadings in each of the three matrices.
These two questions (#1 and #2) ask whether or not students
are proud to be associated with MSU and whether or not
they are satisfied with the overall quality of the educa-
tion they are receiving at MSU. Two other questions (#8

and #9a) which have some of the very highest loadings in each of the three matrices ask about the quality of classroom instruction and whether or not MSU deserves respect. In all, the 9 questions below (numbered #1, #2, #6, #7, #8, #9a, #9b, #9d, and #9g in the questionnaire) drawn from an initial group of 12 questions were used in the final measure of school alienation:

1. All in all, are you proud to be associated with MSU?
     Yes, definitely....................[ ]
     Yes, somewhat......................[ ]
     Yes, but only minimally............[ ]
     No, somewhat.......................[ ]
     No, definitely.....................[ ]

2. Are you satisfied with the overall quality of education you are receiving here at MSU?
     Yes, definitely....................[ ]
     Yes, somewhat......................[ ]
     No, somewhat.......................[ ]
     No, definitely.....................[ ]

6. Do you think the present goals and aims of higher education at MSU should be revised?
     Yes, major revisions of all aspects of MSU are needed........[ ]
     Yes, major revisions of some aspects of MSU are needed.......[ ]
     Yes, revisions of a few aspects of MSU are needed............[ ]
     Yes, some minor revisions of MSU are needed..................[ ]
     No, the present situation needs little revising..............[ ]

7. Financial and personal non-academic reasons aside, have you ever thought of quitting college because you weren't getting all that you hoped to get from college?
     Yes, seriously.................[ ]
     Yes, but not very seriously.....[ ]
     Yes, but only in passing........[ ]
     No, never.......................[ ]

8. Are you satisfied with the quality of the classroom instruction you are receiving here at MSU?
     Yes, definitely.............[ ]
     Yes, somewhat...............[ ]
     No, somewhat................[ ]
     No, definitely..............[ ]

9. Please mark the space (e.g., : X :) between each pair of words so as to best describe your feelings toward Michigan State University with regard to each set of descriptions.

                    MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

    Deserves respect :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Deserves no respect

        Undemocratic :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Democratic

 Needs restructuring :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Needs no restructuring

Serves public interests :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Serves private interests

The three questions (#9c, #9e, and #9f) excluded from this scale of nine had their highest loadings on different dimensions in each of the different sampling subgroups. Questions #9c and #9e, asked, respectively about whether funds were being spent wisely or wastefully at MSU and whether students were being treated equally or unequally. The responses to both these questions tended toward a more negative assessment of the school than reflected on the nine questions used in the school alienation measure. The reason for this, I suspect, is that it is easy to find fault with an institution as large as MSU in these two matters, spending and equal treatment. There is, I am sure, a great diversity of opinions from all sectors of the student population on how school funds should be spent. Similarly, students have a variety of ideas about how they should be treated--many of these based on personal views and experiences with the non-classroom aspects of the school. As for question #9e, there is the additional possibility that the question allowed for too much personal interpretation, for in asking whether students are treated equally or not, the matter of equality in comparison to whom was not made clear. It is uncontestable that undergraduates do not receive the same treatment as graduate students and faculty and even among undergraduates, seniors are treated differently than freshmen. The question would probably have been less ambiguous if it asked whether or not students were treated

fairly instead of unequally. The third question excluded
(#9f) asked whether MSU tended to be restrictive or per-
missive without defining what was meant by restrictive or
permissive. Aside from this definitional vagueness, the
notion of permissiveness and restrictiveness would seem
to pertain more to social, housing, and administrative
aspects of MSU rather than to its educational endeavors,
and in this respect, may be seen as having a different
focus than most of the other questions asked about school
alienation.

3. Political Efficacy

Three of the SRC political efficacy questions and
four other questions designed, among other things, to
alter the affirmative response-set bias built into the SRC
measure were incorporated into the questionnaire for use
in operationalizing political efficacy. The measure as
finally adopted was based on four questions (#16g, h, i,
and l), of which only #16h is from the original SRC
measure. These questions are listed below:

16. g. People like myself can be effective in influencing
the passage or defeat of laws. [] [] [] []

h. People like me don't have any say about what the
government does. [] [] [] []
SD MD MA SA

i. People like me don't have any say about what the
university does. [] [] [] []

l. There's nothing I can do that will have any effect
upon what happens in politics. [] [] [] []

In reducing the political efficacy scale from seven to
four items, the first question which was eliminated was
the SRC question (#16k) which asks whether the respondent
really understands what goes on in a governmental situation
that sometimes seems so complicated. In the original 53-
item factor analysis, this question had its highest load-
ing on the dimensions for political irrelevance, school
alienation, and personal efficacy for the MNC sample,
Stratum I, and Stratum II, respectively--hardly a display
of consistency. For all three of these subsamples, this
question's loading on the political efficacy dimension was
the second lowest of the six possibilities in a six-
dimensional factor solution. The fact that this question
revealed itself to be so very different from the other
political efficacy questions in its loadings affirms my
suspicion that this question is more related to Seeman's
idea of "meaninglessness" than his idea of "powerlessness."[24]
The two other questions which failed to load highly on
the political efficacy dimension had a marked tendency to
load highly on the political cynicism dimension. This
may be an empirical indication of how political cynicism
and political efficacy reinforce each other. Satisfaction
with government policy as reflected in low political
cynicism inclines one to believe that government is
responsive to one's own opinions and interests and puts one
in the pleasant position of relative unconcern about, if not
confidence in, one's political efficacy. High cynicism, on

the other hand, is likely to reflect dissatisfaction with government policy and the feeling that one's opinions and interests either are being ignored by policy-makers or have low priority with them. Whatever the case, high cynicism is likely to be associated with low efficacy.

4. Personal Cynicism

The five items from the Rosenberg "faith in people" scale[25] were used with slight modification to measure personal cynicism. Also known as the "misanthropy" scale, this measure attempts "to assess one's degree of confidence in the trustworthiness, honesty, goodness, generosity and brotherliness of people in general."[26] This scale in one version or another, has been used widely in alienation studies by researchers such as Litt,[27] Aberbach,[28] and Finifter.[29] The items used, numbered #14a, b, c, d, and e in the original questionnaire and displayed below, proved to be cohesive in virtually all of the various factor analyses executed with the three different sub-samples.

132

14. Would you please answer these questions?
a. Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?
Most people can be trusted.....[]
You can't be too careful.......[]
b. Would you say that most people try to be helpful or that they are mostly looking out for themselves?
Try to be helpful..............[]
Looking out for themselves.....[]
c. If you don't watch yourself, most people will try to take advantage of you.
Agree, strongly.....[]   Disagree, strongly.....[]
Agree, mildly.......[]   Disagree, mildly.......[]
d. When you get right down to it, no one is going to care much about what happens to you.
Agree, strongly.....[]   Disagree, strongly.....[]
Agree, mildly.......[]   Disagree, mildly.......[]
e. Human nature is fundamentally cooperative.
Agree, strongly.....[]   Disagree, strongly.....[]
Agree, mildly.......[]   Disagree, mildly.......[]

5. Political Relevance

Five questions were written to measure the salience of politics to the individual after the manner described in Chapter II and accordingly, to help differentiate between those who would be likely to withdraw from or to become active in politics. Of these five questions, the four listed below were included in the final measure:

16. Please indicate how you feel about the following:

Strongly agree-[]
Mildly agree-[]
Mildly disagree-[]
Strongly disagree-[]

a. I feel that the problems of politics have little bearing on the quality of my life.   [] [] [] []
SD MD MA SA

c. Political decisions made in Washington, D.C., have an effect in altering my daily routine of activities   [] [] [] []

d. The problems of life which I would be most eager to see solved relate to me personally and are not public matters.   [] [] [] []

e. Politics is a powerful force in determining the direction of my day-to-day existence.   [] [] [] []

Of these, the defining question for this set (#16e), which had high loadings in all three rotated factor matrices, asks the extent to which politics is a force in determining the direction of a person's life. The question (#16b) which was excluded from this set of four asked whether government and politics were essential for "the good life." Perhaps because of the ambiguity of the phrase, "the good life," and the many differing opinions (or lack of opinions) about what constitutes "the good life," this question behaved very erratically from subsample to subsample, loading high on practically every dimension other than that of political relevance.

6. Personal Efficacy

This set of questions is adapted from Rotter's "internal-external control" measure[30] and was written into the questionnaire as a set of five questions #16m, n, o, p, q) from which one question was dropped in the measure as adopted. The four questions are listed below:

---

10. Please mark [x] the answer which best corresponds to your experience:

                                                    Yes, frequently-[]
                                        Yes, occasionally-[]   :
                                Yes, once or twice-[]   :   :
                                    No, never-[]   :   :   :

n.	Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it.	[]	[]	[]	[]
o.	Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.	[]	[]	[]	[]
		SD	MD	MA	SA
p.	Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.	[]	[]	[]	[]
q.	What happens to me is largely my own doing.	[]	[]	[]	[]

The one question excluded from the original set (#16m) had
to do with whether teachers were arbitrary in assigning
grades to students. Not unexpectedly, the response to
this question, more than the others, seems to be affected
by the student's grade-point average.

Having separated items into groupings representing
different types of alienation, the next step in developing
measures of alienation through factor analysis was to
submit these items to a cluster scoring technique which
summed up the responses to the items in each of these six
groupings, so that each respondent in the sample was given
six different alienation scores. The summation of scores
for three of the alienation types--political relevance,
political efficacy, and personal efficacy--was relatively
simply, for each of the items in these categories had the
same number of response options which could be weighted
1, 2, 3, or 4 in that or reversed order as need be, then
added to similar weightings for each of the other items for
that measure. The other three alienation groupings were
more problematic, for each of them had items with different
numbers of possible response options. The nine-item school
alienation scale had two questions with 5 response options
and four questions with 7 possible response options. The
five personal cynicism questions had either 2 or 4 response
options each, and the 14 political cynicism questions had
either 4 or 7 response options each. It was decided to
weigh each response option for the various questions in

such a way as to give each question the opportunity to contribute equally to the summated score. The weightings were assigned as follows:

1. School alienation--a. Those items with 7 response options per question could assume weights of 1,2,3,4, 5,6,7.
   b. Those items with 5 response options could assume weights of 1,3,4,5,7.
   c. Those items with 4 response options could assume weights of 1,3,5,7.

2. Personal cynicism--a. Those items with 4 response options could assume weights of 1,1,2,2.
   b. Those items with only 2 response options could assume weights of 1 or 2.

3. Political cynicism-a. Those items with 7 response options could assume weights of 1,2,3,4,5,6,7.
   b. Those items with 4 response options could assume weights of 1,3,5,7.

Given these weightings, Hoyt reliability coefficients[31] were computed for each of the alienation measures for all of the 822 respondents in the sample:

Political cynicism (14 items)	.9216
School alienation (9 items)	.8564
Political efficacy (4 items)	.7554
Personal cynicism (5 items)	.7254
Political relevance (4 items)	.6278
Personal efficacy (4 items)	.5573

These reliability coefficients compare well with similar scores reported for other studies on alienation. Agger et al., for instance, report Kuder-Richardson coefficients of .62 [with a coefficient of reproducibility (CR) of .94] for a six-item scale on political cynicism and .25 [with

CR of .92] for a four item scale on personal cynicism.[32]

Dean reports Spearman-Brown coefficients of .78 for a

nine-item scale on powerlessness, .73 for a six-item scale

on normlessness, and .84 for a nine-item scale on social

isolation.[33] Streuning and Richardson for their 1965

study report Spearman-Brown coefficients of .86 for a

16-item scale on alienation via rejection and .65 for a

six-item scale on purposelessness.[34]

A Likert-type scale analysis showing item to over-
all score correlation for each of the six alienation

measures averaged for all 822 respondents in the sample

offers another basis for judging the internal reliability

of the alienation scores. The following listing of the

item to score correlations, including the correlations for

those items originally considered but later excluded from

the alienation scores, indicates that factor analysis was

effective in eliminating the least related items:

1. School Alienation*

Q.#1	.7868	
#2	.7711	Average absolute correlation
#6	-.7044	of 9 items used = .6997
#7	-.6026	
#8	.6909	
#9a	.7656	
#9b	-.6787	
#9c	.4961	
#9d	-.6926	
#9e	.4503	
#9f	-.5003	
#9g	.6951	

*The question numbers are those used in the questionnaire and
the underlined correlations are of those items included in
the final measures.

2. <u>Political Cynicism</u>

Q. #15a	.7481	Q. #19a	-.7844		
#15b	-.7259	#19b	-.7471		
#15c	-.6460	#19c	-.7174	Average abso-	
#15d	.7029	#19d	-.6607	lute correla-	
#15e	.7724	#19e	.5179	tion of the	
#15f	-.7644	#19f	.6658	14 items	
#15g	-.6796	#19g	.7538	used = .7063	
		#19h	.4543		

3. <u>Political Efficacy</u>

Q. #16f	-.4864
#16g	.7536
#16h	-.8406
#16i	.7485
#16j	.4585
#16l	-.6911

Average absolute correlation for the 4 items used = .7583

4. <u>Personal Cynicism</u>

Q. #14a	.7324
#14b	.7829
#14c	-.7224
#14d	-.6223
#14e	.6031

Average absolute correlation for the 5 items used = .6818

5. <u>Political Relevance</u>

Q. #16a	.6583
#16b	-.2198
#16c	-.6930
#16d	.6518
#16e	-.7514

Average absolute correlation for the 4 items used = .6886

6. <u>Personal Efficacy</u>

Q. #16n	.6508
#16o	-.6546
#16p	-.6777
#16q	.6446

Average absolute correlation for the 4 items used = .6569

In spite of the use of orthogonal factor rotation, the different measures of alienation for each of the 822

respondents are correlated with each other to varying degrees, as seen in Table V-4. Most of the correlations are fairly low with the exception of the correlations between political cynicism and school alienation (.65), political cynicism and political efficacy (-.40), and political efficacy and school alienation (-.31). However, even the highest of these correlations (.65) signifies that two-thirds of each measure's variance is independent of the other. Nevertheless, to the extent that the correlations are high, the orthogonal model imposes assumptions of independence which are unrealistic for this set of data.

There are a number of reasons for these rather high correlations. One has to do with the manner in which the alienation measures were developed. The individual items were grouped together on the basis of their highest loadings. While we would hope that the loadings for each item on its dominant factor would approach 1.00, the observed values were generally in the range of .60 to .70, with some around .40. At the same time, some items had loadings in the .25 range on other factors. Thus, simple structure was not entirely achieved. Given these patterns of loadings, it was not reasonable to expect that the various measures of alienation would be entirely uncorrelated with each other.

There are clear substantive reasons for high correlations between the scales. My comments here will be

TABLE V-4.--Correlations Between the Six Measures of Alienation for all 822 Respondents.

	SA	Percyn	Polcyn	Polrel	Poleff
School alienation (SA)					
Personal cynicism (Percyn)	.05				
Political cynicism (Polcyn)	.65	.04			
Political relevance (Polrel)	.18	.00	.18		
Political Efficacy (Poleff)	-.31	-.14	-.40	.15	
Personal Efficacy (Pereff)	-.18	-.06	-.24	-.07	.19

limited to the alienation measures with the three highest

correlations. In the case of political cynicism and

school alienation, the two measures with the highest

correlation, both inquire into the respondent's orientation

toward arms of "the Establishment," as the political system

and the university both might be described. Both institu-

tions are large and important public organizations that

serve diverse sectors of society in a great variety of

ways through quite formidable bureaucratic structures. The

two institutions are interrelated in a number of ways

through finances, exchange of personnel and ideas, and a

variety of programs. Given this sort of relatedness and

the suspicion sometimes voiced by students and others that

the two institutions are sometimes in collusion with each

other, it is not altogether surprising that some respon-

dents might regard these two institutions in the same

light. Even if the two institutions had little in common,

a respondent who felt that society itself is "going to the

dogs" might see both institutions as contributing or

otherwise involved in this deterioration. As for politi-

cal cynicism and political efficacy, we have already noted

that the two are not entirely independent conceptually,

that a person high in political cynicism is likely also

to be low in political efficacy. As to how political

efficacy and school alienation are related, that is less

easy to explain in substantive terms than the first two

cases. There are however at least two connections that

might be made. One is the question in the political

efficacy scale which asks whether people like the respondent

have any say in what the university does. This question

while seemingly misplaced in a political efficacy scale

was included in it as part of the price of the factor

analytic configuration desired. Substantively speaking,

one might consider that the same kind of efficacy needed

to cope with the political system may be helpful in sur-

viving in a university. A person who feels helpless and

lost in the political system might easily feel the same

way toward the university.

Aside from the internal characteristics of a

measure, another and perhaps more important aspect of a

measure is its validity. The question of validity goes

to the meaning of a measure and asks whether the measure

is really measuring what we intended it to measure. In

certain respects, the validity of the measures of aliena-

tion constructed in this study has already been evaluated.

One of the first criteria for validity used on most

measures is "face" or "content" validity.[35] This approach

to validity asks whether the content of the items which

go into the measure appears relevant and representative

of the measure as defined. In other words, do the items

taken for their "face" value (i.e., their outward content)

seem to measure what they are supposed to measure? The

measures in this study, especially since so many of the

items come from previously used and validated scales,

qualify admirably, I think, by this criterion. The use of factor analysis in developing the measures also contributes something to what we want to know about a measure's validity. As cited earlier, Kerlinger talks about factor analysis as an important tool in construct validity. Construct validity is an assessment of expected relationships suggested by the conceptualization given to the measure being examined. Factor analysis in this study demonstrated that the items related to each other in terms of content loaded highly on the same dimension and separated themselves from the other items relating to other aspects of alienation. This distinction between the various aspects of alienation was exactly what is suggested in Keniston's schema for the conceptualization of alienation.

A related test of validity would be to see how each of the sampling subgroups score on each of the alienation measures. Such a comparison of average alienation scores would follow a known-groups method of validation. The expectancy here is that since the subsamples are very different from each other and generally recognized for known patterns of behavior that their scores on alienation would fall into a predictable pattern. Beginning with school alienation, we see in Table V-5 that there is a dramatic progression of scores from high to low alienation beginning with the SDS group, followed by MNC, Stratum I, and Stratum II, in that order. The fact that the SDS group was most disenchanted with school and Stratum II

TABLE V-5.--Means and Standard Deviations of School Alienation for Sampling Subgroups.*

	SDS (N=14)		MNC (N=148)		Stratum I (N=363)		Stratum II (N=297)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
	55.86	9.79	40.33	9.12	37.17	9.61	33.92	9.63

*The maximum possible range of school alienation scores is 9 to 63, and the overall mean for all 822 respondents is 36.89 with a SD of 10.11.

(which consists largely of undergraduates outside the
humanities and social sciences) was the least alienated
subgroup was as expected. What was surprising was the
absolutely high degree of alienation--an average of approx-
imately 56 from a maximum possible of 63--exhibited by the
SDS group, though this may be attributed to the size and
selectiveness of the SDS sample. That the MNC group is
more alienated from school than Stratum I (selected human-
ities and social science majors) is what might be expected
from previous studies.[36]

A look at the political cynicism scores by sampling
subgroups reveals the same pattern as with school aliena-
tion--very high cynicism among the SDS, followed by
decreasing cynicism in the MNC group, Stratum I, and
finally, Stratum II. This pattern in the political
cynicism scores among the sampling subgroups is consistent
with one of the most frequently documented findings in
studies of student politics which show left-wing activist
groups highly cynical about politics, and humanities and
social science majors generally more politically cynical
than other majors.[37] Noteworthy is the fact that as with
school alienation, the SDS group average for this score is
extraordinarily high, especially in contrast to Stratum II.
This similarity in the ordering of subgroups for both the
school alienation and the political cynicism scores
reflects the high correlation of .65 between these two
scores among all 822 respondents.

TABLE V-6.--Means and Standard Deviations of Political Cynicism for Sampling Subgroups.*

SDS (N=14)		MNC (N=148)		Stratum I (N=363)		Stratum II (N=297)	
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
90.71	9.82	78.09	11.60	72.12	15.08	65.88	14.55

*The maximum possible range for political cynicism is 14 to 98 and the overall mean for all 822 respondents is 71.26 with a SD of 15.10.

The political efficacy scores show a slight devia-
tion from the pattern laid out by the two previous scores.
This "deviation," if it can be called that, results from
the MNC score, which for the two preceding scales fit into
a slot between the SDS and Stratum I scores, but which
changes order here. An interpretation of political efficacy
as defined in this study and applied to the various sub-
groups suggests that the MNC score rather than being a
deviation from the expected is consistent with the main
hypotheses of this study. The similarity of the MNC score
to the scores for Stratum I and Stratum II indicates that
the MNC group's orientation to the political system is very
much different from that of the SDS. The people in MNC
feel that government decision-making lies out of their
control but they also have faith enough in the system's
ability to reform itself that they are willing to work
through the system for reform. Moreover, because of their
association with MNC which as an organization did meet
with some limited success in mobilizing support for reform-
oriented candidates in the November, 1970, elections,[38]
MNC members have in a realistic sense, I think, more
justification than the SDS and unorganized students in
believing that their voices are heard and heeded by the
powers that be. Stratum II's score and, to a lesser
extent, Stratum I's score on political efficacy, which
reflect rather high efficacy, are in keeping with the
results of other studies that almost universally indicate

147

TABLE V-7.--Means and Standard Deviations of Political Efficacy for Sampling Subgroups.*

SDS (N=14)		MNC (N=148)		Stratum I (N=363)		Stratum II (N=297)	
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
8.07	2.30	10.56	2.70	10.53	2.71	10.80	2.69

*The maximum possible range of political efficacy is 4 to 16 and the overall mean for all 822 respondents is 10.59 with a SD of 2.71.

that the less politically cynical tend to feel more effica-
cious.[39] A moderately high correlation of -.40 between
political efficacy and political cynicism for all 822
respondents indicates that this general pattern relating
cynicism with efficacy does hold true in this study.

What is intriguing and potentially troublesome in
terms of the main hypotheses of this study is the lack of
difference among the various subgroups, except SDS, on
political efficacy. Given the fact that political efficacy
as used in other studies is usually found to be related to
political participation, the evenness of political
efficacy among the three larger sampling subgroups would
suggest an evenness in their participation patterns. This
is potentially troublesome since one of the main hypotheses
rests on the assumption that there will be a differential
rate or intensity of participation among the subgroups.

Political relevance is the third measure of alien-
ation oriented toward politics, and it follows the pattern
established earlier by school alienation and political
cynicism, with the SDS group feeling politics to be most
relevant, followed by the MNC group, Stratum I, and
finally, Stratum II as the group feeling politics to be
most irrelevant. This pattern is exactly what was
expected. Given the intention to use political relevance
to distinguish between political activists and the politi-
cally withdrawn, it is gratifying to see that political
relevance can distinguish clearly between politically

TABLE V-8.--Means and Standard Deviations of Political Relevance for Sampling Subgroups.*

SDS N=14)		MNC (N=148)		Stratum I (N=363)		Stratum II (N=297)	
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
6.00	2.11	8.23	2.78	8.92	2.50	9.21	2.50

*The maximum possible range of scores for political relevance is 4 to 16 and the overall mean for all 822 respondents is 8.85 with a SD of 2.59.

active and inactive groups. The fact that the SDS is shown
by this measure to be a group very much concerned with
politics and not at all a culturally alienated, politically
withdrawn, "hippie" group is a fact crucial to the under-
standing of SDS in this study.

The subgroup scores for personal cynicism and, to
a greater extent, that of personal efficacy follow a less
distinct pattern than the other alienation scores. With
personal cynicism, a distinction can just barely be made
between groups scoring high and low on personal cynicism.
Distinctions among subgroups on the basis of personal
cynicism are less obvious than with some of the other
alienation scores largely, I suspect, because the sampling
subgroups were selected on the basis of political partici-
pation characteristics, not on the basis of less obvious
personal characteristics such as represented by personal
cynicism.

What it is possible to discern between the personal
cynicism scores of the subgroups is that the two groups
with scores above the overall mean are Stratum I and
Stratum II, the two groups, interestingly enough, with
the lowest scores on political cynicism, while the SDS and
MNC groups, the groups with the highest political cynicism
scores, rank low on personal cynicism. Applying a two-
tailed t-test for significance between means reveals that
the MNC group and Stratum II, the groups most similar to
each other from each of the two halves of the high-low

TABLE V-9.--Means and Standard Deviations of Personal Cynicism for Sampling Subgroups.*

SDS (N=14)		MNC (N=148)		Stratum I (N=363)		Stratum II (N=297)	
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
6.21	1.67	6.49	1.46	6.95	1.68	6.87	1.64

*The maximum possible range of scores for personal cynicism is 5 to 10 and the overall mean for all 822 respondents is 6.83 with a SD of 1.63.

152

TABLE V-10.--Means and Standard Deviations of Personal Efficacy for Sampling Subgroups.*

SDS (N=14)		MNC (N=148)		Stratum I (N=363)		Stratum II (N=297)	
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
10.14	2.21	9.72	2.13	9.99	2.11	10.22	2.10

*The maximum possible range for personal efficacy scores is 4 to 16 and the overall mean for all 822 respondents is 10.03 with a SD of 21.2.

distinction, are significantly different beyond the .01

level. This lower personal cynicism among the left-wing

oriented groups is in keeping with the observation that

the student new-left movement of recent years, if not

left-wing movements in general, holds to a belief in the

goodness of their fellow man.[40]

The last alienation score to be discussed here is

that of personal efficacy, which seems to distribute

itself rather randomly among the four sampling subgroups.

The inability of personal efficacy in this study to

distinguish systematically between groups with high and

low rates of participation is consistent with what

Thurber and Rogers found in their study of student par-

ticipation in the 1970 elections.[41]

Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented a detailed picture of

the procedures used in developing the six measures of

alienation central to this study, and in doing so furnished

evidence as to their internal cohesiveness and reliability.

Using a rather demanding application of factor analysis, it

was shown, in confirmation of the first main hypothesis of

this study, that different types of alienation as outlined

by Keniston in terms of form, focus, and mode can be

empirically as well as conceptually distinguished from

each other. The resulting measures of alienation were

shown, for the most part, to adhere to the conceptual

differences discussed in their formulation and so would
seem to be valid measures of the several alienation
concepts.

FOOTNOTES--CHAPTER V

[1] Arthur G. Neal and Saloman Rettig, "Dimensions of
Alienation among Manual and Non-Manual Workers," American
Sociological Review, 28 (August, 1963), pp. 599-608;
Neal and Rettig, "On the Multi-dimensionality of Aliena-
tion," American Sociological Review, 32 (February, 1967),
pp. 54-64; Elmer L. Struening and Arthur H. Richardson,
"A Factor Analytic Exploration of Alienation, Anomie,
and Authoritarianism Domain," American Sociological Review,
30 (March, 1965), pp. 768-776; Ada W. Finifter, "Dimen-
sions of Political Alienation," American Political Science
Review, 64 (June, 1970), pp. 389-410; Joel D. Aberbach,
"Alienation and Political Behavior," American Political
Science Review, 62 (March, 1969), pp. 86-99.

[2] Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation,"
American Sociological Review, 24 (December, 1959), pp.
783-791; Kenneth Keniston, The Uncommitted: Alienated
Youth in American Society (New York: Dell, 1965),
especially, appendix B.

[3] Abraham J. Tannenbaum, "Introduction: Alienated
Youth," Journal of Social Issues, 22 (Spring, 1969), p. 1.

[4] Ibid.

[5] John P. Robinson, Jerrold G. Rusk, and Kendra B.
Head, Measures of Political Attitudes (Ann Arbor:
Institute for Social Research, 1968), pp. 17-18.

[6] J. P. Guilford, "New Standards for Test Evalua-
tion," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 6 (1946),
p. 429.

[7] Ibid., pp. 437-438.

[8] Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral
Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964),
p. 445.

[9] Hayward R. Alker, Jr. and Bruce M. Russett, World
Politics in the General Assembly (New Haven: Yale Univer-
sity Press, 1965), p. xxii.

[10]A general rule of thumb described below (Appendix, part B-1) was used to eliminate the most flagrant cases of missing data from the sample. After this initial elimination, all that remained were questionnaires with a handful or so of generally isolated missing data items, items which for the most part did not pertain to the measurement of alienation. It was decided that arithmetic means should be used as "best guesses" for all those items (such as the alienation items) which had more or less continuous response choices, and that modes would be used for those items with discrete response choices. This meant that for items with response choice which ranged, for instance, from strongly disagree to strongly agree, means were used as "best guess" substitutes for missing data responses, while for those items such as marital status and religion with discrete response choices, modes were used as "best guess" estimates of missing data. To further insure that these means and modes were in fact "best guesses," the entire sample was broken down into the groups established for the original sampling, so that instead of one large group, separate missing data estimates were established for each of four groups--MNC, SDS, stratum one and stratum two-- according to the means and modes of each separate group. This group separation was done because it was observed that a best guess for a particular item in one group was not necessarily the best guess for the same item in another group. For instance question #1--g-2 asks how frequently respondents had actively participated in protest action against the government on-campus. Of four response choices, all four group's best guess estimates, based on group means for that item, were different! Best guess estimates ranged from "frequent" participation for the SDS subgroup to "never" for stratum two. By breaking down the entire sample into its sampling units and assigning "best guess" estimates for each subunit separately, the usual modulating effect of "best guess" estimates based on means and modes is reduced, though admittedly, this procedure tends to arti ically increase subunit homogeneity.

The following is a summary of the number of missing data items for each of the subgroups:

	No. of missing data items for subgroup	Average no. of missing data items per respondent
SDS (N=14	5	0.357
MNC (N=148)	115	0.777
Stratum I (N=363)	284	0.782
Stratum II (N=297)	262	0.882

	No. of individuals with one or missing data items	% of respondents with missing data items
SDS (N=14)	5	35.7
MNC (N=148)	50	33.7
Stratum I (N=363)	78	21.4
Stratum II (N=297)	83	27.9

These figures on missing data items provide some potentially
useful information about the nature of the data collected.
For one, the low number of missing data items per respondent
is evidence, it seems, of the strict screening of usable
and unusable questionnaires. The rather uniform number of
missing data items per respondent across the three main
subgroups--MNC, Stratum I, and Stratum II--along with the
rather uniform questionnaire return rates for each subgroup
provides additional confidence that the data for the differ-
ent subgroups are comparable. The fact that the SDS and MNC
respondents were likely not to have answered at least one
question agrees with the expectation that they would be
the ones who would be most sensitive about providing personal
information potentially threatening to their sense of
privacy. That this was not was not a serious problem, how-
ever, is indicated by the fact that on a per respondent basis
the SDS and MNC individuals left fewer unanswered questions.

[11]Robinson, et al., p. 18.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Quinn McNemar, "On the Sampling Errors of Factor
Analysis," Psychometrika, 6, 3 (June, 1941), pp. 141-152.

[14]R. J. Rummel, Applied Factor Analysis (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970), p. 392 and 170-171, has stated that varimax rotation is "now generally accepted as the best analytic orthogonal rotation technique." Harry H. Harman, Modern Factor Analysis, 2nd edition, revised (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), p. 307, has stated that varimax rotation is "the most popular means of getting an orthogonal multiple-factor solution." This preference for varimax rotation stems from its inclination to maximize the loadings of the high loading items in each factor, emphasizing the importance of the items central to each factor, and thus aiding in the interpretation or labelling of the different factors.

[15]Michigan State University, Computer Institute for Social Science Research (CISSR), Technical Report No. 34, Factor A, no date.

[16]Neal and Rettig, op. cit.

[17]Rummel, op. cit., p. 325.

[18]See Harman, op. cit., p. 98.

[19]Ibid., p. 294.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Edgar Litt, "Civic Education, Norms, and Political Indoctrination," American Sociological Review, 28 (1963), pp. 69-75.

[22]This four-item scale of "American Chauvivism" as derived from Litt has a Hoyt internal reliability coefficient of .7724. Hoyt's measure of reliability produces exactly the same solution through analysis of variance as the more familiar Kuder-Richardson formula 20. Cyril Hoyt, "Test Reliability Estimated by Analysis of Variance," Psychometrika, 6 (June, 1941), pp. 153-160.

[23]See Robinson, Rusk, and Head, op. cit., pp. 459-60.

[24]Seeman, op. cit.

[25]M. Rosenberg, "Misanthropy and Political Ideology," American Sociological Review, 21 (1956), pp. 690-695.

[26]John P. Robinson and Phillip R. Shaver, Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1969), p. 526.

[27]Edgar Litt, "Political Cynicism and Political Futility," Journal of Politics, 25, 2 (May, 1963), pp. 312-323.

[28]Aberbach, op. cit.

[29]Finifter, op. cit.

[30]J. B. Rotter, "Generalized Expectancies for Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement," Psychological Monographs, 80, whole no. 609 (1966), pp. 1-38.

[31]Hoyt, op. cit. Hoyt's measure of reliability results in exactly the same end product as the more familiar Kuder-Richardson formula 20.

[32]Robert E. Agger, Marshall N. Goldstein, and Stanley A. Pearl, "Political Cynicism: Measurement and Meaning," Journal of Politics, 23 (August, 1961), pp. 477-506.

[33]Dwight G. Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," American Sociological Review, 26, 5 (October, 1961), pp. 753-758.

[34]Streuning and Richardson, op. cit.

[35]Kerlinger, op. cit., Chapter 25.

[36]George S. Paulus, "A Multivariate Analysis Study of Student Activist Leaders, Student Government Leaders, and Non-Activists" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967) reports that student activists at MSU are disenchanted with the school in a number of ways and also summarizes other studies that show a similar orientation by student activists in other schools.

[37]Among others see: S. M. Lipset, "The Activists: A Profile," in Confrontation, ed. by Daniel Bell and Irving Kristol (New York: Basic Books, 1969); Robert H. Somers, The Mainsprings of the Rebellion: A Survey of Berkeley Students in November, 1964," in The Berkeley Student Revolt: Facts and Interpretations, ed. by S. M. Lipset and Sheldon S. Wolin (New York: Anchor Books, 1965), pp. 538-557; Leonard L. Baird, "Who Protests: A Study of Student Activists," in Protest!: Student Activism in America, ed. by Julian Foster and Durward Long (New York: Morrow and Co., 1970), pp. 122-133.

[38]William T. Murphy, Jr., "Student Power in the 1970 Elections: A Preliminary Assessment," P.S., Winter, 1971, pp. 27-32.

[39]George I. Balch, "Multiple Indicators in Survey Research: The Concept 'Sense of Political Efficacy'," paper delivered at the 1971 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, September, 1971, p. 6.

[40]Jack Newfield, A Prophetic Minority (New York: New American Library, 1966); Carl Oglesby, ed., The New Left Reader (New York: Grove Press, 1969).

[41]James A. Thurber and Evan D. Rogers, "Causes and Consequences of Student Participation in the 1970 Elections," paper delivered at the 1971 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, September, 1971.

CHAPTER VI

THE NATURE OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

This chapter will explain the formulation and the nature of political participation as used in this study. It will discuss some of the problems implicit in the formulation of a measure of political participation, the chief dependent variable in this study, and describe how these problems were resolved. In this chapter also will be a description of an attempt to differentiate between styles of participation. By styles of participation, I do not mean a distinction in terms of intensity of participation but rather a distinction of support for the government, i.e., participation directed toward maintenance of the status quo, reform, or revolution. This direction of support should not be likened to right-wing vs. left-wing political orientations, since the right-left distinction overlooks the fact that pressure for change in governmental policies and structure comes from the right as well as the left segments of the contemporary American political spectrum. Finally, this chapter will touch briefly upon personal characteristics associated with different styles and intensities of political participation.

From the outset, several conditions were accepted
that were important in formulation of the concept of
political participation. The first was that political
participation would be formulated entirely as a behavioral,
as opposed to an attitudinal, concept, in spite of the fact
that Finifter's typology of participant types allows and,
in some respects, invites, introduction of an attitudinal
component. In differentiating, for example, between
reform-oriented behavior and conformative behavior or
between reform behavior and revolutionary activity, one's
attitudinal perspective may be the crucial distinguishing
factor. For some students engaging in political activity
within the university community, participation in reform
activity qualifies as conformative behavior, especially
if the student were caught up in the so-called "liberal"
bias of the university community. Similarly, the distinc-
tion between reformist and revolutionary activity might be
considered only a matter of degree as to the extent of
desired change and use of various tactics to achieve given
ends. In a great many ways, the reformists and separatists-
revolutionaries want to achieve the very same goals. Both
want to bring about a more popularly controlled, democratic
government whose policies are formulated openly and without
undue pressure from monied, special interest groups. In
certain respects, both groups seek to achieve these ends by
engaging in similar kinds of activities such as raising the
public consciousness about politics, opposing the war in

Southeast Asia, and supporting minority group participation
in politics. Frequently, the activities of reformists and
separatists-revolutionaries are not only similar but
identical--e.g., contributing funds to free black "politi-
cal" prisoners, marching in protest to university partici-
pation in certain foreign aid programs, and supporting
draft resisters.

Considering these possible similarities in the
participation of some of the types outlined in Finifter's
typology, it would seem difficult to distinguish at times
between these groups solely on the basis of actual parti-
cipation. Why not then ask respondents about their
political inclinations and sympathies as well as their
activity, so that two persons who engaged in similar
activities but who are divided in their support for the
Black Panthers and the Americans for Democratic Action
can be distinguished from each other? The point is that
it may be easier to categorize people into participant
types, such as reformists and separatist-revolutionaries,
by their verbal responses than by their behavior,
especially, when behavioral patterns overlap. But the
easier alternative is not necessarily better, for as the
old adage says, action, or behavior, speaks louder than
words. To a behavioral scientist, behavior is a more
reliable indicator of a person's disposition than verbal
response, and it also tells us more. The social implica-
tions of behavior as opposed to those of attitudes are

more apparent, more direct, and of greater consequence.
Whereas attitudes are generally considered links in a
causal chain of events, behavior is usually taken as the
final link in the chain. Another reason why behavior rather
than attitudes is desirable in a study such as this is
that behavior represents something more readily observable
and more stable than attitudes and consequently studies
based on behavior can be more easily and validly gener-
alized to other situations.

Another constraint imposed upon the formulation of
the measure of political participation is the range of
participant types in the Finifter typology. Most scales
of political participation cover a more limited or at
least a different range of activities than does Finifter.[1]
In many political participation scales, the items vary in
terms of intensity of involvement, with the "hardest"
type of participation usually being the holding of public
office.[2] In Finifter's typology, the participant types
differ not only in intensity of involvement but also in
style of participation, style defined largely in terms
of support or disapproval of the government or its policies.
If support is actually the factor differentiating parti-
cipant types in Finifter's typology, then as mentioned
earlier, it may be difficult to measure participation as
an entirely behavioral, as opposed to attitudinal, variable.
Support for the political system involves more than out-
wardly observable behavior. As Easton has stated:

> In many cases, the ability to detect accurately
> the existence of convert support, or supportive
> states of mind, is far more important than its
> actual expression in overt behavior.[3]

To cope partially at least with this difficulty of measuring

political support solely by observable indices, this study

will use the known-group distinctions in its sampling

schema to test some of the hypotheses derived from

Finifter's typology. The four main sampling subgroups will

be matched with and used to approximate the four main

participant types in Finifter's typology. SDS will be

used to approximate a group exhibiting "extreme disengage-

ment;" MNC as exhibiting a "reform orientation;" Stratum

II (non-humanities and non-social science majors) as

approximating what might be labelled "apathy," especially

in contrast with the other groups; and Stratum I (humani-

ties and social science majors) as approximating, in a

relative sense, a form of "conformative participation."

Admittedly, this approximation of "conformative particica-

tion" by Stratum I is not very good, since these students

are probably much more politically active and liberal than

the average college student and, in that sense, certainly

not "conformative." Nevertheless, neither are they

politically apathetic, especially when compared to

Students in Stratum II. The matching of these known-groups

with Finifter's participant types then are relative approx-

imations given the groups in the sample.

Using known-group distinctions as approximations of
the participant types outlined by Finifter is intended as a
secondary means of testing her typology. The primary means
of testing the main hypotheses of this study will be a set
of questions on political participation written specifically
for college students. These questions explore participation
from two dimensions. The first dimension distinguishes
between the "difficulty" of activities. "Difficult"
activities are those which require intensity of conviction
and usually attract fewer people than "easier" activities.
Used in this sense, the idea of "difficulty" is present in
virtually every measure of participation. The measure of
participation used in this study will differ in some ways
from those that might be used on a group of adult non-
students. When this study was conducted in the spring of
1971, for example, 18-year olds could not vote except in a
few states. So, a question on voting was not included in
this study. On the other hand, students, because of
their proximity to the activities of the university and
the nature of their time schedules and responsibilities,
probably are more likely than their elders to attend
political discussions and rallies. For this reason, several
questions along these lines were included in this measure.
The items cover a broad range of activities which were
chosen because they were thought pertinent to the distinc-
tions made by Finifter in her typology. They ask in three

separate instances that the respondent distinguish whether
the particular activity happened on-campus or off-campus.

The second dimension in the participation measure
asks that the respondent indicate the frequency of his
involvement in the various activities covered in the ques-
tionnaire on a four-point scale from _frequent_ participa-
tion to _no_ participation. This four-point option is
slightly different from that found in most participation
scales which ask only for a yes-no response about partici-
pation in given activities. The object in making this
distinction was the belief that while two participant types,
such as reformists and conformists, may, as suggested
earlier, engage in the same kinds of activities to some
extent, their frequency in participating in these activi-
ties will tend to vary. Many students have, for example,
worn a button for a political cause at one time or
another, but I would assume that students with conforma-
tive participation styles do so less frequently than
reformist oriented students.

Fifteen items selected largely on the basis of
their correspondence to the participant types in Finifter's
typology were eventually used to construct the measure for
political participation. These items (see attached list-
ing) when ranked by "difficulty" ordered themselves as they
were generally expected to. As can be seen in Table VI-1
activities such as discussing politics and keeping informed
about politics were entered into most frequently by the

10. Please mark [x] the answer which best corresponds to your experience:

	Yes, frequently-	Yes, occasionally-	Yes, once or twice-	No, never-
a. Have you ever contributed money to either a political candidate or cause?	[]	[]	[]	[]
b. Have you ever attempted to persuade someone to change his political views or position?	N []	Y12 []	Y,O []	Y,F []
c. Have you ever seriously discussed social or political issues with your friends or family?	[]	[]	[]	[]
d. Have you ever worn a button or displayed a bumper sticker or poster on behalf of either a political candidate or cause?	[]	[]	[]	[]
e. Have you ever personally contacted a public official to express an opinion or complaint, either by mail, phone, letter, or in person?	[]	[]	[]	[]
f. Have you ever gone to a political rally, meeting, debate, or discussion——————— Off-campus?	[]	[]	[]	[]
On-campus?	[]	[]	[]	[]
g. Have you ever actively participated in a protest action against the government——————— Off-campus?	[]	[]	[]	[]
On-campus?	[]	[]	[]	[]
	N	Y12	Y,O	Y,F
h. Have you ever gotten upset or emotionally involved with what is happening in politics?	[]	[]	[]	[]
i. Have you ever worked actively in a student movement to change university rules, procedures, or policies?	[]	[]	[]	[]
j. Have you ever worked to assist a political candidate or cause——————— Off-campus?	[]	[]	[]	[]
On-campus?	[]	[]	[]	[]

11. Did you support and actively participate in the "strike" activities of last spring after Kent State and Cambodia?

Yes, definitely.............................[]
Yes, somewhat...............................[]
Yes, but only minimally.....................[]
No, hardly at all...........................[]
NO, I was in opposition to the "strike"....[]

12. Do you make a conscientious effort to keep informed on public affairs?

Yes, definitely........[]
Yes, somewhat..........[]
Yes, minimally (mainly TV & radio, newspaper headlines)....[]
No, hardly at all......[]

respondents, while working for political candidates on-campus and for a change in university structure or policy were among the least widespread activities. These 15 items were summated for each individual so that each respondent had the possibility of a general participation score with a range of 15 to 60. The average political participation score for all 822 respondents turned out to be

TABLE   VI-1.--Fifteen Participation Items Rank Ordered in
Terms of "Difficulty" of Activity with
"Easiest" Activities Listed First, with
Their Respective Means and Standard Deviations
(N=822).

Rank Order	Question Number*	Question Content	Mean**	SD
1.	#10c	Discuss politics	3.54	0.68
2.	#12 (reversed)	Keep informed	3.28	0.81
3.	#10h	Get upset about politics	3.16	0.93
4.	#10b	Persuade someone	2.80	0.98
5.	#10d	Wear button or display poster	2.55	1.12
6.	#10f-2	Attend meeting-- on-campus	2.35	1.05
7.	#10f-1	Attend meeting-- off-campus	2.19	1.04
8.	#10e	Contact official	1.98	0.96
9.	#10g-2	Participate in protest--on-campus	1.98	1.07
10.	#11 (reversed)	Support 1970 "strike"	1.92	1.13
11.	#10j-1	Work for candidate-- off-campus	1.90	1.04
12.	#10g-1	Participate in protest--off-campus	1.88	1.07
13.	#10a	Contribute money	1.79	0.92
14.	#10i	Work to change of university	1.74	0.97
15.	#10j-2	Work for candidate-- on-campus	1.57	0.91

*Question number refer to those used in questionnaire,
which is appended.

**Means are calculated on the basis of a 1 to 4 range with
1 being no participation whatsoever and 4 being frequent
participation.

35.05 with a standard deviation of 10.33. The Hoyt internal reliability coefficient[4] for these scores was a high .9182. Separately, each of the sampling subgroups had the following average participation scores:

SDS (N=14)		MNC (N=148)		Stratum I (N=363)		Stratum II (N=297)	
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
50.21	7.30	44.01	8.53	34.53	9.14	30.50	9.14

This particular ordering of average participation scores by subgroups is exactly what was hypothesized earlier with regard to the main hypotheses of the study. Given the acceptance of the idea expressed earlier that the sampling subgroups approximate the four main participant types in Finifter's typology, this rank-ordering of subgroups according to participation scores is an affirmation of the assumption upon which the second main hypothesis of this study is based (c.f., p. 84) that the participant types will rank-order themselves in the following manner from high activity to low activity:

1. Separatist-revolutionaries
2. Reformists
3. Conformative participants
4. Apathetics

Evidence of the anticipated ordering of subgroups, while not an actual testing of the typology, lends support for the use of the general participation score as a means of identifying and categorizing various participant types.

Before applying this measure of participation to the testing of the typology, a further attempt was made to differentiate between styles of participation. A glance at the participation items suggests that these items can be divided into groups according to their "difficulty" and that the general orientation of those groups of items might be expected to coincide with the participation types in Finifter's typology. One would expect, for instance, that reformists and separatists-revolutionaries would have higher scores on items dealing with protest action and "strike" activities than the other two participant types and that on items of lesser "difficulty" such as those dealing with discussing politics and getting upset about politics, there would be little difference in the scores of the various participant types.

With this in mind, the fifteen participation items were factor analyzed to determine if there is an empirical relationship between items of similar levels of difficulty and the styles of participation central to this study. The factor analytic technique used was identical with that employed earlier—a principal components model using orthogonal (varimax) rotation with eigenvalues for all rotated factors greater than unity. As with the earlier factor analyses, the three main sampling subgroups—MNC, Stratum I, and Stratum II—were factor analyzed separately so as to avoid a factor solution peculiar to the sampling scheme used in this study. After examining several

solutions of two to four dimensions, a three-factor solu-
tion was pursued because it incorporated to a high degree
similar patterns of high loadings for all three subgroups,
which in terms of the content of the high loadings in each
dimension seemed interpretable along the lines of the
typology.

The idea of breaking down the total participation
measure into subtypes by means of factor analysis to
examine attitudinal underpinnings of participation is an
approach explored previously by W. S. Robinson[5] and
Bernard Finifter.[6] Both these researchers uncover three
different subtypes of political participation, which they
show are linked to different sets of predictors.

The three dimensions divide the participation items
in an interpretable pattern, though not one which coin-
cides strictly with their level of "difficulty" as seen
in Table VI-1. The four items rank-ordered as the four
"easiest" have their highest leadings on the same dimen-
sion, but the other eleven items do not divide themselves
between dimensions strictly according to their difficulty.
Among the six most "difficult" items, there is a three-to-
three split between two dimensions, while among the five
remaining items of medium "difficulty," there is a three-
to-two split, three items in one dimension and two in the
other. In Tables VI-2 to VI-5, we see that the four least
"difficult" items (rank-ordered #1,2,3,4) all have their
highest loadings on the third dimension. Beyond these items

TABLE VI-2.--Factor Loadings (Varimax Rotation) of 15 Participation Items for Total Sample (N=822).

	Protest	Activist	Casual	Commu.
1. Asst. candid.-off	.2374	-.7909	.2104	.7262
2. Contrib. money	.3127	-.6773	.1711	.5858
3. Contact politician	.0751	-.6711	.3430	.5737
4. Asst. candid.-of	.4012	-.6668	.0591	.6090
5. Button/poster	.2206	-.6619	.3724	.6254
6. Rally, demon.-off	.5492	-.5532	.2507	.6705
7. Protest-on	.8573	-.2542	.2023	.8405
8. Spring "strike"*	-.7902	.0371	-.2403	.6835
9. Protest-off	.7716	-.3451	.1833	.7480
10. Rally, demon.-on	.7251	-.3627	.2617	.7258
11. Student movement	.5834	-.4102	.0889	.5166
12. Discuss politics	.0779	-.1171	.8255	.7012
13. Politics upsetting	.3055	-.1417	.6812	.5774
14. Attempt. persuade	.2539	-.3508	.6532	.6141
15. Keep informed*	-.1200	.2528	-.5625	.3947
Propor. Vari.	.2447	.2286	.1662	

*Reversed scoring.

TABLE VI-3.--Factor Loadings (Varimax Rotation) of 15 Participation Items for <u>MNC</u> Subsample (N=148).

	Protest	Activist	Casual	Commu.
1. Contrib. money	.0312	-.7848	.0560	.6200
2. Button/poster	.2957	-.7173	.1144	.6150
3. Asst. candid.-off	.1689	-.6673	.3748	.5391
4. Contact politician	.1449	-.6019	.4000	.5432
5. Asst. candid.-on	.4553	-.5678	.0970	.5391
6. Protest-on	.8754	-.1593	.1615	.8177
7. Rally, demon.-on	.7666	-.2031	.1467	.6504
8. Protest-off	.7410	-.2353	.1623	.6308
9. Spring "strike"*	-.7207	-.0150	-.0924	.5282
10. Student movement	.6121	-.2804	.0164	.4536
11. Rally, demon.-off	.5064	-.4217	.3777	.5769
12. Discuss politics	-.0335	-.0069	.8280	.6868
13. Keep informed*	-.1611	.1130	-.6735	.4923
14. Attempt. persuade	.1488	-.3452	.6536	.5685
15. Politics upsetting	.2690	-.2428	.5219	.4037
Propor. Vari.	.2347	.1887	.1594	

*Reversed scoring.

TABLE VI-4.--Factor Loadings (Varimax Rotation) of 15 Participation Items for Stratum I (N=363).

	Protest	Activist	Casual	Commu.
1. Asst. candid.-off	.1517	.7839	-.1560	.6618
2. Contact politician	-.0016	.6879	-.3732	.5788
3. Asst. candid.-on	.3193	.6668	-.0192	.5470
4. Button/poster	.1065	.6544	-.3732	.5788
5. Contrib. money	.2875	.6363	-.2177	.5349
6. Rally, demon.-off	.4627	.6010	-.1725	.6051
7. Protest-on	.8821	.1732	-.1885	.8436
8. Spring "strike"*	-.7994	.0205	.1311	.6566
9. Protest-off	.7647	.3242	-.1430	.7103
10. Rally, demon.-on	.6842	.3908	-.2503	.6836
11. Student movement	.5443	.4966	-.0376	.5443
12. Discuss politics	.0333	.0542	-.8129	.6648
13. Attempt. persuade	.2925	.2619	-.6715	.6050
14. Politics upsetting	.2154	.1367	-.6712	.5156
15. Keep informed*	-.0586	-.2654	.5169	.3410
Propor. Vari.	.2224	.2281	.1506	

*Reversed scoring.

TABLE VI-5.--Factor Loadings (Varimax Rotation) of 15 Participation Items for Stratum II (N=297).

	Protest	Activist	Casual	Commu.
1. Asst. candid.-off	.2365	-.7980	-.1763	.7238
2. Contrib. money	.3419	-.6978	-.0932	.6125
3. Button/poster	.1821	-.6107	-.4368	.5969
4. Contact politician	.1183	-.5785	-.4664	.5662
5. Asst. candid.-on	.4236	-.4983	-.0399	.4294
6. Protest-on	.8463	-.2449	-.1496	.7986
7. Protest-off	.7761	-.3269	-.1611	.7351
8. Spring "srike"*	-.7649	-.0472	.2543	.6520
9. Rally, demon.-on	.7618	-.2793	-.2502	.7209
10. Rally, demon.-off	.6132	-.4983	-.2472	.6855
11. Student movement	.5521	-.3089	-.1587	.4254
12. Discuss politics	.1696	-.0771	-.7946	.6661
13. Attempt persuade	.1380	-.3154	-.6971	.6046
14. Politics upsetting	.3848	-.0302	-.6840	.6168
15. Keep informed*	-.1401	.1873	.5436	.3502
Propor. Vari.	.2520	.1875	.1728	

*Reversed scoring.

however, an item's "difficulty" and its highest loading do
not coincide so nicely. The highest loading items in the
first dimension are rank-ordered by their difficulty in
the following manner: #5, 7, 8, 11, 13, 15; while those
with their highest loadings in the second dimension have
the following rank-orders: #6, 9, 10, 12, 14.

The pattern found in the factor analysis of
participation items suggests that the different dimensions
may be labelled in accordance with what we have called
styles of participation--style being defined only in part
by the "difficulty" of the activity involved. The simplest
dimension to interpret is that on which the four "easiest"
items have their highest loadings. These items reflect
an involvement in the political system which is neither
very intense nor very direct, but rather, generally passive
and directed more toward other individuals than the poli-
tical hierarchy per se. These activities include discus-
sing politics, keeping informed about politics, getting
upset about politics, and attempting to persuade someone
on one issue or another. A noteworthy aspect of this
dimension is that it holds together in the factor analysis
for all 822 respondents and also when the three main
sampling subgroups, MNC, Stratum I, and Stratum II, are
factor analyzed separately. In all these four factor
analyses, the same item emerges with the highest factor
loading; that item is #10-c, which asks whether the respon-
dent discusses politics with others. The other two

178

dimensions have similar though not quite as much consistency
of high loadings between subsamples. There is one item
which has its highest loading on either one of two dimen-
sions, depending on the subsample analyzed. That item is
#10f-1 in the questionnaire, which asks about attendance
at off-campus rallies and meetings. This item loads most
heavily on what might be called the activist dimension in
the analysis of the entire sample of 822 respondents and
that of Stratum I, but loads most heavily on what might be
called the protest dimension for the MNC and Stratum II
analyses. This switching of high loadings from one dimen-
sion to another in different subsamples may be because
people in the different subsamples attend different types
of rallies and meetings.

Whatever the reason for the switching between
dimensions, the necessity of placing this item in one
dimension or another for purposes of cluster scoring was
resolved by placing it in the protest dimension. The
justification behind this move was two-fold: a) this
item was already in the protest dimension in two of the
three main subsamples, which comprise more than half the
entire sample; b) in terms of substantive content, this
item's "twin" (#10f-2), which asks about participation in
rallies and meetings on-campus, instead of off-campus, is
in the protest dimension for all four factor analyses.
So placing this item in the protest dimension helps keep

items of similar content together, thus lessening the com-
plications involved in interpreting the two dimensions.
With the placement of item #10f-1 in the protest dimension,
the labelling of the dimension is, I think, quite clearcut.

The five items which load most heavily on the
dimension which might be labelled "activist" include acti-
vities such as assisting a political candidate, contribut-
ing money, contacting a public official--all activities
which have customarily been associated with partisan
politics. In every instance, these five items make refer-
ence to a "political candidate or cause" or to a "public
official." By contrast, the six items which load most
heavily on the "protest" dimension include items which
refer more to non-establishment type politics and to such
activities as protest action against the government,
"strike" activities, a movement to change university rules,
and attendance at political rallies and meetings. All
items in this dimension except the two which ask about
attendance at political rallies and meetings involve
explicitly non-establishment activity. The item which is
uniformly the highest loading item for all four factor
analyses on this latter dimension asks about participation
in protest activity against the government, on-campus. The
distinction then among the three dimensions seems clear.
First, there is a dimension which is oriented toward
casual, passive sorts of political involvement. Second,
there is involvement in partisan activities of an "activist"

bent, and finally there is a third dimension which involves
non-establishment "protest" oriented political activity.

On the basis of this factor analyses, the fifteen
participation items were divided into three groups repre-
senting protest, activist, and casual political participa-
tion. Using a cluster scoring technique, individuals'
responses of each of the items were weighted from $\underline{1}$
signifying no participation to $\underline{4}$ signifying frequent parti-
cipation, and summed with the other items in the category,
so that each individual could receive a maximum and mini-
mum score for each style of participation, as listed
below:

Protest participation (6 items) --maximum score possible -24
                                 --minimum score possible - 6

Activist participation (5 items)--maximum - 20
                                   minimum - 5

Casual participation (4 items)   --maximum - 16
                                   minimum - 4

For all 822 respondents in the study, the average
scores with their respective standard deviations and Hoyt
internal reliability coefficients were as follows:

Protest participation --average - 12.49
                        Standard deviation - 5.39
                        Hoyt coefficient - .8934

Activist participation--average - 9.79
                        Standard deviation - 3.87
                        Hoyt coefficient - .8408

Casual participation --average - 12.78
                        Standard deviation - 2.55
                        Hoyt coefficient - .7312

In looking at these scores, a striking observation is that in spite of the fact that the maximum possible score for casual participation is the lowest of the three types of participation, its average score is higher than either of the other two. Given this, one would suspect, and it is true, that all the sampling subgroups, though significantly different from each other at the .01 level or more, have rather high scores on casual participation, as can be seen below:

SDS (N=14)		MNC (N=148)		Stratum I (N=363)		Stratum II (N=297)	
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
14.71	1.44	14.32	1.83	12.84	2.42	11.84	2.62

The similarity of the subgroup scores does not preclude the subgroups from rank-ordering in the expected manner after the fashion of the general participation scores with SDS having the highest score, followed by MNC, Stratum I, and Stratum II with the lowest score. This rank-order is repeated for the activist and protest participation scores, as displayed in Table VI-6.

The similarity of the rank-order pattern for the various participation scores would seem to indicate a high degree of correlation between these scores. The nature of these correlations is, I think, informative. As seen in Table VI-7, the lowest correlation between any of the

TABLE VI-6.--Average Activist and Protest Participation
         Scores by Sampling Subgroups with Standard
         Deviations.

SDS (N=14)		MNC (N=148)		Stratum I (N=363)		Stratum II (N=297)	
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Activist Participation Scores							
14.28	4.41	13.32	3.62	9.39	3.48	8.30	3.15
Protest Participation Scores							
21.21	2.86	16.38	4.69	12.30	5.00	10.37	4.81

TABLE VI-7.--Product-Moment Correlation of Scores for the
         Three Participation Subtypes (N=822).

	Protest Participation	Activist Participation
Activist Participation	.6854	
Casual Participation	.5685	.6073

participation scores is .5685 between protest and casual
participation, which seems understandable in view of the
fact that these two participant subtypes are the most
extreme pair in intensity or "difficulty" of activity. The
second lowest correlation is .6073 between activist and
casual participation, followed by the correlation of .6854

between protest and activist participation. This means
that the coefficient of determination (r^2) between the
two most related participant subtypes is .47 and .32
between the two least related subtypes. To the extent
that these participant subtypes reflect substantive dif-
ferences, it seems worthwhile to see what additional
insights into the relationship between alienation and
participation may be gained by using these subtype scores
along with the total participation score in the testing
of the main hypotheses of this study.

Participation and Alienation: A Preliminary Analysis

This section will include a preliminary discussion
of the relationship between participation and alienation,
largely in terms of zero-order correlations. Of chief
interest will be the four alienation measures--political
efficacy, political cynicism, political relevance and
personal efficacy--which in the next chapter play a
prominent role in the testing of the main hypotheses.

In examining the association between the various
participation and alienation scores in this study (Table
VI-8), an intriguing observation, aside from the generally
high correlations between participation and many types of
alienation, is the correlation between political efficacy
and each of the four participation scores. Compared
to the correlations for the other alienation scores, poli-
tical efficacy's correlations with the various participation

TABLE VI-8.--Zero-Order Correlations Between the Various
Participation and Alienation Scores (N=822).

| Alienation | Participation | | | |
	Total	Protest	Activist	Casual
Political cynicism	.52*	.56	.33	.43
School alienation	.49	.55	.33	.34
Political relevance	-.40	-.30	-.35	-.43
Personal efficacy	-.10	-.12	-.04	-.12
Personal cynicism	-.09	-.07	-.10	-.05
Political efficacy	-.02	-.10	.06	.01

*Correlation coefficients of .07 are significant at the
.05 level, while correlations of .09 are significant at
the .01 level.

subtypes run in different directions. That is, political

efficacy's correlation with protest participation is in

the negative direction (-.10), while the correlations with

activist and casual participation are either nil or weakly

positive (+.06 and +.01, respectively). While it would

be imprudent to read too much into correlations as low as

these, this difference in direction of correlations is

suggested in Finifter's typology. If protest participation

is accepted as akin to extreme disengagement and activist

participation to reform activity, then those engaged in

protest activities would seem to be inclined toward feel-

ings of political inefficacy, while those engaged in

activist participation would seem to be, at least tenta-

tively, inclined toward political efficacy.

Two different explanations for why political effi-
cacy relates as it does to the participation subtypes come
from Robert Lane and George Balch,[7] who both suggest a
re-examination of the concept of political efficacy. Lane
suggests that political efficacy may have explanatory
power only with respect to specific types of political
activity such as discussing issues and writing letters.
In the next chapter when testing some of the hypotheses
derived from Finifter's typology, political efficacy will
be shown to be rather successful in distinguishing the
behavioral pattern of apathetics from that of conformative
participants, while generally less successful in differ-
entiating reformists from the extremely disengaged. The
fact that political discussion and letter writing would
seem to be the type of activity that would differentiate
apathetics from conformative participants but not
reformists from the extremely disengaged lends credence
to Lane's suggestion.

Balch approaches his examination of efficacy
differently. He shows that the widely used Survey Research
Center's political efficacy scale, after which political
efficacy in this study is patterned, can be divided into
two parts, each with very different properties. One part
refers to "internal" efficacy, the feeling that one is
personally capable of action in the political sphere
without regard to whether his actions meet with success
or not. "Internal" efficacy is largely concerned with

whether a person feels resourceful enough to get his political message into the ears of policy-makers. Whether his message is responded to favorably is what "external" efficacy is all about. The concern of "external" efficacy is whether or not government policy-makers are responsive to messages that reach them. In order that a realistic feeling of political efficacy sustain itself, there must be a feeling of both "internal" and "external" efficacy--the feeling that one is capable of getting a message to policymakers as well as the feeling that policymakers will not dismiss or react unfavorably to that message.[8]

An examination of correlations between general participation and the four items which comprise the political efficacy scale used in this study (see Table VI-9) reveals something suggestive of Balch's notion of "internal" vs. "external" efficacy.[9] One of the political efficacy items (#161), which asks whether one can be effective in politics, seems to be reacting quite differently to the general participation score than the other efficacy items. This is the only efficacy item in which high political efficacy is associated with low levels of participation. This same item (#161) is decidedly less correlated with political cynicism than the other political efficacy items (see Table VI-9). Given that these differences between the efficacy items are not dissimilar to the differences Balch found between his "internal" and "external" efficacy items, it is suggested that this

TABLE VI-9.--Correlations of the Four Political Efficacy
Items to General Political Participation and
Political Cynicism (N = 822).

	General Participation	Political Cynicism
Q. #16g--Can influence passage of laws	-.04	.50
Q. #16h--Have say in government	.09	.40
Q. #16i--Have say in university	.15	.30
Q. #16l--Have effect upon politics	-.21	.12

possible distinction between types of efficacy be con-
sidered in future studies and that conscious attempts be
made to construct a measure of efficacy which reflects
these two aspects of the concept. If efficacy is proved
to have these two aspects, then the entire conceptualiza-
tion of the concept might have to be revised. It would
also mean that in testing the Finifter typology, it might
be revealing if tests were run using both the political
efficacy scale as a whole and the individual efficacy
items separately, since this might allow us to show the
complementary aspects of this important concept. In
accordance with the possibility that efficacy has these
two aspects, the effects of the individual efficacy items
on participation will be compared in the next chapter.

Looking back at Table VI-8, we see that political
cynicism is correlated with general participation at the
.52 level, indicating that the politically cynical are
likely to be politically active. This sort of conclusion
contradicts Milbrath's statement, supported by no less
than 13 citations, "that persons who feel cynical about
or alienated from politics are much less likely to parti-
cipate in politics."[10] Milbrath is, of course, drawing
his conclusion from studies of adults engaged in rather
undemanding and traditional forms of political activity.
Studies of student political participation have produced
evidence contrary to Milbrath's conclusion.[11] These
studies of student politics are consistent with findings

of this study and with what Agger <u>et al</u>. have said in pass-
ing about Negro law students who were found to combine
political cynicism with political activity. According to
Agger <u>et al</u>.,

> A pessimistic, cynical view of politics may push
> people towards drastic solutions much as a
> pessimistic prognosis may lead to drastic surgery
> on the part of physicians.[12]

That political cynicism explains more variance with regard
to participation than any other alienation measure agrees
with DiPalma's conclusion that most of the difference in
political participation in the Almond and Verba study is
explained by differences in "political disaffection," a
concept quite similar to political cynicism as used in
this study.[13]

An examination of the correlations between cynicism
and the various subtypes of participation indicates protest
participation correlated with cynicism at the .56 level,
while activist and casual participation have correlations
of .33 and .43, respectively. While all these correlations
are highly significant, they tend to follow a pattern sug-
gested by Jackson that those active in protest activities
definitely tend to be politically cynical.[14] It is less
conclusive that those involved in what Jackson calls
"traditional" activity are politically cynical, though in
this study that is the direction of their disposition.
One inference possible from these findings is that intense
participation such as political protest is more motivated
by politically oriented feelings than less intense forms

of political activity. This statement, while very tenta-

tive, broaches the question of whether student protest

derives from parental permissiveness,[15] conflict between

generations,[16] or deep seated moral and political convic-

tions,[17] to mention only a few of the more popular theories

of student unrest.[18] Initial evidence here (see Table

VI-10) is that political activity is much more strongly

related to political convictions than to variables having

to do with parents or family background. The two items

pertaining to parents and family background which correlate

most highly with protest participation ask whether parents

taken individually are regarded as models of the kind of

person the respondent would like to become. Note that

having parents as affirmative models is positively related

to greater political protest, which is the opposite of

what the "conflict between generation" theorists generally

allege.

TABLE VI-10.--Correlations Between Protest Participation and
            Selected Variables (N=822).

Q. #17 --Political ideological orientation	-.62
#21g--Support of Nixon administration	-.53
#21h--Prosecution for draft evastion	-.43
#21f--Legalization of marijuana	-.40
#38a--Father as model	.18
#38b--Mother as model	.16

Political relevance is found to be positively corre-
lated with political participation to a moderately high
degree (+.40), affirming our expectation in this study and
a finding of Milbrath that:

> It is probably necessary for the person to see
> some relationship between political activity
> and solution to his problems. Persons who
> were highly anxious and were absorbed in their
> personal problems were found to be unlikely
> to be interested in politics.[19]

Chapter Summary

This chapter examines the nature and validity of
the study's main dependent variable, political participa-
tion.

The measure was constructed to capture both the
intensity and style of political participation of college
students. Perhaps the most significant finding in this
chapter is that the four sampling subgroups which loosely
approximate the four main participant types in Finifter's
typology rank-order themselves by their average total
participation scores as hypothesized. The sampling sub-
group with the highest participation score was the SDS,
followed by MNC, Stratum I, and then Stratum II. This
rank-ordering substantiates to a degree the selection of
these particular sampling subgroups and provides empiri-
cal support for an assumption upon which several of the
main hypotheses are built, namely that these sampling
subgroups correspond approximately to the participant
types in Finifter's typology.

An attempt to use factor analysis to divide the
total participation scale into subtypes analogous to those
in Finifter's typology met with qualified success--
"qualified" in that the subtype scores, representing casual,
activist, and protest participation, are fairly highly
intercorrelated. Aside from this qualified success, the
participant subtypes operated in orthodox fashion after
the example of the parent scale. In spite of their inter-
correlations, the participant subtypes have substantive
similarities to some of the participation categories in
Finifter's typology, which suggest that they might be used
to provide a different perspective to the hypotheses to
be tested.

[1]A number of these political participation scales may be found in John P. Robinson, Jerrold G. Rusk, and Kendra B. Head, Measures of Political Attitudes (Ann Arbor: Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan, 1968), pp. 423-435.

[2]Two such instances in which the "hardest" form of participation considered is the holding of public office are to be found in Donald R. Matthews and James W. Prothro, Negroes and the New Southern Politics (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966), and Lester W. Milbrath, Political Participation (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965).

[3]David Easton, A Systems Analysis of Political Life (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965), p. 161.

[4]Cyril Hoyt, "Test Reliability Estimated by Analysis of Variance," Psychometrika, 6 (June, 1941), pp. 153-160. The Hoyt coefficient is the same as the end-product of the Kuder-Richardson formula 20.

[5]W. S. Robinson, "The Motivational Structure of Political Participation," American Sociological Review, 17, 2 (April, 1952), pp. 151-156.

[6]Bernard M. Finifter, "Styles of Participation in Political Life: A Study of University Students in Venezuela" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1967).

[7]Robert E. Lane, Political Life: Why People Get Involved in Politics (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1959), p. 152; George I. Blach, "Multiple Indicators in Survey Research: The Concept 'Sense of Political Efficacy'," paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, September, 1971.

[8]Jacob A. Hurwitz, "Political Efficacy Among Isreali Youth: Beliefs in Government Responsiveness and Political Effectiveness in a Hybrid Political System" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971).

[9]Balch, op. cit., found two of the four items from the University of Michigan Survey Research Center's political efficacy scale similar to political "trust" (the opposite of cynicism as used in this study) items. The two items are those which read:
1. I don't think public officials care much what people like me think.
2. People like me don't have any say about what government does.

[10]Milbrath, op. cit., p. 97.

[11]James A. Thurber and Evan D. Rogers, "Causes and Consequences of Student Participation in the 1970 Elections," paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, September, 1971, found student participants in the 1970 election campaigns more cynical than non-participants, though not to a significant extent. John S. Jackson, III, "Alienation and Black Political Participation," paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April, 1971, found political cynicism and "protest" activity clearly and positively associated with each other so that it was possible to conclude in his study that protest activists are politically cynical. Jackson does however point out that the political cynical are not necessarily protesters--a finding compatible with the distinction made in this study between the two types of extremely disengaged people.

[12]Robert E. Agger, Marshall N. Goldstein, and Stanley A. Pearl, "Political Cynicism: Measurement and Meaning," Journal of Politics, 23, 3 (August, 1961), p. 501.

[13]Giuseppe Di Palma, Apathy and Participation (New York: The Free Press, 1970), p. 73, 30.

[14]Jackson, op. cit.

[15]For an argument linking parental permissiveness with student unrest, see George F. Kennan, Democracy and the Student Left (New York: Bantam, 1968).

[16]Perhaps the most eminent advocate of this line of reasoning is Lewis S. Feuer, The Conflict of Generations (New York: Basic Books, 1969).

[17]One of the outstanding advocates of this orientation is Kenneth Keniston. Among other of this works, see his latest book, Youth and Dissent: The Rise of a New Opposition (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971) in

which he states that youthful dissent could turn out "to
be the last bright chance to transform--and, by renewing,
to preserve--our civilization."--p. xii.

[18]One of the very best summaries of various theories
of student protest is by Seymour L. Halleck, "Hypotheses
of Student Unrest," in Protest!: Student Activism in
America, ed. by Julian Foster and Durward Long (New York:
William Morrow and Co., 1970), pp. 105-122, which is a
paper originally presented at the American Association
for Higher Education, March, 1967.

[19]Milbrath, op. cit.

CHAPTER VII

ALIENATION AND PARTICIPATION: TESTING

OF THE MAIN HYPOTHESES

Studies have linked alienation to political parti-
cipation in a number of ways. Though often defined
differently, alienation has been associated with non-
voting[1] as well as low interest and participation in
politics.[2] Of particular interest in this regard is the
conclusion of a number of studies that when alienated
people break from their usual pattern of low participation
and become politically active that their participation is
frequently negativistic and in opposition to the status
quo--for example, voting "no" in elections and referenda,
sometimes even on issues favored by a majority of the
community and acting in protest against or even to over-
throw the existing power structure.[3] That alienation
toward government, especially if intense, should manifest
itself in political activity is expected, though not
always welcomed even in a participatory democracy, for
alienation is an indication of the failure of government
to perform as expected. In its most extreme state, poli-
tical alienation can lead to the collapse or overthrow of

a regime, while in less extreme forms, alienation can be
regarded as a reflection of the unpopularity or lack of
confidence people have in a given policy, set of offi-
cials, or political structure. Whatever the intensity of
alienation within a political system, its widespread
presence is an ominous warning to political incumbents
that all is not well and that change of policy, of
policy-makers, or both is desired by the populace.

It is the general premise of this study that pres-
sure for political change may take various forms depending
on the nature and intensity of alienation. The concern
of this study is, as stated earlier, directed toward
demonstrative political behavior, as opposed to attitudi-
nal inclinations, for if pressure for change is to have
consequences of any sort, it must eventually so manifest
itself. The concern here is how various manifestations
of alienation relate to various manifestations of change-
oriented behavior. On the basis of alienation alone, it
is rather difficult to predict in all but the most extreme
cases whether behavior will take a liberal or conservative
course. It is however possible to predict that the greater
the alienation of those seeking change, the more likely
it is that they will seek drastic, comprehensive changes
accompanied by militant, if not violent, confrontation.
Within this context, this study will demonstrate empiri-
cally that two forms of political alienation--cynicism and
efficacy--in combination with each other are useful in

delineating the type of political participation likely to
occur and hence the nature of change-oriented behavior
within a political system.

The basic thrust of the main hypotheses of this
study comes from the Finifter typology, outlined earlier, in
which various combinations of high and low political
cynicism and efficacy are related to four basic types of
political participation in the following manner:

1. Those high in political cynicism and low in
political efficacy are hypothesized to tend
toward involvement in activities reflecting
extreme disengagement from the political
system. This group breaks down into two
quite different types of behavior; those low
in political relevance are expected to tend
toward complete withdrawal from politics,
while those high in political relevance
are expected to tend toward involvement in
separatist and revolutionary movements.

2. Those high in political cynicism and also
high in political efficacy are hypothesized
to tend toward involvement in reform
oriented activities directed toward specific
grievances against the established institu-
tions of the system and expressed largely
in terms in accord with established "rules-
of-the-game."

3. Those low in political cynicism and high in
political efficacy are hypothesized to tend
toward involvement in conformative partici-
pation. While what is meant by conformative
participation may be expected to vary some-
what depending on the population and circum-
stance under consideration, it is assumed
that for the most part, participation of
this type would be expected to be of low
intensity (i.e., involving comparatively
little personal investment of time and
energy), low profile (i.e., arousing and
attracting little public attention), con-
ventional (i.e., non-militant and non-
violent), and supportive of the status quo.

4. Those low in political cynicism and low in
    political efficacy are hypothesized to tend
    to be politically apathetic.

In testing the Finifter typology, I will begin by

referring back to hypothesis #2 in the final section of

Chapter III, where the relationship between the four main

categories of participation and the two types of political

alienation is presented along with my estimations of how

these categories of participation should rank-order on the

political participation scale developed for this study.

The expected ordering of categories is as follows, listed

in rank-order from most active to least active:

 Most active--Extreme disengagement--high cynicism and
            low efficacy
          --Reform orientation--high cynicism and
            high efficacy
          --Conformative participation--low cynicism
            and high efficacy
Least active--Apathy--low cynicism and low efficacy

To test this hypothesis, the political cynicism

and political efficacy scales were each divided into

high and low categories at their means.[4] The distribution

of scores for both political cynicism and political eff-

cacy was such that dichotomizing the two measures at

their means also created high and low categories very

nearly equal in size, as recommended by Davis.[5] The

rationale for the 50:50 dichotomization of subjects is

that such a division maximizes variation in the data by

maximizing the number of different random pairs possible

between each half of the dichotomy.[6] The dichotomization

of cynicism and efficacy produces a four-celled distribution

for which an average general participation score for each cell was calculated. These results are reported in Table VII-1. Table VII-1 indicates that the main hypothesis is generally though not completely borne out by the data. As hypothesized, the low cynicism-low efficacy "apathetics"

TABLE VII-1.--Means and Standard Deviations of the General Participation Scores for all 822 Respondents Broken Down by High and Low Political Cynicism and Political Efficacy.

		Political efficacy	
		Low	High
Political Cynicism	High	x = 39.16 SD = 10.00 N = 259	x = 39.85 SD = 9.62 N = 180
	Low	x = 28.34 SD = 7.62 N = 132	x = 30.90 SD = 8.70 N = 251

were the most inactive group and the difference between their level of participation (28.34) and the average participation score (30.90) for the low cynicism-high efficacy "conformative participants" group, the next most active group, was significant beyond the .01 level according to a t-test for comparison of means for a large sample.[7] The next most active group, the high cynicism-high efficacy "reformists," had an average participation score of 39.85, which is significantly greater, far in excess of the .01

level, than that of the "conformative participants."
The difference between this latter group and the high-
cynicism-low efficacy "extremely disengaged" group was
reversed from the hypothesized rank-ordering; instead of
being the most active group, the "extremely disengaged"
had a participation score (39.16) slightly smaller than
that of the "reformist" group.

This discrepancy in my hypothesized rank-ordering
might have been produced by factors other than the sound-
ness of the hypothesis. One explanation lies in the fact
that the extremely disengaged group as conceived by
Finifter is composed of two subsets very different in
political participation. One subset is associated with
separatist and revolutionary movements and would be
expected to be very active politically. The other subset
is characterized by complete withdrawal from politics
and as such would be expected to be very inactive. The
lower than expected participation score for this high
cynicism-low efficacy group may rectify itself when an
attempt is made to differentiate between these two sub-
sets through use of the variable of political relevance.
The expectation is that the separatist-revolutionary sub-
set will break away from the completely withdrawn indi-
viduals when the group is subdivided by high and low
political relevance. One indication that this high
cynicism-low efficacy group consists of diverse elements

202

with very different participation scores is the fact that
the standard deviation for this group is larger than the
other three groups.

Another explanation for the lower than expected
score for the high cynicism-low efficacy cell involves the
particular distribution of the respondents across the four
cells of the typology. In the analysis above (Table VII-
1), the extremely disengaged cell contains the largest
number of respondents, 259, compared to 251, 180, and 132
for the other three cells. Considering the four partici-
pant types and the sample drawn for this study, it would
be my contention that the extremely disengaged cell con-
tains far more respondents than can legitimately be called
extremely disengaged, even given the deliberate over-
representation in this sample of SDS, MNC, and social
science and humanities students. The reason for the large
number of people in this particular cell is not that there
are so many such people in this sample whom we realisti-
cally believe to be "extremely disengaged," but that the
high correlation between cynicism and efficacy (-.40)
and use of the entire sample in this analysis rather than
just the extreme cases forces the high cynicism-low
efficacy cell and its diagonal opposite, the low cynicism-
high efficacy cell, to contain a disproportionately large
number of the respondents in the study. The apportionment
of respondents in the different cells is an artifact of
the criteria used to create the cells--a criteria justified

on methodological groups but not truly reflective of our
substantive notions of the alienation levels of the
respondents in the sample. That the proportion of respon-
dents in each of the cells is not an accurate reflection
of the actual participation pattern within the study is
evident when one considers that while there are 148
respondents in the MNC subsample and only 14 in the SDS
subsample, there are, respectively, 180 and 259 in the
reformist and the extremely disengaged cells. The large
number in the extremely disengaged cell is a gross exag-
geration of the number of people in the entire sample who
might legitimately be described as extremely disengaged.
This is especially so when we consider that Stratum I,
the study's largest subsample and the one most likely to
contribute additional numbers to the extremely disengaged
and reformist cells, would be expected to contain many
more people whose actual participation likens them to the
reformist category than to the extremely disengaged cate-
gory. This being the case, the reformist category should
be larger than the extremely disengaged category, while
in fact, the opposite is true. It seems to me clear that
the selection of cutting points between high and low
political alienation based on non-substantive criteria
inflates the number of people falling into the extremely
disengaged cell. The enlargement of this cell adds
greatly to the possibility that respondents descriptive
of neither type of extremely disengaged individual--the

separatist-revolutionaries or the completely withdrawn--
are included in this cell, thus diluting the effect that
the extremely disengaged individuals may have on the
average cell score.

One way of diminishing the critical effect of
the cutting points is to eliminate from the analysis the
middle group in each of the alienation scales. To do so
would eliminate those respondents who are most likely to
be incorrectly classified because of measurement error
or arbitrary selection of cutting points. The procedure
used in eliminating the middle groups from the alienation
scales was to take those respondents with scores
approximately one-half standard deviation above
and below the mean for either cynicism and efficacy and
to exclude them from the analysis. Using this procedure,
those with political cynicism scores from 65 to 78 and
political efficacy scores of 10 and 11 were eliminated
from the analysis, leaving 426 respondents left to be
analyzed. (The mean and standard deviations for politi-
cal cynicism are 71.26 and 15.10, respectively, and for
political efficacy, 10.59 and 2.71.) These 426 individuals
were divided into their four respective cells in propor-
tions not dissimilar to the previous analysis with all
822 respondents. As in the previous analysis, the
extremely disengaged and the conformative participation
cells contain the largest number of respondents, while the
apathetic cell was the smallest and the reformist cell the

TABLE VII-2.--Means and Standard Deviations of General
            Participation Scores for Upper and Lower
            Segments of the Political Cynicism and
            Efficacy Scales.* (N=426)

		Political efficacy	
		Low	High
	upper	x = 41.17 SD = 9.52 N = 150	x = 42.28 SD = 9.92 N = 160
Political Cynicism	lower	x = 26.71 SD = 7.14 N = 52	x = 30.21 SD = 8.42 N = 164

*Respondents with political cynicism or political efficacy
scores one-half standard deviation above and below the
mean for these scores were excluded from the analysis.

second smallest. With the middle segment of the scales

excluded, the cell averages are, as expected, more extreme

than when all 822 respondents were included in the analy-

sis. The score for the apathetic cell, for instance, is

lower than in the previous analysis for all 822 respondents

and the average score for the reformist cell higher than

before. But the troublesome difference between the

extremely disengaged and the reformist cells remains, as

before, contrary to that hypothesized, with the reformist

cell average the larger of the two. With this exception,

the cell averages follow the hypothesized rank-ordering.

In addition to the explanations above, we must face

the prospect that the scores for the extremely disengaged

and the reformist cells do not rank-order as hypothesized

because of basic inadequacies in the hypothesis itself and
with some of the basic concepts used. It should be noted
that the fact that the high cynicism-high efficacy cell
has the highest participation scores bears out Gamson's
hypothesis that this combination of alienation is optimum
for mobilization.[8] In fact, the data throughout the study
consistently support Gamson's hypothesis. At the same
time, it might be noticed that my hypothesis was qualified
on two counts by the distinction between separatist-
revolutionaries and the completely withdrawn. The first
involves the use of the concept of political relevance
to distinguish between these two forms of extreme dis-
engagement. My hypothesis is contingent upon a certain
level of relevance among the extremely disengaged. The
difficulty with this contingency is that in many political
systems, ours included, politics is not of high salience
or relevance to most people. If politics were more
salient, then we might expect to find a greater tendency
toward separatist-revolutionary activity in the extremely
disengaged cell. But if that were the case, we might
also expect higher levels of participation in the popula-
tion generally, so that the difference in participation
scores among the various alienation combinations might
remain relatively static.

A second consideration is the relative preponder-
ance of extremely disengaged individuals in the target
population. My hypothesis was based in part on an

expectation that the completely withdrawn would be gener-
ally uncooperative respondents, thus accentuating the
presence of the separatist-revolutionaries. It may be that
the withdrawn individuals in this study were flattered by
the opportunity to express themselves and by the personal
attention we tried to give each respondent, and responded
accordingly. Without another independent survey, we do
not know with any certainty that the MSU student popula-
tion even contains very many separatist-revolutionaries.

Two other explanations for the failure of my
hypothesis to be supported by data require re-examination
of two basic concepts related to the hypothesis--partici-
pation and efficacy. We must consider the possibility
that the concept of participation as operationalized in
this study may fail to capture the stylistic distinctions
which the typology makes. In an attempt to correct this
problem, calculations using the same high-low distinctions
for political cynicism and political efficacy used earlier
were developed for the three participation subtypes--
protest, activist, and casual participation--in place of
the general participation score. Table VII-3, which con-
tains these results, indicates that while the hypothesized
rank-orderings emerges for most of the cell relationships
that the extremely disengaged and the reformist cells
still rank-order in opposite direction to that hypothesized.

The conclusion of these various analyses with
participation subtypes is that while the evidence is not at

TABLE VII-3.--Means and Standard Deviations of Participation
Subtype Scores for all 822 Respondents Accord-
ing to High and Low Political Cynicism and
Efficacy.

| | | Political efficacy | |
| | | Low | High |

Protest Participation Score (6 items)

		Low	High
Political Cynicism	high	x = 14.86 SD = 5.46 N = 259	x = 14.94 SD = 5.04 N = 180
	low	x = 9.30 SD = 3.71 N = 132	x = 12.96 SD = 4.18 N = 251

Activist Participation Score (5 items)

		Low	High
Political Cynicism	high	x = 10.62 SD = 3.91 N = 259	x = 11.12 SD = 3.91 N = 180
	low	x = 7.96 SD = 3.02 N = 132	x = 8.92 SD = 3.64 N = 251

Casual Participation Score (4 items)

		Low	High
Political Cynicism	high	x = 13.68 SD = 2.31 N = 259	x = 13.78 SD = 2.05 N = 180
	low	x = 11.07 SD = 2.52 N = 132	x = 12.01 SD = 2.41 N = 251

all overwhelming, the more participation measures emphasize specific stylistic, rather than intensity distinctions, the more nearly the hypothesized rank-ordering seems to evidence itself. Support for this statement includes the apparently greater similarity between the scores in the extremely disengaged and the reformist cells in the protest participation analysis than in the analysis with the general participation score.

The failure to support the hypothesis in all its aspects must be viewed in light of its success in predicting the relationship of scores between all the cells except that of the extremely disengaged behavior. The inability of the hypothesis to correctly predict the relationship between the extremely disengaged and the reformist cells may be due, not to the basic reasoning behind the hypothesis, but to the difficulty in successfully reproducing the stylistic differences in the participation categories of Finifter's typology.

Another explanation for why the extremely disengaged cell participation is smaller than that of the reformist cell has to do with the concept of political efficacy. The data in practically every table in this chapter indicate that political efficacy has much less effect on the rate of participation among those high in political cynicism than among those low in cynicism. From this sort of evidence, the conclusion might be drawn that efficacy has explanatory power only with types of

participation associated with certain degrees of cynicism.
Lane has suggested something of this very sort, that
political efficacy may have explanatory power only with
certain types of political activity, mentioning specifically
letter writing and discussing politics, activities which
characterize those of low cynicism better than the highly
cynical. This finding supports the idea that political
efficacy and political cynicism are not entirely independent
of each other, as the -.40 correlation between these two
concepts for all 822 respondents indicates. In this
regard, Gamson suggests quite directly that "Feelings of
low efficacy and feelings that the government is not being
run in one's interest are, of course, likely to be found
together."[9] If political cynicism combines, as Gamson
says, a "perception of the efficiency of the political
system in achieving collective goals and its bias in
handling conflicts of interest,"[10] then would not a poli-
tically cynical person be predisposed toward believing
that this bias in handling conflicts will work against
him, rendering him comparatively ineffective in influenc-
ing how government outputs are distributed?

Among those who are politically cynical because
they feel they have been ignored or discriminated against
by government, there would seem to be no proof and little
cause to believe that one is or can be effective in get-
ting government to act favorably. For these people,
political efficacy would exist more as a belief that

government might possibly be influenced in its decision-making. This distinction between political efficacy as a political norm and as a psychological disposition or feeling is, as Easton and Dennis have reminded us,[11] crucial to our understanding of the concept. One can believe in the democratic principles underlying a feeling of political efficacy as it should or might exist among the citizenry but still not feel politically efficacious. Central to this distinction between efficacy as a norm and a feeling is the realization that the feeling of political efficacy is a relational concept involving at least two elements-- one, belief in one's personal competence to skillfully use available political resources and two, belief in the government's receptivity to pressures from the citizenry.

The less receptive government is to citizen pressure, the less likely individuals will feel politically efficacious. If government decision-making is normally isolated from public pressure, only those with a high degree of political skill and resources will be able to influence decisions and hence have a realistic basis for feeling efficacious. If government wanted to, it could even discourage citizens from feeling efficacious by threatening or punishing all those who interfere or try to make suggestions with regard to government policy-making. Under these conditions in which citizens feel they have little or no control over what government does, it is rather easy to imagine a link between efficacy and high

feelings of cynicism. As Lane has written, "Possibly . . .
to some extent the sense of political efficacy relates
less to deeper personality qualities than to the actual
responsiveness of the governmental authorities."[12]

> While the two variables [efficacy and cynicism]
> may be distinguished conceptually, it is dif-
> ficult to construct a measure of efficacy
> which is not contaminated by trust [cynicism].
> No matter how interested or active an individual
> is, he is unlikely to say that he can influence
> political affairs if he regards the government
> as essentially unresponsive.[13]

In an effort to see how the political efficacy
measure might be reconstituted to conform to our under-
standing of the differences between the extremely dis-
engaged and the reformist cells, the high-low categories
of political cynicism and each of the four individual
political efficacy items (divided into high and low
categories as close to their medians as possible) were run
against the general participation score. The results,
which appear in Table VII-4, show that two of the four
efficacy items, #16h and #16i, produce extremely dis-
engaged cell scores higher than that of the reformist
cell. The difference between the two cells' scores are
however quite small and statistically insignificant. The
content of these two items provides no special
insight into why they, instead of the other two items, have
this desired effect on the extremely disengaged cell,
leaving us without much of a clue as to how the efficacy

TABLE VII-4.--Means and Standard Deviations of General Participation Scores Broken Down by High and Low Categories of Political Cynicism and the Individual Political Efficacy Items* (N=822).

		Political efficacy item #16g		Political efficacy item #16h	
Political Cynicism	High	x = 38.86, SD = 10.00, N = 218	x = 40.02, SD = 9.68, N = 221	x = 39.61, SD = 9.94, N = 257	x = 39.21, SD = 9.73, N = 182
	Low	x = 28.81, SD = 8.06, N = 112	x = 30.52, SD = 8.54, N = 271	x = 28.23, SD = 7.07, N = 114	x = 30.77, SD = 8.85, N = 269

		Political efficacy item #16i		Political efficacy item #16l	
Political Cynicism	High	x = 39.47, SD = 9.69, N = 289	x = 39.39, SD = 10.17, N = 150	x = 37.60, SD = 9.47, N = 302	x = 43.50, SD = 9.46, N = 137
	Low	x = 30.66, SD = 8.57, N = 163	x = 29.54, SD = 8.32, N = 220	x = 28.55, SD = 7.62, N = 259	x = 32.55, SD = 9.46, N = 124

*The political efficacy items were scored from 1 to 4. The wording of each of the items follow with a notation on how responses were divided into high and low categories:

#16g--People like myself can be effective in influencing the passage and defeat of laws. (Scores of 3 and 4 were classified as high, and 1 and 2 as low.)

#16h--People like me don't have any say about what the government does. (1 and 2 classified as high and 3 and 4 as low.)

#16i--People like me don't have any say about what the university does. (1 and 2 classified as high and 3 and 4 as low.)

#16l--There's nothing I can do that will have any effect upon what happens in politics. (1 classified as high and 2, 3, and 4 as low.)

scale might be reconstructed to clarify the reasons why the hypothesis was not supported.

Of interest tangentially is the observation that while these two items, #16h and #16i, are "twins," so to speak, of each other, both asking whether people like the respondent have any say about what the government or the university, respectively, does, the two have quite different effects on participation scores in the low cynicism-low efficacy cell. One of the most consistent features in the analysis thus far is the relationship between the apathetic and the conformative participation cells, which almost invariably finds the latter's score larger than the former's. In this particular case, this relationship does not hold. With question #16i, which refers to whether the respondent feels people like him have a say in the university, the "apathetic" cell score is higher than that of the conformative participation cell, while the reverse is true for this question's twin, #16h, which refers to the government. This observation that the question which relates to government conforms generally to the hypothesis on political participation while its twin which refers to the university does not, is satisfying to me because in this case the question with the substantive content more appropriate to this analysis (i.e., reference to the political system) proves more adequate in its empirical predictability than a question with substantively less meaningful content. This

illustration that substantive content of an item coincides
with empirical evidence supporting a hypothesized outcome
is especially meaningful since question #16i with its
reference to the university was only reluctantly included
in the measure of political efficacy. This illustration
reawakens us to the value of using substantive content to
guide the selection of items for a measure.

The following section deals with the third main
hypothesis (see page 87) which introduces into the analysis
the sample subgroups. The sample subgroups, because they
represent populations with fairly distinct and well-known
patterns of participation, provide a means, albeit imper-
fect, of testing the stylistic emphasis of participation
in the typology. These sample groups, especially the two
hand-picked subgroups (i.e., MNC and SDS), serve rather
well to approximate the various styles of participation
included in the typology.

Starting with the extremely disengaged cell, if
we assume that the SDS is, relative to the other groups,
extremely disengaged from the political culture, then we
would expect that its members would be found concentrated
in the high cynicism-low efficacy cell of the typology.
An inspection of Table VII-5 indicates that this is the
case. Of the fourteen SDS members in the sample, twelve
or 85.7 per cent of them fell into this cell of the
typology. In addition, each of the other three subgroups
had decreasing percentages of their respective members

TABLE VII-5.--Means and Standard Deviations of General Participation Scores for Sampling Subgroups Broken down into Categories of High and Low Political Cynicism and Political Efficacy. (Percentages in parentheses indicates the proportion of that subgroup in that cell.)

		SDS (N=14) Political efficacy		MNC (N=148) Political efficacy	
		Low	High	Low	High
Political Cynicism	high	x = 48.83 SD = 6.95 N = 12 (85.7%)	x = 59.00 N = 1 (7.1%)	x = 45.74 SD = 7.78 N = 61 (41.2%)	x = 44.84 SD = 7.16 N = 50 (33.8%)
	low	N = 0	x = 58.00 N = 1 (7.1%)	x = 38.18 SD = 9.84 N = 11 (7.4%)	x = 40.85 SD = 10.43 N = 26 (17.6%)

		Stratum I (N=363) Political efficacy		Stratum II (N=297) Political efficacy	
		Low	High	Low	High
Political Cynicism	high	x = 36.77 SD = 8.78 N = 122 (33.6%)	x = 38.50 SD = 9.46 N = 81 (22.3%)	x = 35.62 SD = 10.59 N = 64 (21.5%)	x = 36.52 SD = 9.92 N = 48 (16.2%)
	low	x = 28.96 SD = 6.89 N = 52 (14.3%)	x = 31.71 SD = 8.09 N = 108 (29.8%)	x = 26.30 SD = 6.49 N = 69 (23.2%)	x = 27.68 SD = 6.34 N = 116 (39.1%)

located in this cell in exact rank-order as one would

predict on the basis of their likelihood of involvement in

radical or "extremely disengaged" politics. Of the MNC

group, which is the group most likely to have views

sympathetic to those of SDS, 41.2 per cent fell into the

extremely disengaged cell. Stratum I had 33.6 per cent

of its members in this category and Stratum II, the group

least likely to be supportive of SDS, had only 21.5 per

cent so categorized. I say that "only" 21.5 per cent of

Stratum II fell into this extremely disengaged cell some-

what guardedly because that is over one-fifth of the sub-

group, an appreciable number. But the aim of this hypo-

thesis is to see how the groups distribute themselves

relative to each other. Also it should be remembered that

dichotomizing alienation into high and low categories

practically guarantees that in each group at least a few

respondents will be found in each of the cells unless the

respondents in each group were clumped together near one

or another extreme of the alienation scales.

Moving over to the high cynicism-high efficacy

"reformist" cell of the typology, the expectation is that

the group with the largest percentage of its members in

this cell would be the MNC subsample, which, after all,

was expressly formed to promote reform in Congress. The

data show that MNC is indeed the group with the largest

percentage of its members in the reformist cell with 33.8

per cent. Setting aside the SDS subsample since it has

218

only one member in each of the two categories outside the
extremely disengaged cell, we find that Stratum I and
Stratum II have 22.3 per cent and 16.2 per cent of their
members, respectively, in the reformist cell--a distribu-
tion compatible with our expectations that social science
and humanities majors are generally more politically
active and liberal than other majors in the university.

In the next cell, that of the low cynicism-low
efficacy "apathetics," the hypothesis is that a relative
non-politically oriented group, a description which fits
Stratum II, will have the largest proportion of its mem-
bers in this cell. As with the two previous cells, the
hypothesis is not only correct about which subsample would
have the largest proportion of its members associated with
this cell, but also bolstered by the fact that the propor-
tions of the other subsamples' contribution to this cate-
gory decrease in rank-order with their known political
proclivities for "apathetic" political behavior. As
Table VII-5 shows, Stratum II has 23.2 per cent of its
members in the apathetic cell, Stratum I some 14.3 per cent,
MNC 7.4 per cent, and SDS, not too surprisingly, has no
representation at all in this cell.

The fourth group, Stratum I (selected social
science and humanities majors) fits less clearly any of
the participation categories of the typology than the
other sampling subgroups do. It has been well-documented
over the years that social science and humanities majors

are more frequently involved in political protest and
campus demonstrations than their school peers.[14] Yet it
would not be expected that Stratum I respondents would be
more active in reform activities than MNC members given
the self-selection involved in volunteering for MNC-type
activity. Given this, the general expectation is that
Stratum I would take a middling position between the MNC
group and Stratum II, having proportionately fewer people
in the reformist cell than the MNC group but at the same
time, proportionately fewer people in the conformative
participation category than Stratum II. This indeed is
what the data indicate--Stratum I has 22.3 per cent of
its members in the reformist cell compared to 33.8 per
cent for MNC and 29.8 per cent in the conformative parti-
cipation cell compared to 39.1 per cent for Stratum II.

The chief contribution of this subgroup analysis
pertains to the extremely disengaged and reformist cells
of the typology which so far has been "uncooperative" in
conforming to the hypotheses of the study. Evidence from
this known-group analysis using the SDS and MNC subsamples,
which closely resemble the participatory types associated
with the extremely disengaged and reformist cells, indi-
cates that tne typology is correct in suggesting that these
participatory types are likely to be characterized by
high cynicism-low efficacy and high cynicism-high efficacy,
respectively. The evidence shows that SDS and MNC are
more heavily concentrated in the extremely disengaged and

the reformist cells, respectively, than any of the other sampling subgroups, thus lending support to that aspect of the typology which before this was unsubstantiated by the data.

The reason, I suspect, for the data to behave as they do, only partially conforming to the hypothesized rank-order of hypothesis #2, is due to the manner in which participation was measured in this study. Examination of the participation scores using the high-low alienation dichotomization for both the sample subgroups (see Table VII-5) and the entire sample (see Table VII-1) reveals practically the same pattern of scores--1) a low participation score in the apathetic cell, 2) followed by a slightly higher score in the conformative participation cell, 3) followed by a much larger score in the reformist cell, and finally, 4) in the extremely disengaged cell, a participation score smaller than that of the reformist cell, except in the instance of the MNC subsample. Basic to this arrangement and significant with respect to the participation measure is the quantitative differences in cell scores. In another circumstance, quantitative participation scores might not even have entered into this discussion, but here they are of concern because that is how the testing of the typology was conceived. Given the quantitative approach used here, the correlations between the two main types of alienation and participation prove helpful in explaining why the cell scores vary as they do.

The reason for the comparatively large increase between the
score for the conformative participation cell and the
reformist cell can be traced to the moderately high corre-
lation of .52 between cynicism--the differentiating factor
between these two cells--and participation. In this
respect, it is noteworthy to examine the virtual lack of
correlation between efficacy and participation, as
exemplified by the -.02 correlation between general parti-
cipation and political efficacy. In spite of this low
correlation, the crude dichotomy between high and low
efficacy is consistently able to produce a difference in
participation scores in the hypothesized direction between
the two low cynicism cells representing apathetic and
conformative participation. In order that political
efficacy produce the differences hypothesized between the
two high cynicism cells as well, there would have to be an
interaction effect in which efficacy has the opposite
effects for high cynicism as compared to low cynicism. As
the data now stand, low efficacy does have the hypothe-
sized suppressor effect on participation when associated
with low cynicism, but fails to demonstrate the hypothe-
sized booster effect on participation when associated with
high cynicism.

It is, of course, this study's use of intensity
rather than qualitative style, to distinguish between
types of participation that makes this particular inter-
action pattern necessary in order that the hypothesis be

proved. From evidence at hand, there is indication that
hopes for any sort of interaction in this direction are
slim. A regression interaction test between all three
major alienation measures as well as political participa-
tion indicates that overall for all 822 respondents no
significant interaction is present between this combina-
tion of variables. The test statistic for this regression
interaction analysis was an $\underline{f}$-ratio of 1.07 with 4 and
418 degrees of freedom--insignificant (an $\underline{f}$-statistic of
2.37 being needed for a .05 level of significance). (For
details on this interaction, see Appendix C.) It should
be noted that this interaction test was based on ungrouped
data, i.e., the original interval scale scores for aliena-
tion instead of the dichotomous high-low distinction used
in tables in this chapter. As such, though this is a
rather definitive test for presence of interaction in the
raw data, it is not strictly compatible with the manner
in which the data was used and displayed in this chapter.
What this test suggests however is that had interaction
as hypothesized been found that it might have been an
artifact of the dichotomizing procedure used.

The Contribution of Political
Relevance to the Typology

Thus far in this analysis, the hypotheses derived
from the typology have been at least partially validated
but never very convincingly. One problematic aspect of
the validation deals with the difference between the

extremely disengaged and reformist cells. In almost every instance so far, the difference between these two cells' scores have run in the opposite direction to that hypothesized. The major exception to this contrary pattern is the evidence from the known-group analysis which indicates that the alienation measures defining the extremely disengaged and reformist cells do distinguish between these types of participants as hypothesized. Another way of checking into the difference between the extremely disengaged and reformist cells is provided by the introduction of the concept of political relevance.

As discussed earlier, political relevance was formulated to distinguish between Finifter's two types of extremely disengaged behavior, complete withdrawal and separatist-revolutionary movements. The difference between these two types of behavior, Finifter suggests, "will likely depend on opportunities for political activation or on certain personality characteristics."[15] In this study, we have chosen to focus on the latter, a "personality" characteristic, to use the term broadly. While it is likely that a number of variables are associated with the differences between complete withdrawal and separatist-revolutionary movements, political relevance was selected as the differentiating concept because it crystallizes what Keniston calls "autoplastic" and "alloplastic" modes of alienation, an idea which in turn captures well, I think, the essence of the difference

between complete withdrawal and separatist-revolutionary activity. To recapitulate briefly, an alloplastic mode is manifested by attempts to change society, specifically in this case, the political system, while those of the autoplastic mode react to alienation by attempting to change themselves. Political relevance differentiates between those who feel politics is important in shaping their lives and those who do not, and by doing so, attempts to distinguish between those who are likely to regard as helpful efforts to solve their alienation by political action and those who do not. Those who do not regard politics as relevant to their life condition are not necessarily more cynical or inefficacious than their counterparts; they just see opportunities for a better life, as they envision it, in a different light.

The initial step in utilizing political relevance was, as in the earlier situation with cynicism and efficacy, to divide the measure into high and low categories at its mean or median point. In this case, as in the political efficacy case earlier, adopting either the mean or the median would have put the cutting point at the same place. The result was that given a range of 4 to 16 with an overall mean of 8.85, those scoring 4 to 8 were classified as being in the high political relevance category and those scoring 9 to 16 were classified in the low political relevance category. Applying this high-low classification for political relevance to the high-low

cynicism-efficacy distinction used previously results in an eight-fold breakdown of the respondents. The scores for general participation as well as for the three participation subtypes in these eight groups of respondents are presented in Table VII-6.

Several notable features of these data provide additional support for the typology and for hypothesis #4. One observation is that among those high in political relevance, those in the extremely disengaged cell have larger scores than those in the reformist cell, except for the case of activist participation. This is the result that was sought unsuccessfully earlier in this chapter. In all cases, the differences between the two scores are small and statistically insignificant, but at least the predicted pattern prevails. This difference between the two high cynicism cells in the high political relevance category is more dramatic when one observes that among those low in political relevance, the reverse is true--scores for the reformist cell are larger than those for the extremely disengaged cell. That this pattern should prevail indicates at least tentatively that the typology is right in differentiating between the extremely disengaged respondents in terms of complete withdrawal and separatist-revolutionary activity and that political relevance as used here has the ability to differentiate between these two types of extremely disengaged behavior.

TABLE VII-6.--Means and Standard Deviations of Participation Scores Broken Down by High and Low Categories of Political Cynicism, Political Efficacy, and Political Relevance (N=822).

| | | High Political Relevance | | Low Political Relevance | |
| | | Political Efficacy | | Political Efficacy | |
		Low	High	Low	High
General Participation Score (15 items)					
Political Cynicism	high	x = 42.57 SD = 9.80 N = 134	x = 41.85 SD = 9.23 N = 99	x = 35.51 SD = 8.90 N = 125	x = 37.41 SD = 9.59 N = 81
	low	x = 30.74 SD = 9.23 N = 39	x = 33.54 SD = 9.29 N = 110	x = 27.33 SD = 6.65 N = 93	x = 28.84 SD = 7.64 N = 141
Protest Participation Score (6 items)					
Political Cynicism	high	x = 16.45 SD = 5.41 N = 134	x = 15.54 SD = 4.84 N = 99	x = 13.15 SD = 5.00 N = 125	x = 14.22 SD = 5.21 N = 81
	low	x = 9.69 SD = 4.38 N = 39	x = 10.78 SD = 4.75 N = 110	x = 9.14 SD = 3.41 N = 93	x = 9.33 SD = 3.59 N = 141

TABLE VII-6.--continued.

		High Political Relevance		Low Political Relevance	
		Political Efficacy		Political Efficacy	
		Low	High	Low	High
Activist Participation Score (5 items)					
Political Cynicism	high	x = 11.64 SD = 4.14 N = 134	x = 11.96 SD = 3.97 N = 99	x = 9.54 SD = 3.33 N = 125	x = 10.10 SD = 3.61 N = 81
	low	x = 8.82 SD = 3.88 N = 39	x = 10.10 SD = 4.05 N = 110	x = 7.60 SD = 2.52 N = 93	x = 8.08 SD = 3.04 N = 141
Casual Participation Score (4 items)					
Political Cynicism	high	x = 14.48 SD = 1.76 N = 134	x = 14.35 SD = 1.75 N = 99	x = 12.82 SD = 2.53 N = 125	x = 13.09 SD = 2.19 N = 81
	low	x = 12.23 SD = 2.46 N = 39	x = 12.76 SD = 2.12 N = 110	x = 10.59 SD = 2.39 N = 93	x = 11.43 SD = 2.47 N = 141

The extreme difference in expected activism between
the two participant types of the extremely disengaged cell
recalls my hypothesis #4a that the difference in participa-
tion scores between high and low relevance individuals in
the extremely disengaged cell should be larger than for
the other cells (in which relevance should make less of a
difference). The absolute differences in scores between
the high and low categories of political relevance for
all four participation scales are listed in Table VII-7 and
argue for the validity of this particular hypothesis. In
all instances, the difference between the extremely dis-
engaged cell scores for high and low relevance was greater
than the comparable differences for the other cells of the
typology. Moreover, the data show that of the three par-
ticipation substyles (protest, activist, and casual), the
difference for protest participation, which should most
fully capture the quality of separatist-revolutionary
activity, is almost as large (3.30) as the difference
between the two levels of relevance for the other two
participation subtypes combined (3.76). Here again we
are reminded of the importance of participation style when
dealing with the typology.

An attempt to increase the differences between the
scores both across levels of relevance and between the
extremely disengaged and reformist cells by excluding from
the analysis the middle segments of the cynicism and

TABLE VII-7.--Arithmetic Differences Between the High and
Low relevance Scores for each of the
Typological Categories for each of the
Participation Measures * (N=822).

| | | Political Efficacy | |
		Low	High
General Participation			
Political Cynicism	high	7.06	4.44
	low	3.41	4.70
Protest Participation			
Political Cynicism	high	3.30	1.32
	low	0.55	1.45
Activist Participation			
Political Cynicism	high	2.10	1.86
	low	1.22	1.92
Casual Participation			
Political Cynicism	high	1.66	1.26
	low	1.64	1.33

*These arithmetic differences were derived from data from
Table VII-7.

efficacy scales (see Table VII-8) resulted in findings
similar to the previous analysis of this type in which
relevance was not used (Table VII-2). The procedure used
to exclude the middle segments of the two alienation scales
was the same as used previously, i.e., excluding those
one-half standard deviation on either side of the mean.

TABLE VII-8.--Means and Standard Deviations of Participation Scores for Upper and Lower Segments of Political Cynicism and Efficacy Scores, and High and Low Categories of Political Relevance* (N=426).

		High Political Relevance		Low Political Relevance	
		Political Efficacy		Political Efficacy	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper

General Participation Score (15 items)

Political Cynicism		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper
	upper	x = 43.96 SD = 9.34 N = 81	x = 44.33 SD = 8.94 N = 39	x = 37.88 SD = 8.71 N = 69	x = 38.48 SD = 10.74 N = 21
	lower	x = 31.20 SD= 10.88 N = 10	x = 33.66 SD = 9.45 N = 73	x = 25.64 SD = 5.59 N = 42	x = 27.45 SD = 6.29 N = 91

Protest Participation Score (6 items)

Political Cynicism		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper
	upper	x = 17.27 SD = 5.18 N = 81	x = 16.97 SD= 4.85 N = 39	x = 14.49 SD = 5.03 N = 69	x = 14.71 SD = 5.35 N = 21
	lower	x = 10.40 SD = 5.27 N = 10	x = 10.81 SD = 4.95 N = 73	x = 8.40 SD = 2.85 N = 42	x = 8.61 SD = 3.13 N = 91

TABLE VII-8.--continued.

	High Political Relevance		Low Political Relevance	
	Political Efficacy		Political Efficacy	
	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper
Activist Participation Score (5 items)				
Political Cynicism — upper	x = 12.05 SD = 4.16 N = 81	x = 12.72 SD = 3.95 N = 39	x = 10.07 SD = 3.47 N = 69	x = 10.57 SD = 4.26 N = 21
Political Cynicism — lower	x = 9.30 SD = 4.60 N = 10	x = 10.11 SD = 4.15 N = 73	x = 7.07 SD = 1.85 N = 42	x = 7.70 SD = 2.55 N = 91
Casual Participation Score (4 items)				
Political Cynicism — upper	x = 14.64 SD = 1.72 N = 81	x = 14.64 SD = 1.31 N = 39	x = 13.32 SD = 2.10 N = 69	x = 13.19 SD = 2.04 N = 21
Political Cynicism — lower	x = 11.50 SD = 2.37 N = 10	x = 12.74 SD = 2.20 N = 73	x = 10.17 SD = 2.19 N = 42	x = 11.13 SD = 2.32 N = 91

*Respondents with political cynicism or political efficacy scores one-half standard deviation above and below the mean were excluded from the analysis.

Examination of this excluded middle analysis reveals variation as the different measures of participation are used. The pattern for the general participation measure follows that which we have seen before: the rank-ordering of cells for both high and low relevance is the same as found when all 822 respondents were analyzed without breaking them down into high and low categories of relevance. That is, the highest scores were found in the reformist cells followed closely by those in the extremely disengaged cells, then the conformative participants, and finally the apathetics. By contrast, the highest _protest_ participation scores among those high in political relevance is to be found in the extremely disengaged cell, not the reformist cell. This is what our hypothesis calls for. Unfortunately, though the hypothesized pattern is evident, the difference in scores between the high relevance, extremely disengaged and the high relevance reformists is quite small and statistically insignificant. This pattern is reversed for the activist participation scores, so that the highest activist participation scores among those high in relevance is found in the reformist cell, while the casual participation score among those in the high relevance, extremely disengaged cell is the same as those in the high relevance, reformist cell. Here again the differences in scores are too small for us to draw firm conclusions.

Another and perhaps more direct way of testing

Finifter's typology is simply to divide the sample into

five parts since the typology makes distinctions among

only five types of behavior, not four or eight. To

accomplish this, all that is required is the subdivision

of the high cynicism-low efficacy, extremely disengaged

cell into two subtypes using high and low political

relevance. When so reconstructed, the data (as seen in

Table VII-9) confirm the hypotheses to a greater extent

than ever before.

TABLE VII-9.--General Participation Scores Comparable to Finifter's Five Types of Political Participation.

		Political Efficacy	
		Low	High
Political Cynicism	high	x = 42.58* SD = 9.80 N = 134	x = 39.85 SD = 9.62 N = 180
	low	x = 28.34 SD = 7.62 N = 132	x = 30.90 SD = 8.70 N = 251

*This score is only for those high in political relevance. Those low in political relevance in this high cynicism-low efficacy category have the following average scores:

$$x = 35.51$$
$$SD = 8.90$$
$$N = 125$$

With the high cynicism-low efficacy cell divided
between those high and low in relevance, the average
score of the high relevance, high cynicism-low efficacy
individuals is clearly higher than the high cynicism-high
efficacy reformists. The reformists, aside from having
the second highest participation scores are also clearly
distinguished from the low relevance, high cynicism-low
efficacy individuals (whose score is presented under
Table VII-9). The difference between these various cate-
gories are statistically significant, so that we finally
have arrived at a situation in which both types of
extremely disengaged individuals, the separatist-revolu-
tionaries and the completely withdrawn, and the reformists
are seen as clearly separable behavioral types. While the
average score for the completely withdrawn category is
still higher than that of the conformists and the
apathetics, perhaps it can be argued that since the
general participation measure includes such "private,"
i.e., unobtrusive, types of behavior as discussing poli-
tics and following the political media that those in the
completely withdrawn group may emphasize these activities.
Because of their latent hostility toward the system, they
could not be expected to submerge completely all their
political concerns. If this is the case, then we might
perhaps have to develop a new measure of participation
focused on unobtrusive vs. public activities in order to
properly gauge the level of activity among the completely

235

withdrawn. So long as the completely withdrawn have not

gotten themselves totally immersed in alternative acti-

vities, it seems plausible that they still continue to be

political participants in their own way, though not with

the goal of affecting the politics of "the Establishment."

Whatever is the case, there is still reason to suggest

that the Finifter typology can be useful in guiding social

scientists through the realm of alienation and participa-

tion.

Chapter Summary and Suggestions for Further Research

The principal object of this chapter was to present

empirical evidence to validate the Finifter typology.

While not in any sense constituting a definitive test of

the typology, the hypotheses tested present some indica-

tion that the typology is a valid conceptualization of the

influence of alienation on political behavior. The

typology emphasizes the value of differentiating between

types of alienation, noting how different combinations of

alienation relate to differences in styles of political

participation. The analysis suggests that a part of the

difference in participation patterns among students can

be attributed to their perception of the political

system as reflected in their scores on political aliena-

tion.

The analysis also indicates that there is addi-

tional work and perhaps better procedures that could be

applied to this problem. Perhaps the most crucial task involves the conceptualization and operationalization of political participation. To test the typology more adequately, it would be desirable to make explicit the qualitative, stylistic distinctions between the various types of participation included in the typology. To do so requires a more rigorous and systematic definition of the different styles of participation, perhaps beginning with a comparative analysis of the behavioral categories of Merton and Finifter. Merton's explication of what he calls "modes of personal adaptation" is heavily anecdotal and lacks a theoretical and systematic base. The participatory categories of Merton and Finifter might profit when analyzed in the context of work by Cloward and Harary,[16] both of whom have suggested ways in which Merton's categories might be modified and made more systematic.

In this study, I have tended to avoid defining the participatory categories any more than absolutely necessary, for to begin such an explication would be to commit oneself to an immense task. Ideally, one would begin by defining the outer limits of what constitutes political participation, then differentiating in some systematic and theoretically meaningful way the various types and patterns of political participation. In this specific situation, the task could involve a survey of the various types of political behavior and the establishment

of a norm for what constitutes, for example, "conformative" behavior, and then from that or some other starting point, solving the definitional and operational problems of what constitutes apathy, reform, and withdrawal. Defining each of these participation subtypes so that they are distinguishable from each other in different socio-political situations and with different populations is an enormously difficult task. Consider, for instance, these questions that relate to the definition of reform or innovation:

> --Is any change whatsoever in government structure or policy an innovation or reform? If not, as I suspect would be the case, what does reform consist of?

> --Wouldn't the researcher's bias enter into what constitutes reform and what constitutes "wholesale" innovation or revolution?

> --Wouldn't the actor's perspective, independent of the researcher's, determine what he, the actor, considered revolution, reform, or conformative behavior? If so, what does one do when the actor and the researcher disagree as to the type of participation the actor is engaged in?

> --Could reform be defined so that what constitutes reform in one time period or social context be tantamount to revolution in another?

More questions such as these and equally difficult questions relating to each of the other types of participation can be posed. Answers to all of these questions would amount to something approaching a taxonomic outline of the participation domain. Since a taxonomy, Kaplan suggests, embodies within it "a provisional and implicit theory" of the subject under investigation,[17] an explicit

formulation of participation subtypes would be quite a large undertaking.

Aside from this matter of refining our conceptualization of participation, there are other problems of conceptualization that might be pursued further. One of the most intriguing relates to the concept of political efficacy. This study indicates, as does the work of a number of other researchers who have used this concept,[18] that political efficacy in certain respects both conceptually and empirically is linked to political cynicism. It would be of interest to learn more precisely how and to what extent efficacy is related to cynicism, and also if there are circumstances, as is suggested, in which efficacy loses some of its explanatory powers. In this study, a number of questions relating to efficacy, both political and personal, were asked. Some of these questions which were not used in this study could be used in addition to or in place of questions which now are part of the political efficacy measure. Such a modification of the efficacy measure could shed light on the make-up of the concept.

Another conceptual undertaking would be that of sharpening the focus of political cynicism. This could be accomplished in two ways--one with regard to the object of focus and another with regard to intensity of cynicism. As to the first, Easton has suggested that people react differently toward different political objects, such as

political incumbents, the political regime, and the broader political community[19]--not to mention different levels and branches of government. Of interest here is the extent to which people differentiate between political objects and if so, what their reactions are. A second approach in refining the concept of political cynicism would be to see if qualitative subcategories of cynicism, as suggested in Chapter II, could be formulated. (In Chapter II, I have presented a brief exposition on cynicism in which the concept is broken down into subtypes which reflect different degrees of intensity.) In this study, questions relating to each of the different intensities of cynicism did not interrelate as expected. But perhaps with further work, some additional questions, and a more systematic framework for differentiating between subtypes, distinctions within the cynicism measure, if there are any, will reveal themselves.

Still another project (and an important one) would be to reproduce the dimensionalization of political and personal alienation as accomplished in this study using a different population or an entirely different social setting, perhaps one outside the university community. Such a project would provide additional support for Keniston's schema for conceptualizing alienation.[20]

On a less ambitious level and limiting ourselves to data on hand, there is considerably more work that might be done. This study has restricted itself to matters

relating to the three types of political alienation,
ignoring the other types of alienation developed in this
study. This leaves a great deal more work left to do
within the domain of alienation. With regard to personal
efficacy, there is a rather intense and interesting debate
to which data from this study might possibly apply. The
debate centers around what has been called the "blocked-
opportunity" and the "alienation-powerlessness" theories
of urban rioting.[21] Thus far, subjects for this debate
have been urban blacks for the most part, but college
students could just as well serve as subjects especially
in light of the window "trashings" and other related types
of violence that frequently occurred around colleges during
the 1969-70 school year and thereafter. There are only a
couple of questions in this study which pertain to use of
violence and rioting because this type of question,
possibly self-incriminating, was generally excluded from
the questionnaire, but the few that remain might serve as
a start for new ideas. Aside from this, aspects relating
to the measure of school alienation were virtually
unexplored in this study, as is also the case with personal
cynicism, which is essentially a duplication of the Rosen-
berg "faith-in-people" scale.[22]

These suggestions represent but some of the possi-
bilities for further work on this topic of alienation.
Hopefully, some, if not all, of these possibilities for
research will be eventually explored. Certainly, there

is enough current concern over alienation to believe that these undertakings could be worthwhile.

[1]See, among other sources, Angus Campbell, Phillip Converse, Warren Miller, and Donald Stokes, The American Voter (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960); Marvin E. Olsen, "Alienation and Public Opinion," Public Opinion Quarterly, 29, 2 (Summer, 1965), pp. 200-213; Donald Stokes, "Popular Evaluations of Government: An Empirical Assessment," in Ethics and Bigness, ed. by Harlan Cleveland and Harold Lasswell (New York: Harper, 1962), pp. 61-73; Kenneth Janda, "A Comparative Study of Political Aliena-tion and Voting Behavior in Three Suburban Communities," Studies in History and Social Sciences: Studies in Honor of John A. Kinneman (Normal: Illinois State University Press, 1965), pp. 53-68.

[2]Campbell et al., op. cit.; Robert E. Agger, Marshall Goldstein, and Stanley A. Pearl, "Political Cynicism: Measurement and Meaning," Journal of Politics, 23, 3 (August, 1961), pp. 477-506; Morris Rosenberg, "Misanthropy and Political Ideology," American Sociologi-cal Review, 21, 6 (December, 1956), pp. 690-695; John P. Clark, "Measuring Alienation Within a Social System," American Sociological Review, 24, 6 (December, 1959), pp. 849-852; Ada W. Finifter, "Dimensions of Political Aliena-tion," American Political Science Review, 64, 2 (June, 1970), pp. 389-410; Dwight G. Dean, "Alienation and Political Apathy," Social Forces, 38, 3 (March, 1960), pp. 185-189.

[3]Wayne E. Thompson and John E. Horton, "Political Alienation as a Force in Political Action," Social Forces, 38, 3 (March, 1960), pp. 190-195; Edward L. McDill and Jeanne Clare Ridley, "Status, Anomie, Political Alienation, and Political Participation," American Journal of Sociology, 68, 2 (September, 1962), pp. 205-213; Janda, op. cit.; John E. Horton and Wayne E. Thompson, "Powerlessness and Political Negativism: A Study of Defeated Local Referen-dums," American Journal of Sociology, 67, 5 (March, 1962), pp. 485-493; Joel Aberbach and Jack Walker, "Political Trust and Racial Ideology," American Political Science Review, 64, 4 (December, 1970), pp. 1199-1219; H. Edward Ransford, "Isolation, Powerlessness, and Violence: A Study

of Attitudes and Participation in the Watts Riot,"
American Journal of Sociology, 73, 5 (March, 1968), pp.
581-291; Maurice Zeitlin, "Alienation and Revolution,"
Social Forces, 45, 2 (December, 1966), pp. 224-236.

[4]Aberbach uses the mean as the dividing point
between high and low political alienation in his study of
the 1964 election. Joel D. Aberbach, "Alienation and
Political Behavior," American Political Science Review,
62, 1 (March, 1969), pp. 86-99.

[5]James A. Davis, Elementary Survey Analysis
(Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971), p. 25.

[6]Ibid., pp. 25-27.

[7]William L. Hays, Statistics for Psychologists
(New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, 1963), pp. 318-
319.

[8]William A. Gamson, Power and Discontent (Home-
wood, Illinois: Dorsey, 1968), p. 48.

[9]Ibid., p. 42.

[10]Ibid., p. 53.

[11]David Easton and Jack Dennis, "The Child's
Acquisition of Regime Norms: Political Efficacy,"
American Political Science Review, 61, 1 (March, 1967),
pp. 25-38.

[12]Robert E. Lane, Political Life (Glencoe,
Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1959), p. 152.

[13]Jeffery M. Paige, "Political Orientation and Riot
Participation," American Sociological Review, 36, 5
(October, 1971), p. 814.

[14]See, among other sources, Seymour Martin Lipset,
"The Activists: A Profile," The Public Interest, 13
(Fall, 1968), pp. 39-51; Frederic Soloman and Jacob
Fishman, "Youth and Peace: A Psychological Study of
Peace Demonstrators in Washington, D.C.," Journal of
Social Issues, 20 (October, 1964), pp. 53-73; Seymour
Martin Lipset and Phillip G. Altbach, Students in Revolt
(New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1969).

[15]Finifter, op. cit., p. 408.

[16]Richard A. Cloward, "Illegitimate Means, Anomie, and Deviant Behavior," American Sociological Review, 24, 2 (April, 1959), pp. 164-176; Frank Harary, "Merton Revisited: A New Classification for Deviant Behavior," American Sociological Review, 31, 5 (October, 1966), pp. 693-697.

[17]Abraham Kaplan, The Conduct of Inquiry (San Francisco: Chandler, 1964), p. 53.

[18]Gamson, op. cit.; Paige, op. cit.; George I. Balch, "Multiple Indicators in Survey Research: The Concept 'Sense of Political Efficacy'," paper delivered at the 1971 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, September, 1971; Jacob A. Hurwitz, "Political Efficacy Among Israeli Youth: Beliefs in Governmental Responsiveness and Political Effectiveness in a Hybrid Political System" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971).

[19]David Easton, A Framework for Political Analysis (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965).

[20]Kenneth Keniston, "Appendix: The Varieties of Alienation; An Attempt at Definition," The Uncommitted (New York: Dell, 1965), pp. 451-475.

[21]A number of papers are related to this theme, though perhaps the most explicit enunciation of the difference between the "blocked-opportunity" and "alienation-powerlessness" theories can be found in John R. Forward and Jay R. Williams, "Internal-External Control and Black Militancy," Journal of Social Issues, 26, 1 (Winter, 1970), pp. 75-92. Other papers which pertain also are: Ransford, op. cit.; Nathan S. Caplan and J. M. Paige, "A Study of Ghetto Rioters," Scientific American, 219, 2 (August, 1968), pp. 15-21; Patricia Gurin, Gerald Gurin, Rosina C. Lao, and Muriel Beattie, "Internal-External Control in the Motivational Dynamics of Negro Youth," Journal of Social Issues, 25, 3 (Summer, 1969), pp. 29-53.

[22]Morris Rosenberg, op. cit.

CHAPTER VIII

THE DILEMMA OF ALIENATION:

AN UNRESOLVED ISSUE

Alienation is a historically rich topic and also

one of more than passing contemporary interest. The issues

raised by an investigation of alienation are perennial

ones because of their unresolvable nature. So long as

there are political conflicts that cannot be solved to the

satisfaction of everyone concerned, the potential for

alienation exists.

In relating political alienation to participation,

Finifter touches upon the topic of political change as it

is affected by the dynamics of different forms of partici-

pation. She notes that alienation is often considered a

threat to the stability and survival of a political system

because it is frequently, as in this study, associated with

revolutionary and protest behavior. However, alienation,

as this study has indicated, is also associated with parti-

cipation which can strengthen a political system. Behavior

such as protest activity and revolutionary movements which

are associated with high levels of alienation are often

regarded as "dysfunctional" in so far as they tend to be

245

disruptive and counter to the <u>status quo</u>. Such an orienta-
tion, Finifter suggests, reflects a bias in the functional
approach to the study of politics and overlooks the fact
that while protest behavior may be disruptive initially, it
also may "generate increasing system integration by the
modification of conditions that violate widely-shared norms
or otherwise inhibit intrasystem cohesion."[1] For this
reason, the term "orthofunctional" with its emphasis on
straightening or correcting is seen by Finifter as prefer-
able to the term "dysfunctional" in describing protest and
possibly even revolutionary behavior.[2]

Whatever term is seen as preferable, the two terms
bear similarities to the distinction Gamson makes between
what he calls "the influence perspective" and "the social
control perspective" toward authorities and potential
partisans.[3] The social control perspective which stresses
the dysfunctionality of protest behavior tends to regard
popular discontentment as a problem for society and
authorities in particular to manage and resolve, not as an
opportunity for policy change. The social control perspec-
tive is concerned with strategies for regulating or control-
ling such attempts to change policy. The influence perspec-
tive, on the other hand, assumes the orientation of actors
in the system and is more concerned with strategies and
tactics that might assist actors in gaining desired goals.
It is Gamson's conclusion that an integration of these two
perspectives will afford a fuller and less biased

understanding of the tension that exists between the authority structure and the general citizenry.[4] Since Gamson's analysis of relationship between the authority structure and what he calls "solidary" groups uses the concepts of cynicism and efficacy, it is pertinent to our consideration of the Finifter typology.

Gamson, drawing from Almond and Verba,[5] notes that political alienation consists of at least two dimensions-- an input (efficacy) dimension and an output (cynicism) dimension. He writes that:

> The efficacy dimension of political alienation refers to people's perception of their ability to influence; the trust dimension refers to their perception of the necessity for influence.[6]

> The average trust (cynicism) may be regarded as a measure of the efficiency of a system while the variance between groups is a measure of its fairness.[7]

The social control perspective emphasizes the efficiency of the system in producing a large quantity of goods and services and the desirability of a high level of popular trust so as to give authorities leeway in using their judgment to commit (or not commit) resources to achieve goals deemed desirable without constraints or excessive need for consultation with the public or their representa- tives. Following Finifter's typology, we see that low political cynicism is associated with those types of activities--apathy and conformative participation--which, more than the other two major types of participation in

Finifter's typology, would seem to facilitate operation of
a centralized, highly trained professional governmental
operation capable of quick, decisive action. A low level
of cynicism among the citizenry, according to the typology,
would allow the government to operate with confidence that
its policies, even if enacted without prior consultation,
will be found agreeable.

If political stability or social control is what
is desired above all else, the optimum situation according
to Finifter's typology, would be a combination of low
cynicism and high efficacy, which should result in conforma-
tive behavior. In such a situation, if the level of cyni-
cism were to drift from low to high, or efficacy from high
to low, the dominant behavioral response would shift from
conformative participation to reform activity or apathy,
respectively, and hence avoid the most threatening situa-
tion, that of separatist and revolutionary movements.
Either the reform or apathetic situations would presumably
still leave the state of affairs in manageable condition.
It was a similar line of reasoning that Lipset seems to
have taken when he stated that stability in a democracy
would be optimized when the system was publicly regarded
as both effective and legitimate.[8] It is interesting and
not entirely coincidental I think, that the manner in which
Lipset defined effectiveness and legitimacy makes them
analogous to the concepts of political cynicism and efficacy
as used in this study.

The extent to which stability or the status quo can be maintained depends largely on, Finifter's typology suggests, the ability of the system to maintain a low level of political cynicism. As long as cynicism is low, activities leading toward reform or revolution can be expected to be minimal. How successful a system is in avoiding what Lipset has called "a crisis of legitimacy" or "a crisis of change" depends, he suggests, on the extent to which a nation can avoid major political and social cleavages which manifest themselves in different policy priorities and demands.[9] Opposing policy demands force authorities to choose between solidary groups, leaving the likelihood, if not the certainty, that for each such situation someone will have reason for discontent. This dis-satisfaction with government policy-makers if cumulative and accompanied by feelings of unfairness (i.e., cynicism about the justice of the decisions) will result in a heightening of the level of political cynicism among those disfavored by government. Given that society is not com-pletely homogeneous and that there are groups with different interests, "(t)he more accurate the perceptions of the political process by solidary groups, the greater the like-lihood that highly confident [non-cynical] groups will have alienated counterparts."[10]

One strategy then for the maintenance of the status quo is to try to reduce the differences that divide solidary groups. For a person committed to the status quo,

there is a dilemma involved in this strategy. Given that

the differences between groups are substantial, and in

order to resolve them in more than a temporary manner,

priority changes would probably be required. Caught

between desire for maintenance of the status quo and

need for priority changes in order to avoid a situation

in which pressures for change become "unmanageable," those

committed to the status quo are faced with a dilemma. What-

ever the course of action taken, those of the social control

perspective committed to the status quo have difficulty

coping with emergence of new demands and groups, and social

change in general.

Aside from the willingness of those committed to

the status quo to undertake policies that will resolve

differences between groups, there is another consideration

which those committed to the maintenance of the status quo

must face. That consideration is what Philip Hauser in

his recent (1968) presidential address to the American

Sociological Association called "The Chaotic Society:

Product of the Social Morphological Revolution."[11] Accord-

ing to Hauser, our contemporary society "possesses cultural

layers much more diverse than any predecessor society" and

"the greatest number of cultural layers," thus making for

the greatest potential for disorder and dissonance ever

possible in the world.[12] Taking these assessments as facts,

the strategy of maintaining the status quo by resolving

differences between solidary groups is laden with great
difficulties.

Another strategy to keep the level of political
cynicism low and by that means maintain the status quo
comes from Edelman, who in his book The Symbolic Uses of
Politics discusses the role of political symbols in convey-
ing rewards and reassurances to groups in society.[13] Edel-
man notes that "politics severely denying resources to
large numbers of people, can be pursued indefinitely with-
out serious controversy," so long as symbolic reassurances
are adequately distributed.[14] In denying rewards, how-
ever, Edelman tells us that it is more difficult to satisfy
organized groups with interests in tangible resources or
in substantial power than unorganized groups.[15] In the
short run, then, the status quo can be maintained by
judicious use of political symbols regardless of the actual
distribution of tangible resources or significant changes
in the political structure, especially if organized groups
with interest in tangible rewards can be satisfied and
kept from using their substantial resources to express
their displeasure or cynicism with governmental policies.
Considering what Hauser speaks of as a historical inevit-
ability, interest proliferation in society is likely to
grow and with it the difficulties of lowering political
cynicism by controlling the diversity of demands made upon
government. Given this historical inevitability, use of
symbolic rewards, at least in the short run, can be

expected to grow in importance. Symbolic rewards differ from tangible rewards in that symbolic rewards have a "non-zero-sum" quality to them as compared to tangible rewards which are generally conveyed on a "zero-sum" basis. By "non-zero-sum," I mean that what one group gains is not necessarily lost by another group. This characteristic of symbolic rewards allows them to be "stretched" so as to accomodate, at least partially, groups with dissimilar interests and demands. This "non-zero-sum" quality of symbolic rewards makes them especially attractive in times of changing group demands since it enables government officials to confer rewards onto groups without necessarily taking them away from others.

The influence perspective places no special value on the maintenance of the status quo. It assumes that the political system is composed of groups constantly in a state of flux and competition, continually trying to mobilize their resources to improve their position in society. From this perspective, a certain level of cynicism will always exist so long as there are groups with diver-gent interests competing for limited resources. Cynicism is thus seen as "natural" and even desirable to the extent to which it reflects policy shortcomings and provides impetus for change. Within this influence perspective and its implicit assumption that there will always exist groups with differing priorities competing for limited resources, the ideal orientation for groups in society from the

position of authorities in power would, according to Gamson, be one of only moderate, rather than high, confidence.[16] This sort of attitudinal atmosphere translated into Finifter's typology would indicate a desirability for groups wavering between or involved in conformative and reform behavior. To avoid extremely disengaged behavior, authorities are advised, the typology suggests, to maintain a high level of efficacy, i.e., remain or at least give the impression of being responsive to citizen demands.

So far, this discussion of participation and alienation has been handled largely from the perspective of authorities in power and a few words would seem in order discussing the matter from the perspective of solidary groups not in positions of power. Within the typology, the two main types of solidary groups likely to seek change in the system are those involved in reform and separatist-revolutionary activity. Change may also originate from those inclined toward conformative behavior but with that group, the extent of change desired and the impetus for change is likely to be rather limited in scope and intensity. Finifter's categories of reform and separatist-revolutionary activity are similar in some respects to Hirschman's categories of "voice" and "exit."[17] Voice and exit for Hirschman are two ways by which individuals may make public their opinions about how goods and services are distributed by private businesses and government. Hirschman however notes a difference between goods and services

produced by government and those produced by most private

businesses. He writes:

> In spite of exit one remains a consumer of the
> output [from government] or at least of its
> external effects from which there is no escape.
> Under these conditions, the customer-member
> will himself be interested in making his exit
> contribute to the improvement of the product-
> organization he is leaving--an improvement which
> he may judge to be impossible without radical
> change in the way in which the organization is
> run. To exit will now mean to resign under
> protest and, in general, to denounce and fight
> the organization from without instead of working
> for change from within. In other words, the
> alternative is now not so much between voice and
> exit as between voice from within and voice from
> without (after exit). The exit decision then
> hinges on a totally new question: At what point
> is one more effective (besides being more at
> peace with oneself) fighting mistaken policies
> from without than continuing the attempt to change
> the policies from within?[18]

Hirschman and Finifter seem in agreement that perceived

effectiveness or efficacy is the crucial factor which

determines whether one works for change from within (reform)

or from without (separatist-revolutionary movements).

If the decision is made to work for change from

without (i.e., through separatist-revolutionary movements),

it is likely, according to Gamson, that the attempt at

influence will be exercised through use of "constraints"

which he defines as "the addition of new disadvantages (as

opposed to indulgencies) to the situation or the threat to

do so . . . ."[19]

> An appeal to an alienated group that it is
> "hurting its cause" by acts of constraint falls
> on deaf ears . . . . For the extremely alienated,
> not only is there little to lose through gener-
> ating resistance, but they can hardly be unaware

that their major resources are constraints--the
capacity to create trouble if their needs are
not met.[20]

Instead of thinking that those applying constraints have

"little to lose through generating resistance," Hirschman

suggests that the actor with this perspective may see his

actions, however disruptive and contrary to public

opinion, as contributing to the public good. Instead of

thinking about harming his own cause, the actor conceives

of himself as contributing to the cure of public ills.

A latent consequence of alienation is the desire for change.

But when these desires reach extreme proportions, so do

the tactics associated with them--tactics which tend to

make those opposed to changes more resistant, the more

extreme the aims and tactics of the alienated become. In

an ideal world, we would hope to avoid this spiral escala-

tion of opposition and resistance, but to do so, we have

need to be familiar with the nature and consequences of

alienation.

In many ways in this chapter and in this study, we

have been dealing with some of the eternal issues of poli-

tics--the problem of keeping a system both cohesive and

self-rejuvenating by among other methods, reducing differ-

ences that ever arise between solidary groups and by pro-

viding groups with rewards and reassurances through skillful

and judicious use of symbolic politics. To be sure, these

concerns are not new. James Madison, for instance, in The

Federalist Papers, No. 10, wrote of "the mischiefs of

256

faction" and the need to either remove the causes of faction
or control its effects. Considering the unequal faculties
of men to acquire property, the chief cause of faction, he
thought the former strategy impractical and to a degree,
even unnatural. Adopting then the latter strategy, Madison
advocated controlling the effects of faction through a
republican and not a pure form of democracy which would
uphold the rights of the minority, regulate to the minimum
extent needed "the various and unequal distribution of
property" and the interests tied to that distribution, and
prevent a tyranny of the majority.

Since Madison's time, much has transpired to modify
our conceptions of democracy and our capacities for pro-
ducing and distributing property, but the dilemma faced by
Madison is still with us today: do we control the mis-
chiefs of faction by removing its causes or by controlling
its effects? Do we recognize the desirability of equality
in the distribution of resources throughout the community
and attempt to satisfy people by treating everyone equally?
Or do we recognize aside from equality the seemingly
inevitable creation and preservation of factions within
which Madison saw the basis and outlet for personal freedom
and achievement? However we try to solve the dilemma, the
issue of alienation remains; whenever we have a dilemma
such as this to solve, the issue of alienation is involved;
and so long as the dilemma remains unresolved, so does the
issue of alienation.

FOOTNOTES--CHAPTER VIII

[1]Ada W. Finifter, "Dimensions of Political Aliena-
tion," American Political Science Review, 64, 2 (June,
1970), p. 407.

[2]Ibid., pp. 406-407.

[3]William A. Gamson, Power and Discontent (Homewood,
Illinois: Dorsey, 1968), pp. 1-19.

[4]Ibid., p. 18.

[5]Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba, The Civic
Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five
Nations (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

[6]Gamson, op. cit., p. 42.

[7]Ibid., p. 58.

[8]Seymour Martin Lipset, Political Man: The Social
Bases of Politics (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books,
1963), pp. 64-86.

[9]Ibid., p. 64.

[10]Gamson, op. cit., p. 57.

[11]Philip M. Hauser, "The Chaotic Society: Product
of the Social Morphological Revolution," American Sociolo-
gical Review, 34, 1 (February, 1969), pp. 1-18.

[12]Ibid., p. 1.

[13]Murray Edelman, The Symbolic Uses of Politics
(Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964.

[14]Ibid., p. 28.

[15]Ibid., p. 22.

[16]Gamson, op. cit., pp. 57-58.

[17]Albert O. Hirschman, _Exit, Voice and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States_ (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970).

[18]_Ibid._, pp. 104-105.

[19]Gamson, _op. cit._, pp. 169, 75.

[20]_Ibid._, pp. 169-170.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aberbach, Joel. "Alienation and Race." Unpublished Ph.D.
        dissertation, Yale University, 1967.

Aberbach, Joel. "Alienation and Political Behavior."
        American Political Science Review, 62, 1 (March,
        1969),   86-99.

Aberbach, Joel and Walker, Jack. "Political Trust and
        Racial Ideology." American Political Science
        Review, 64, 4 (December, 1970),   1199-1219.

Agger, Robert E.; Goldstein, Marshall N.; and Pearl,
        Stanley A. "Political Cynicism: Measurement
        and Meaning." Journal of Politics, 23, 3
        (August, 1961), 477-506.

Alker, Hayward R., Jr., and Russett, Bruce M. World
        Politics in the General Assembly. New Haven:
        Yale University Press, 1965.

Allardt, Erik. "Types of Protest and Alienation." Mass
        Politics: Studies in Political Sociology.
        Edited by Erik Allardt and Stein Rokkan. New
        York: The Free Press, 1970.

Allport, Gordon. "Attitudes." In The Handbook of Social
        Psychology. Edited by C. Murchinson. Worcester,
        Mass.: Clark University Press, 1935.

Almond, Gabriel A. and Verba, Sidney. The Civic Culture:
        Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations.
        Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Arnove, Robert F. "The Impact of University Social Struc-
        ture on Alienation: A Venezuelan Study." Unpub-
        lished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University,
        1969.

Baird, Leonard L. "Who Protests: A Study of Student
        Activists." In Protest! Student Activism in
        America. Edited by Julian Foster and Durward
        Long. New York: Morrow and Co., 1970), 122-133.

261

Balch, George I. "Multiple Indicators in Survey Research: The Concept 'Sense of Political Efficacy'." Paper delivered at the 1971 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, September, 1971.

Barton, Allen H. "The Concept of Property-Space in Social Research." In The Language of Social Research. Edited by Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Morris Rosenberg. Glencoe: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1955, pp. 40-53.

Bay, Christian. The Structure of Freedom. New York: Athenum, 1965.

Bell, Daniel. "The Debate on Alienation." In Revisionism: Essays on the History of Marxist Ideas. Edited by Leopold Labedz. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1962, pp. 195-211.

Berelson, Bernard R.; Lazarsfeld, Paul F; and McPhee, William N. Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. Causal Inferences in Nonexperimental Research. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1964.

Boorstin, Daniel J. The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.

Campbell, Angus; Converse, Phillip; Miller, Warren; and Stokes, Donald. The American Voter. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960.

Caplan, Nathan S. and Paige, J. M. "A Study of Ghetto Rioters." Scientific American, 219, 2 (August, 1968), 15-21.

Clark, John P. "Measuring Alienation within a Social System." American Sociological Review, 24, 6 (December, 1959), 849-852.

Cloward, Richard A. "Illegitimate Means, Anomie, Deviant Behavior." American Sociological Review, 24, 2 (April, 1959), 164-176.

Dahl, Robert A. "The Concept of Power." Behavioral Science, 2 (July, 1957), 201-215.

Dahl, Robert A. After the Revolution? New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.

Davis, James A. Elementary Survey Analysis. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Dean, Dwight G. "Alienation and Political Apathy." Social Forces, 38, 3 (March, 1960), 185-189.

Dean, Dwight G. "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement." American Sociological Review, 26, 5 (October, 1961), 735-758.

de Grezia, Sebestian. The Political Community: A Study of Anomie. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

De Palma, Giuseppe. Apathy and Participation. New York: The Free Press, 1970.

Djilas, Milovan. "On Alienation." Encounter, 36, 5 (May, 1971), 8-15.

Douglas, Jack D. Youth in Turmoil: America's Changing Youth Cultures and Student Protest Movements. Chevy Chase, Maryland: National Institute of Mental Health, 1970.

Dubey, Sumati N. "Powerlessness of Mobility Orientations Among Disadvantaged Blacks." Public Opinion Quarterly, 35, 2 (Summer, 1971), 183-188.

Dubin, Robert. "Deviant Behavior and Social Structure: Continuties in Social Theory." American Sociological Review, 24, 2 (April, 1969), 147-164.

Easton, David. The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science. New York: Knopf, 1953.

Easton, David. A Systems Analysis of Political Life. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965.

Easton, David. A Framework for Political Analysis. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Easton, David and Dennis, Jack. "The Child's Acquisition of Regime Norms: Political Efficacy." American Political Science Review, 61, 7 (March, 1967), 25-38.

Edelman, Murray. The Symbolic Uses of Politics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964.

Eisenstadt, S. N. From Generation to Generation: Age Groups and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1956.

Erdos, Paul L. Professional Mail Surveys. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Farris, Charles. "Selected Attitudes on Foreign Affairs as Correlates of Authoritarianism of Political Anomie." Journal of Politics, 22, 1.

Fendrich, James and Axelson, Leland J. "Marital Status and Political Alienation Among Black Veterans." American Journal of Sociology, 77, 2 (September, 1971), 245-261.

Feuer, Lewis. "What is Alienation?: The Career of a Concept." In Sociology on Trial. Edited by Maurice Stein and Arthur Vidich. Englewood, Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963, pp. 127-147. (Originally in New Politics, 1, 3 (Spring, 1963), 116-134.

Feuer, Lewis S. The Conflict of Generations: The Character and Significance of Student Movements. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Finifter, Ada W. "Dimensions of Political Alienation." American Political Science Review, 64, 2 (June, 1970), 389-410.

Finifter, Ada W. (ed.). Alienation and the Social Sciences. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972.

Finifter, Bernard M. "Styles of Participation in Political Life: A Study of University Students in Venezuela." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1967.

Flacks, Richard. "The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest." Journal of Social Issues, 23, 3 (July, 1967), 52-75.

Forward, John R. and Williams, Jay R. "Internal-External Control of Black Military." Journal of Social Issues, 26, 1 (Winter, 1970), 75-92.

Fraser, John. "The Mistrustful Efficacious Hypothesis and Political Participation. Journal of Politics, 32, 2 (May, 1970), 444-449.

Fromm, Erich. The Sane Society. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955.

Gamson, William A. Power and Discontent. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey, 1968.

Glazer, Nathan. "The 'Alienation' of Modern Man." Commentary, 3, 4 (April, 1947), 378-385.

Gold, Marvin. "Juvenile Delinquency as a Symptom of Alienation." Journal of Social Issues, 25, 2 (Spring, 1965), 121-135.

Greenley, Andrew M. "Sociology as an Art Form." The American Sociologist, 6, 3 (August, 1971), 223-225.

Guilford, J. P. "New Standards for Test Evaluation." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 6 (1946), 427-438.

Gurin, Patricia; Gurin, Gerald, Lao, Rosina C.; and Beattie, Muriel. "Internal-External Control in the Motivational Dynamics of Negro Youth." Journal of Social Issues, 25, 3 (Summer, 1969), 29-53.

Hadden, Jeffrey K. "The Private Generation." Psychology Today, 3, 5 (October, 1969), 32-35 and 68-69.

Hajda, Jan. "Alienation and Integration of Student Intellectuals." American Sociological Review, 26, 5 (October, 1961), 758-777.

Halleck, Seymour L. "Hypotheses of Student Unrest." In Protest! Student Activism in America. Edited by Julian Foster and Durward Long. New York: William Morrow and Co., 1970), pp. 105-122.

Harary, Frank. "Merton Revisited: A New Classification for Deviant Behavior." American Sociological Review, 31, 5 (October, 1966), 693-697.

Hauser, Philip M. "The Chaotic Society: Product of the Social Morphological Revolution." American Sociological Review, 34, 1 (February, 1969), 1-18.

Hawkins, Brett W.; Marando, Vincent L.; and Taylor, George A. "Efficacy, Mistrust and Political Participation: Findings from Additional Data of Indicators." Journal of Politics, 33, 4 (November, 1971), 1130-1136.

Hays, William L. Statistics for Psychologists. New York:
        Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Hechninger, Fred M. "New Mood is 'Tune Out and Turn
        Inward'." New York Times, December 13, 1970.

Hirschman, Albert O. Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses
        to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States.
        Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University
        Press, 1970.

Hitchcock, James. "Revolution in the University." The
        Yale Review, 60, 2 (Winter, 1971), 161-174.

Horowitz, Irving Louis and Friedland, William H. The
        Knowledge Factory: Student Power and Academic
        Politics in America. Carbondale: Southern
        Illinois University Press, 1970, p. 354.

Horton, John E. and Thompson, Wayne E. "Powerlessness
        and Political Negativism: A Study of Defeated
        Local Referendums." American Journal of Sociology,
        67, 5 (March, 1962), 485-493.

Hoyt, Cyril. "Test Reliability Estimated by Analysis of
        Variance." Psychometrika, 6 (June, 1941), 153-160.

Hurwitz, Jacob A. "Political Efficacy Among Israeli
        Youth: Beliefs in Governmental Responsiveness
        and Political Effectiveness in a Hybrid Political
        System." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan
        State University, 1971.

Huxley, Aldous. The Genius and the Goddess. New York:
        Bantam, 1955.

Jackson, John S., III. "Alienation and Black Political
        Participation." Paper delivered at the annual
        meeting of the Midwest Political Science Associa-
        tion, Chicago, April, 1971.

Janda, Kenneth. "A Comparative Study of Political Aliena-
        tion and Voting Behavior in Three Suburban Communi-
        ties." Studies in History and the Social Sciences:
        Studies in Honor of John A. Kinneman. Normal:
        Illinois State University, 1965, pp. 53-68.

Jaros, Dean and Mason, Gene L. "Party Choice and Support
        for Demagogues: An Experimental Examination."
        American Political Science Review, 62, 1 (March,
        1969), 100-110.

Josephson, Eric and Josephson, Mary, eds. Man Alone:
    Alienation in Modern Society. New York: Dell,
    1962.

Kahler, Erich. The Tower and the Abyss. New York:
    Braziller, 1957.

Kaplan, Abraham. The Conduct of Inquiry. San Francisco:
    Chandler, 1964.

Kariel, Henry S. The Promise of Politics. Englewood,
    Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Keniston, Kenneth. The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in
    American Society. New York: Dell, 1965.

Keniston, Kenneth. Young Radicals: Notes on Committed
    Youth. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World,
    1968.

Keniston, Kenneth. Youth and Dissent: The Rise of a New
    Opposition. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich,
    1971.

Kennan, George F. Democracy and the Student Left. Boston:
    Little, Brown, 1968.

Kenyon, Sandra J. "The Development of Political Cynicism
    Among Negro and White Adolescents." Paper
    delivered at the annual meeting of the American
    Political Science Association, New York, September,
    1969.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research.
    New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Kneeland, Douglas E. "Youth Rebellion of Sixties Waning."
    New York Times, October 24, 1971.

Laing, R. D. The Politics of Experience. New York:
    Ballantine Books, 1967.

Lane, Robert E. Political Life: Why People Get Involved
    in Politics. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press
    of Glencoe, 1959.

Lane, Robert E. Political Ideology: Why the American
    Common Man Believes What he Does. New York:
    The Free Press, 1962.

Lane, Robert E. Political Thinking and Consciousness.
    Chicago: Markham, 1969.

Langton, Kenneth P. and Jennings, M. Kent. "Political Socialization and the High School Civics Curriculum in the United States." American Political Science Review, 62, 3 (September, 1968), 852-867.

Lasswell, Harold D. Power and Personality. New York: Viking, 1962.

Levin, Murray. The Alienated Voter. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

Lippmann, Walter. The Public Philosophy. New York: Mentor Books, 1955.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1963.

Lipset, S. M. and Altbach, Philip G. Student Politics. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. "The Activists: A Profile." Public Interest, 13 (Fall, 1968), 39-51.

Lipset, Seymour Martin and Altbech, Philip G. Students in Revolt. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1969.

Litt, Edgar. "Civic Education, Community Norms, and Political Indoctrination." American Sociological Review, 28, 1 (February, 1963).

Litt, Edgar. "Political Cynicism and Political Futility." Journal of Politics, 25, 2 (May, 1963), 312-323.

Lopreato, Joseph and Alston, Letitia. "Ideal Types and the Idealization Strategy." American Sociological Review, 35, 1 (February, 1970), 88-96.

Lyons, Schley R. "The Political Socialization of Ghetto Children: Efficacy and Cynicism." Journal of Politics, 32, 2 (May, 1970), 288-304.

McClosky, Herbert and Schaar, John. "Psychological Dimensions of Anomy." American Sociological Review, 30, 1 (February, 1965), 14-40.

McDill, Edward L. and Ridley, Jeanne Clare. "Status, Anomie, Political Alienation, and Political Participation." American Journal of Sociology, 68, 2 (September, 1962), 205-213.

McGuire, William J. "The Nature of Attitudes and Attitude Change." In The Handbook of Social Psychology. 2nd Edition. Edited by Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson. Reading, Mass.: Addision-Wesley, 1969.

McKinney, John C. Constructive Typology and Social Theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.

McKinney, John C. "Typification, Typologies, and Sociological Theory." Social Forces, 48, 1 (September, 1969), 1-12.

Mannheim, Karl. Ideology and Utopia. New York: Harvest Books, 1936.

Maslow, Abraham, H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.

Matthews, Donald R. and Prothro, James W. Negroes and the New Southern Politics. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966.

Mayo, Henry B. An Introduction to Democratic Theory. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Merton, Robert K. "Social Structure and Anomie," and "Continuities in the Theory of Social Structure and Anomie." Social Theory and Social Structure. Rev. Enlarged Ed. New York: Free Press, 1968, pp. 185-248.

Merton, Robert K. "Social Conformity, Deviation, and Opportunity-Structures: A Comment on the Contributions of Dubin and Cloward." American Sociological Review, 24, 2 (April, 1959), 177-191.

Michigan State University. Computer Institute for Social Science Research (CISSR). Technical Report No. 34, Factor A, no date.

Michner. James A. Kent State: What Happened and Why. Greenwich, Conn." Fawcett, 1971.

Milbrath, Lester W. Political Participation. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Moser, C. A. Survey Methods in Social Investigation. London: Heninemann, 1958.

Myrdal, Gunnar. An American Dream: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy. New York: Harper and Row, 1944.

269

Neal, Arthur G. and Groat, H. Theodore. "Alienation
    Correlates of Catholic Fertility." American
    Journal of Sociology, 76, 3 (November, 1970,
    460-473.

Neal, Arthur G. and Rettig, Salomon. "Dimensions of
    Alienation among Manual and Non-manual Workers."
    American Sociological Review, 28, 4 (August, 1963),
    599-608.

Neal, Arthur G. and Rettig, Salomon. "On the Multidimen-
    sionality of Alienation." American Sociological
    Review, 32, 1 (February, 1967), 54-64.

Nettler, Gwynn. "A Measure of Alienation." American
    Sociological Review, 22, 6 (1957), 670-677.

Neuhaus, Richard J. "A Revolutionary Consciousness."
    In The New Politics: Mood or Movement? Edited
    by James A. Burkhart and Rank J. Kendrick.
    Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971, pp. 186-
    192.

Newfield, Jack. A Prophetic Minority. New York: New
    American Library, 1966.

Nisbet, Robert. The Quest for Community: A Study in
    the Ethics of Order and Freedom. New York:
    Oxford University Press, 1953.

Oglesby, Carl, ed. The New Left Leader. New York:
    Grove Press, 1969.

Olsen, Marvin E. "Political Assimilation, Social Oppor-
    tunities, and Political Alienation." Unpublished
    Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1965.

Olsen, Marvin E. "Alienation and Political Opinions."
    Public Opinion Quarterly, 29, 2 (Summer, 1965),
    200-212.

Olsen, Marvin E. "Two Categories of Political Aliena-
    tion." Social Forces, 47, 3 (March, 1969),
    288-298.

Paige, Jeffery M. "Political Orientation of Riot Parti-
    cipation." American Sociological Review, 36, 5
    (October, 1971), 810-820.

Paulus, George S. "A Multivariate Analysis Study of
    Student Activist Leaders, Student Government
    Leaders, and Non-Activists. Unpublished Ed.D.
    dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Pearlin, Leonard I. "Alienation from Work: A Study of Nursing Personnel." American Sociological Review, 27, 3 (June, 1962), 314-326.

Peters, B. Guy. "The Development of Social Policy: A Longitudinal Analysis of Social Expenditures and Their Impacts in the United Kingdom, France, and Sweden." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970.

Powell, Elwin H. "Occupation, Status, and Suicide: Toward Redefinition of Anomie." American Sociological Review, 23, 2 (April, 1958), 131-139.

Ransford, H. Edward. "Isolation, Powerlessness, and Violence: A Study of Attitudes of Participation in the Watts Riot." American Journal of Sociology, 73, 5 (March, 1968), 581-91.

Reich, Charles A. The Greening of America: How the Youth Revolution is Trying to Make America Livable. New York: Random House, 1970.

Reston, James. "U.S. Students Desert Arena of Politics." Detroit Free Press, November 27, 1970.

Robbins, Lionel. "Present Discontents in the Student Age Group." In Individuality and the New Society. Edited by Abraham Kaplan. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1970.

Robinson, John P.; Rusk, Jerrold G.; and Head, Kendra. Measures of Political Attitudes. Ann Arbor: Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan, 1968.

Robinson, John P. and Shaver, Phillip R. Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1969.

Robinson, W. S. "The Motivational Structure of Political Participation." American Sociological Review, 17, 2 (April, 1952), 151-156.

Rodgers, Harrell, Jr., and Taylor, George. "Pre-Adult Attitudes Toward Legal Compliance: Notes Toward Theory." Social Science Quarterly, 51, 3 (December, 1970), 539-551.

Rokeach, Milton. "The Nature of Attitudes." In The International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New York: Macmillan, 1968.

Rokeach, Milton. Beliefs, Attitudes and Values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Rosenberg, Morris. "Misanthropy and Political Ideology." American Sociological Review, 21, 6 (December, 1956), 690-695.

Roszak, Theodore. The Making of a Counter Culture. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1969.

Rudner, Richard S. Philosophy of Social Science. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966, p. 118.

Rummel, R. J. Applied Factor Analysis. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

Runciman, W. G. "False Consciousness." Philosophy, 44, 170 (October, 1969), 303-313.

Sarnoff, Irving. Society with Tears. New York: The Citadel Press, 1966.

Sartori, Giovanni. Democratic Theory. New York: Praeger, 1962.

Scranton, William W., Chairman. The Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. New York: Avon, 1971.

Scott, Marvin B. "The Social Sources of Alienation." In The New Sociology. Edited by Irving L. Horowitz. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964, pp. 239-252.

Scott, William A. "Attitude Measurement." In The Handbook of Social Psychology. 2nd Edition. Edited by Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Seeman, Melvin. "On the Meaning of Alienation." American Sociological Review, 24, 6 (December, 1959), 783-791.

Seeman, Melvin. "Alienation: A Map." Psychology Today, 5, 3 (August, 1971), 82+.

Seeman, Melvin. "The Urban Alienations: Some Dubious Theses from Marx to Marcuse." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 19 (August, 1971), 135-143.

Simmons, J. L. and Winogard, Barry. It's Happening: A Portrait of the Youth Scene Today. Santa Barbara, Calif.: McNally and Loftin, 1966.

Sjoberg, Gideon and Nett, Roger. A Methodology for Social Research. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Smith, Duane E. "Alienation and the American Dream." In The Radical Left: The Abuse of Content. Edited by William P. Gerberding and Duane E. Smith. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1970.

Soloman, Frederic and Fishman, Jacob. "Youth and Peace: A Psychological Study of Peace Demonstrations in Washington, D.C." Journal of Social Issues, 20, 4 (October, 1964), 54-73.

Somers, Robert H. "The Mainsprings of the Rebellion: A Survey of Berkeley Students in November, 1964." In The Berkeley Student Revolt: Facts and Interpretations. Edited by S. M. Lipset and Sheldon S. Wolin. New York: Anchor Books, 1965, pp. 530-557.

Srole, Leo. "Social Integration and Certain Corrollaries: An Exploratory Study. American Sociological Review, 21, 6 (December, 1956), 709-716.

Stavis, Ben. We Were the Campaign: New Hampshire to Chicago for McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. Constructing Social Theories. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968.

Stokes, Donald E. "Popular Evaluations of Government: An Empirical Assessment." In Ethics of Bigness. Edited by Harlan Cleveland and Harold Lasswell. New York: Harper, 1962), 61-67.

Stone, I. F. The Killings at Kent State: How Murder Went Unpunished. New York: Vintage, 1970.

Struening, Elmer L. and Richardson, Arthur M. "A Factor Analytic Exploration of the Alienation, Anomie, and Authoritarianism Domain. American Sociological Review, 30, 5 (March, 1965), 768-776.

Tannenbaum, Abraham L. "Introduction: Alienated Youth." In Journal of Social Issues (on Alienated Youth). Edited by Abraham J. Tannenbaum. 25, 2 (April, 1969), pp. 1-6.

Thompson, Wayne E. and Horton, John E. "Political Aliena-
        tion as a Force in Political Action." Social
        Forces, 38, 3 (March, 1960), 190-195.

Thurber, James A. and Rogers, Evan D. "Causes and Conse-
        quences of Student Participation in the 1970
        Elections." Paper delivered at the annual meeting
        of the American Political Science Association,
        Chicago, September, 1971.

Tiryakian, Edward. "Typological Classification." Inter-
        national Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New
        York: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 177-186.

Van Dyke, Vernon. Political Science: A Philosophical
        Analysis. Stanford: Stanford University Press,
        1960.

Warnecke, Steven. "American Student Politics." The Yale
        Review, 60, 2 (Winter, 1971), 185-198.

Watts, William A. and Whittaker, David. "Free Speech
        Advocates at Berkeley." Journal of Applied
        Behavioral Science, 2, 1 (January-March, 1966),
        41-62.

Waxman, Chaim I., ed. The End of Ideology Debate. New
        York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1968.

Zeitlin, Maurice. "Alienation of Revolution." Social
        Forces, 45, 2 (December, 1966), 224-236.

Zetterberg, Hans L. On Theory and Verification in
        Sociology. Totowa, New Jersey: Bedminster
        Press, 1965. 3rd Enlarged Edition.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

MSU STUDENT SURVEY PROJECT - 1971

Directions:
1. ANONYMITY INSURED - Do not write your name on this questionnaire.
2. Would you please answer all questions as best you can given the response options. Unanswered questions seriously detract from the questionnaire's usability.
3. As this is in large part an opinion survey, there are no right or wrong answers for most of the questions.
4. Please mark [x] only one answer for each question.

1. All in all, are you proud to be associated with MSU?
   - Yes, definitely................... []
   - Yes, somewhat.................... []
   - Yes, but only minimally.......... []
   - No, somewhat..................... []
   - No, definitely................... []

2. Are you satisfied with the overall quality of education you are receiving here at MSU?
   - Yes, definitely................... []
   - Yes, somewhat.................... []
   - No, somewhat..................... []
   - No, definitely................... []

3. Do you think your class-oriented activities will be more important to you ten years from now than will your out-of-class activities?
   - Yes, definitely................... []
   - Yes, somewhat.................... []
   - No, somewhat..................... []
   - No, definitely................... []

4. Would you say that you are at MSU more to prepare yourself for your chosen vocation or more to acquire a general education?
   - More for chosen vocation......... []
   - Partly for chosen vocation....... []
   - Partly for general education..... []
   - More for general education....... []

5. Do you consider yourself a serious intellectually oriented student?
   - Yes, definitely................... []
   - Yes, somewhat.................... []
   - Yes, but only minimally.......... []
   - No, somewhat..................... []
   - No, definitely................... []

6. Do you think the present goals and aims of higher education at MSU should be revised?
   - Yes, major revisions of all aspects of MSU are needed........ []
   - Yes, major revisions of some aspects of MSU are needed....... []
   - Yes, revisions of a few aspects of MSU are needed............ []
   - Yes, some minor revisions of MSU are needed.................. []
   - No, the present situation needs little revising.............. []

7. Financial and personal non-academic reasons aside, have you ever thought of quitting college because you weren't getting all that you hoped to get from college?
   - Yes, seriously................... []
   - Yes, but not very seriously..... []
   - Yes, but only in passing........ []
   - No, never....................... []

8. Are you satisfied with the quality of the classroom instruction you are receiving here at MSU?

        Yes, definitely...............[]
        Yes, somewhat.................[]
        No, somewhat..................[]
        No, definitely...............[]

9. Please mark the space (e.g., : X :) between each pair of words so as to best describe your feelings toward <u>Michigan State University</u> with regard to each set of descriptions.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Deserves respect :__:__:__:__:__:__:	Deserves no respect
Undemocratic :__:__:__:__:__:__:	Democratic
Spends funds wisely :__:__:__:__:__:__:	Spends funds wastefully
Needs restructuring :__:__:__:__:__:__:	Needs no restructuring
Treats students equally :__:__:__:__:__:__:	Treats students unequally
Restrictive :__:__:__:__:__:__:	Permissive
Serves public interests :__:__:__:__:__:__:	Serves private interests

10. Please mark [x] the answer which best corresponds to <u>your</u> experience:

                                    Yes, frequently-[]
                                 Yes, occasionally-[]
                              Yes, once or twice-[]
                                     No, never-[]

a. Have you ever contributed money to either a political candidate or cause? [] [] [] []

b. Have you ever attempted to persuade someone to change his political views or position?
   N Y12 Y,O Y,F
   [] [] [] []

c. Have you ever seriously discussed social or political issues with your friends or family? [] [] [] []

d. Have you ever worn a button or displayed a bumper sticker or poster on behalf of either a political candidate or cause? [] [] [] []

e. Have you ever personally contacted a public official to express an opinion or complaint, either by mail, phone, letter, or in person? [] [] [] []

f. Have you ever gone to a political rally, meeting, debate, or discussion——————— Off-campus? [] [] [] []
                                          On-campus? [] [] [] []

g. Have you ever actively participated in a protest action against the government——————— Off-campus? [] [] [] []
                                                 On-campus? [] [] [] []
   N Y12 Y,O Y,F

h. Have you ever gotten upset or emotionally involved with what is happening in politics? [] [] [] []

i. Have you ever worked actively in a student movement to change university rules, procedures, or policies? [] [] [] []

j. Have you ever worked to assist a political candidate or cause——————————————— Off-campus? [] [] [] []
                                              On-campus? [] [] [] []

11. Did you support and actively participate in the "strike" activities of last spring after Kent State and Cambodia?
    Yes, definitely..............................[ ]
    Yes, somewhat................................[ ]
    Yes, but only minimally......................[ ]
    No, hardly at all............................[ ]
    NO, I was in opposition to the "strike"....[ ]

12. Do you make a conscientious effort to keep informed on public affairs?
    Yes, definitely........[ ]
    Yes, somewhat..........[ ]
    Yes, minimally (mainly TV & radio, newspaper headlines)....[ ]
    No, hardly at all......[ ]

13. How would you rate your social and political activism?
    Active..................[ ]
    Somewhat active.........[ ]
    Average.................[ ]
    Somewhat inactive.......[ ]
    Inactive................[ ]

14. Would you please answer these questions?

    a. Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?
       Most people can be trusted.....[ ]
       You can't be too careful.......[ ]

    b. Would you say that most people try to be helpful or that they are mostly looking out for themselves?
       Try to be helpful..............[ ]
       Looking out for themselves.....[ ]

    c. If you don't watch yourself, most people will try to take advantage of you.
       Agree, strongly.....[ ]   Disagree, strongly.....[ ]
       Agree, mildly.......[ ]   Disagree, mildly.......[ ]

    d. When you get right down to it, no one is going to care much about what happens to you.
       Agree, strongly.....[ ]   Disagree, strongly.....[ ]
       Agree, mildly.......[ ]   Disagree, mildly.......[ ]

    e. Human nature is fundamentally cooperative.
       Agree, strongly.....[ ]   Disagree, strongly.....[ ]
       Agree, mildly.......[ ]   Disagree, mildly.......[ ]

15. Please mark the space (e.g., :_X_:) between pair of words which best describes your feelings toward the U.S. Government.

U.S. GOVERNMENT

Treats citizens equally :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Treats citizens unequally
Serves private interests :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Serves public interests
Spends funds wastefully :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Spends funds wisely
Permissive :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Restrictive
Democratic :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Undemocratic
Deserves no respect:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Deserves respect
Needs restructuring :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Needs no restructuring

279

16. Please indicate how you feel about the following:

Strongly agree-[ ]
Mildly agree-[ ]
Mildly disagree-[ ]
Strongly disagree-[ ]

a. I feel that the problems of politics have little bearing on the quality of my life.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
SD MD MA SA

b. Government and politics are essential for "the good life."

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

c. Political decisions made in Washington, D.C., have an effect in altering my daily routine of activities

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

d. The problems of life which I would be most eager to see solved relate to me personally and are not public matters.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

e. Politics is a powerful force in determining the direction of my day-to-day existence.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

f. I believe public officials don't care about what people like me think.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

g. People like myself can be effective in influencing the passage or defeat of laws.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

h. People like me don't have any say about what the government does.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
SD MD MA SA

i. People like me don't have any say about what the university does.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

j. The government pays attention to what people like me are thinking when it decides what to do.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

k. Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

l. There's nothing I can do that will have any effect upon what happens in politics.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

m. The idea that teachers are arbitrary in assigning grades to students is nonsense.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

n. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

o. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
SD MD MA SA

p. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

q. What happens to me is largely my own doing.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

17. How would you characterize your general political orientation?

New or radical left	Very liberal	Liberal	Moderate, unsure, uncommitted	Conservative	Very conservative	New or radical right
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

18. Do you identify yourself with either the Democratic or Republic party?
    Identify with Democrats................[ ]
    Lean toward Democrats..................[ ]
    Lean toward Republicans................[ ]
    ...entify with Republicans..............[ ]
    Do not identify with either party......[ ]

19. Please mark [x] your answer for each of the following questions.

Strongly agree-[ ]
Mildly agree-[ ]
Mildly disagree-[ ]
Strongly disagree-[ ]

a. Government usually does what is in the best interest of the majority of the people.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
SD MD MA SA

b. The public's welfare is generally advanced by the government's policies.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

c. All in all, the government makes good use of our tax money.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

d. Government is doing as efficient a job as can be expected given its scope of responsibility, size, and complexity.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

e. Elected public officials think more about getting themselves re-elected than about doing what is best for the community.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

f. Government is often more attentive to special private interests of the rich and powerful than to the general public.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

g. Government is so hopelessly bad that it should be thoroughly reorganized from the ground up.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

h. Fundamental priority changes are urgently needed in government policy.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

20. The following statements have to do with radical student movements in the United States. For each statement, please indicate your opinion.

	Agree to a great extent	Agree to some extent	Agree slightly	Do not agree at all
a. They are helping free middle-class society from its repressive attitudes.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
b. They are afraid to commit themselves to any positive program of action that might challenge their moral arrogance.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
c. They are much more aware of themselves than their peers are of themselves.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
d. They are much too hostile and antagonistic to be really effective.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
e. They are helping preserve America's revolutionary tradition.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
f. They are too intolerant of everyone else's opinion.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

21. Would you respond to the following items:

Strongly agree—[]
Mildly agree—[] :
Mildly disagree—[] : :
Strongly disagree—[] : : :

a. The general public can be trusted to make the right decisions on difficult and crucial political issues. [] [] [] []

b. People should be encouraged to vote even if they haven't kept fully informed with all the issues of the day.
SD MD MA SA
[] [] [] []

c. If they are expected to get things done, politcians should sometimes be allowed to cut a few corners. [] [] [] []

d. Great changes for the benefit of mankind often require some innocent people to suffer. [] [] [] []

e. A person should not criticize our political system unless he also has something constructive to say. [] [] [] []

f. Marijuana is a potentially harmful drug and should not be legalized. [] [] [] []

g. The Nixon administration deserves the support of the American people. [] [] [] []

h. Persons who evade or "cheat" the military draft should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.
[] [] [] []
SD MD MA SA

i. No one should have a "take-home" income more than ten times larger than the average national income. [] [] [] []

j. The United States should seek an immediate withdrawal of all its troops from Vietnam. [] [] [] []

k. Violent and disruptive protest can never be justified as a means of social change. [] [] [] []

l. The present level of racial discrimination in the U.S. is minimal. [] [] [] []

m. Taken as a whole, American political institutions are the worst in the world. [] [] [] []

n. America may not be perfect, but the American way of life has brought this country as close as men have yet gotten to a perfect society.
[] [] [] []
SD MD MA SA

o. The American political system is a model that other countries would do well to copy. [] [] [] []

p. Americans are more democratic in spirit than any other people in the world. [] [] [] []

NOW FOR SOME FINAL QUESTIONS ABOUT YOURSELF AND YOUR FAMILY.

22. How old were you on your last birthday? _____ years old.

23. What is your present class level?
Freshman....[]   Graduate student – master's level....[]
Sophomore...[]   Graduate student – doctoral level...[]
Junior......[]   Non-degree or special student.......[]
Senior......[]

24. Please indicate your sex: Female....[];   Male....[].

25. What is your present marital status?
    Single...............[]   Married...........................[]
    Engaged or pinned.....[]   Divorced, separated, or widowed...[]

26. What is your residency status? -Michigan resident.......[]
                                     Out-of-state resident...[]
                                     Foreign student.........[]

27. What is your race?
    American Indian.....[]   Oriental......[]
    Black or Negro......[]   Caucasian.....[]
    Chicano.............[]   Other: _____ (write in)

28. What kind of town did you grow up in?   (If several, pick the one which
                                             you lived in longest.)
    Rural community or town (less than 10,000 population).......[]
    Small town (10,000 to 25,000)..............................[]
    Small city (25,000 to 100,000).............................[]
    City (100,000 to 500,000)..................................[]
    City metropolis (over 500,000).............................[]
    Suburb of city or city metropolis.........................[]

29. What is your present major in college? _____
    (If no preference, please indicate.)

30. What is your present vocational career choice? _____
    (If undecided or unsure, please indicate.)

31. What was your overall grade point average at the end of last term?
    4.5 - 4.00......[]   2.49 - 2.00........[]
    3.99 - 3.50.....[]   1.99 - 1.50........[]
    3.49 - 3.00.....[]   1.49 - 1.00........[]
    2.99 - 2.50.....[]   below 1.00.........[]

32. What is the highest level of education you hope to complete?
    There is a possibility that I will not complete my bachelor's degree...[]
    Bachelor's degree......................................[]
    Master's degree or equivalent..........................[]
    Ph.D. or professional degree as M.D., L.L.B., Ed.D......[]

33. How much formal education did your parents receive?

    Less than high-school graduate....(Father).[]   (Mother)..[]
    High-school graduate........................[]   []
    Some college................................[]   []
    College degree..............................[]   []
    Advanced college degree.....................[]   []

34. What is your father's occupation? (Please be specific. For example,
    if he works for Oldsmobile, tell us what he does.)

_____

35. Mother's occupation (again, please be specific): _____

36. To the best of your knowledge, would you estimate your parents'
    annual income?
    Less than $5000.......[] $15,000 - $19,999.....[]
    $5000 - $9999.........[] $20,000 - $24,999.....[]
    $10,000 - $14,999.....[]   Over $25,000..........[]

37. Do you consider your father or mother more influential in developing
your present values and beliefs?
    Father definitely more influential..........[ ]
    Father somewhat more influential............[ ]
    Mother somewhat more influential............[ ]
    Mother definitely more influential..........[ ]
    Neither parent particularly influential.....[ ]
    Both parents equally influential............[ ]

38. Do you consider your parents models of the kind of person you would
like to be when you reach their age?   (Please answer both.)

    Father: Yes, definitely.....[ ]   Mother: Yes, definitely.....[ ]
            Yes, somewhat.......[ ]   Yes, somewhat.......[ ]
            No, somewhat........[ ]   No, somewhat........[ ]
            No, definitely......[ ]   No, definitely......[ ]

39. Do you regard your friends and others in your age bracket more
influential than your parents in developing your present values
and beliefs?
            Yes, definitely......[ ]
            Yes, somewhat........[ ]
            No, somewhat.........[ ]
            No, definitely.......[ ]

40. What is your religious preference?
    Catholic........[ ]   Agnostic or atheist.....[ ]
    Protestant......[ ]   Other: _____ (write in)
    Jewish..........[ ]

41. During the past six months, about how often have you gone to church?
    At least once a week......[ ]
    About every other week....[ ]
    About once a month........[ ]
    Once or twice.............[ ]
    Not at all................[ ]

42. How important is religion to you at the present time?
    Extremely important.......[ ]
    Somewhat important........[ ]
    Fairly important..........[ ]
    Not too important.........[ ]
    Not important at all......[ ]

— THANK YOU for participating in this study.
Would you make certain you have answered every question before
mailing back the questionnaire?

We would appreciate any comments, criticisms, or suggestions you may
have about this questionnaire or about any of the questions asked.
(You may write in the space below.)

APPENDIX B

THE SAMPLE

THE SAMPLE

Part I

The seven questionnaires declared unusable from

the MNC part of the sample were divided into the follow-

ing three categories:

    a. Blanks or "jokers"   --1 questionnaire
    b. Graduate students   --2 questionnaires
    c. Missing data   --4 questionnaires

These three categories of unusable questionnaires were

recorded for the entire sample. The first category, that

of blanks or "jokers," was distinguished from the other

two categories because they were considered so blatantly

unusable that they were eliminated from the study before

the questionnaires were prepared for coding and keypunching.

Blanks were questionnaires which were usually completely

unmarked or in some cases, only marked on one or two

pages. "Jokers" were questionnaires which were completed

for the most part but which contained some highly improbable

responses. Here are two examples of self-descriptions of

"jokers":

    Joker #1--16 years old.
            --a graduate student, doctoral level.
            --indicated he was both "engaged or pinned"
              and "divorced, separated, or widowed."
            --an American Indian in racial background.
            --grade point average of 4.5 to 4.00.
            --major: "cattle butchering."
            --vocational choice: "neuro-surgen." (sic)

285

Joker #2--an American Indian in racial background
        and also a foreign student.
        --grade point average of 4.5 to 4.00.
        --indicated his political orientation as
          "radical or new right" but in reviewing
          other items, seems better characterized
          as a leftist.
        --vocational choice: "spy."
        --father's occupation: "Indian chief."
        --mother's occupation: "squaw."

Two other categories of unusable questionnaires were
not so easily detected and were not eliminated from the
sample until after they had been processed and the data
they contained punched onto cards. All respondents who
indicated they were graduate students were eliminated on
the grounds that they were probably "jokers" or students
taking graduate courses on a special basis but who never-
theless may be undergraduates. The classification of ques-
tionnaires with missing data was generally reserved for
those who did not answer a substantial number of items,
especially items dealing with alienation or items with
discrete choices which do not easily lend themselves to
probabilistic guesses based on means of the group. The
general rule of thumb was to consider for elimination any
questionnaire with more than one missing item in any given
measure of alienation or two or more consecutive unanswered
items.

Aside from these three types of unusable question-
naires, the number of questionnaires which were returned
because the respondent could not be located was recorded
separately. For the MNC sample, there were 3 questionnaires

which in spite of our best efforts could not be delivered to the proper persons. From one perspective, the fact that 3 out of 189 questionnaires went undelivered is somewhat disturbing because the sample had been cross-checked with the school registrar's files for the spring term so that there was good reason to believe that all addresses were current. From another perspective, however, 3 undelivered questionnaires from a list of 189 would seem like a most encouraging figure when one considers what the figure for undelivered questionnaires could have been had the mailing list been gathered using the year's fall, rather than spring enrollment. According to figures from the registrar's office, the spring undergraduate enrollment at MSU was 29,034 and the fall undergraduate enrollment, 40,509--a difference of some 11,475! So had an easier method of sampling been taken and the sample drawn from the student directory released that fall, the number of undelivered questionnaires would probably have been well over a fourth the total sample.

The high return rate was achieved by follow-ups, which were simplified by the numbering of the return envelopes which had been enclosed with the outgoing questionnaires. The respondents were informed of this number in the letters accompanying the questionnaires. In a good many cases, this number was inked out or even cut out by the respondents so that it was impossible to know whose questionnaire was being returned. Anticipating the inking

out of numbers, a method was devised by which MNC respondents could be distinguished from the rest of the sample even if their numbers had been removed. In numbering the return envelopes, all those in the MNC sample had their return numbers placed in the front, lower left corner of the envelope. So even if their numbers had been cut or inked out, it was possible to distinguish if the questionnaire was from the MNC sample since only the MNC sample had their return envelopes marked in that particular corner. Aside from this special number procedure, there were no differences between the mailings sent to the MNC group and the rest of the sample. The MNC sample was not told that they had been selected because of their interest in MNC activities. The letters they received were identical to those sent to the others, informing them that they had been "randomly selected" from among the undergraduates at MSU.

Part II

As it worked out, the 1/13 and 1/85 ratios resulted in a list of only 645 names, far short of the 800 mark. This unexpectedly small drawing came about because in developing these ratios, enrollment figures for the fall term had been used which were a record 11,000 students more than were enrolled in the spring term. Because the sample of 645 was considered too small to provide sufficiently large numbers of usable questionnaires for subgroup analysis

and since materials had already been printed for mailings of about 800, a second drawing was made. This second drawing produced 219 names which when added to the 645 in the first drawing produced a total sample for Stratum I and II of 864 names. Returns from the two drawings showed their population characteristics comparable (see below), so the two drawings were combined and treated as one. The 27 unusable questionnaires in this part of the sample fell into the following categories:

    a. Blanks or "jokers"   --14 questionnaires
    b. Graduate students   -- 2 questionnaires
    c. Missing data   --11 questionnaires

In addition to these 27 unusable questionnaires, 22 questionnaires from this portion of the study were undeliverable.

Part III

Seniors seem over-represented in the MNC sample. The explanation for this may be found by examining the schedule of academic credits a student needs for each class level:

    Freshman classification   -- 1 to 44 credits
    Sophomore classification   --45 to 84 credits
    Junior classification   --85 to 124 credits
    Senior classification   --125+ with a minimum
                                     of 180 credits needed
                                     for graduation

While it takes only 41 credits to advance from freshman to junior status or from sophomore to senior status, it takes a senior a minimum of 55 credits to qualify for graduation.

As such, it is not uncommon for a student at MSU to remain
a senior more terms than as a junior, sophomore, or fresh-
man. At the "normal" rate of progress, carrying 15
credits per term, a student beginning the third term of
his third year is only 5 credits or possibly only one
course away from senior status. Since this survey was
taken in the spring term, many of the MNC group, which
incidentally reported the highest grade-point average of any
of the sampling subgroups, could conceivably have qualified
for senior status.

Part IV

A more critical comparison of the similarity between
the two drawings consists of a comparison of key respondent
characteristics as compiled from the usable questionnaires
of each drawing. While there are differences between the
characteristics of respondents in each drawing, these differ-
ences were judged to be largely insignificant and easily the
result of random error as opposed to a major defect in
sampling procedure.

	Drawing #1 (N=508)	Drawing #2 (N=152)
Sex--		
Female	49.2%	53.9%
Male	50.8%	46.1%
	100.0%	100.0%
Class level--		
Freshmen	18.5%	16.4%
Sophomore	21.3%	22.4%
Junior	29.9%	36.2%
Senior	30.3%	25.0%
	100.0%	100.0%
Grade point average-- (as reported by respondents)		
4.00-4.50	1.4%	3.9%
3.50-3.99	14.2%	13.8%
3.00-3.45	27.4%	23.0%
2.50-2.99	36.0%	40.1%
2.00-2.45	18.7%	15.1%
1.50-1.99	2.0%	2.6%
1.00-1.45	0.0%	0.7%
no response	0.2%	0.7%
	99.9%	99.9%

Of the two drawings, these differences were judged to be insignificant, so on the basis of this and the other similarities of the two drawings, the drawings were combined.

Part V

The mailings sent to respondents were carefully prepared in an attempt to maximize the response rate. Some of the more noteworthy procedures are as follows:

1. The printing of the two envelopes (outgoing and return), the three letters (the advance and two different accompanying letters), and the questionnaire was done with an offset press, which while more expensive than the usual

office mimeograph process produces a much more presentable

copy. The offset process allowed printing on both sides of

opaque 11" x 17" size paper, making it possible to fit the

equivalent of eight sides of a standard 8½" x 11" sheet on

two pieces of paper which could then be folded into one

another "book fashion" without use of staples or glue. The

result was a highly readable, compact, professional looking

questionnaire, which no doubt helped boost the response rate.

(A copy of the questionnaire is contained in Appendix A.)

2. A pre-stamped, self-addressed return envelope

accompanied every questionnaire. A commemorative stamp, not

a postal meter equivalent, for first-class postage,[1] was used

on both the outgoing and return envelopes for all off-campus

respondents. On-campus respondents received and returned

their questionnaires through the campus mail system; instruc-

tions about the use of the campus mail system were included

in the letter accompanying the questionnaire.

---

[1]Numerous researchers have supported the use of
postage stamps, as opposed to metered stamps, to increase
response rates of mail surveys. Among them are: Paul L.
Erdos, Professional Mail Surveys (New York: McGraw-Hill,
1970), pp. 119-121; John T. Gullahorn and Jeanne E. Gullahorn,
"An Investigation of the Effects of Three Factors on Response
to Mail Questionnaires," Public Opinion Quarterly, 27, 2
(Summer, 1963), pp. 294-296; Andrew E. Kimball, "Increasing
the Rate of Return in Mail Surveys," Journal of Marketing, 25,
6 (October, 1961), pp. 63-64; William J. Goode and Paul K.
Hatt, Methods in Social Research (New York: McGraw-Hill,
1952), p. 179; R. A. Robinson, "How to Boost Returns from
Mail Surveys," Printers' Ink, 237, 6 (June 6, 1952), pp.
35-37.

3. An advance letter personally signed by myself was sent to respondents two to four days before their first questionnaires were mailed. This highly recommended proceedure[2] alerted respondents to the arrival of the questionnaire and helped give respondents a sense of the importance of the questionnaire.

4. The two mailings of the questionnaire each included a letter, a different one for each mailing, explaining the study and soliciting cooperation. The letters, which were personally signed, tried to incorporate many of the 22 considerations outlined by Erdos for letters of this sort.[3] To emphasize the difference between the two letters, they were printed on different colored paper.

5. In addition to the mailings, telephone calls were placed to respondents who, according to our records, had not returned the first questionnaire. The phone calls were timed so that they were received at about the same time the second set of questionnaires reached the respondents. The intended effect of these phone calls was to reinforce the appeal of the second questionnaire before these questionnaires were discarded or lost.

In addition to these mailing and collection proceedures, the actual measurement instrument itself--the questionnaire--was constructed with an eye toward a high and unbiased

---

[2]Erdos, op. cit., pp. 89-93; for other citations on this point, see Erdos, p. 93.

[3]Ibid., pp. 101-117.

response rate. Efforts were made to give the questionnaire a "short and easy" look.[4] The questions themselves and their format were constructed so that they could be easily understood and answered without hesitation. To this end, the following steps were taken:

1. Pretesting--Even after the wording of the questions had been scrutinized by a handful of knowledgeable individuals, it was felt that a pretesting of the questionnaire would be useful. There were two phases to the pretesting. Phase one involved students in two undergraduate classes (N=77), who were asked to complete the questionnaire and then to comment on the questionnaire as a whole and on specific questions which they felt could be improved. Phase two involved twelve students associated with a variety of student groups in campus. These student activists were asked individually to complete the questionnaire and after doing so, to discuss at length the wording of the questionnaires. These discussions lasted from five minutes to over an hour, with the average lasting about 20-30 minutes. This latter group was especially helpful in suggesting a number of modifications which appeared in the final version of the questionnaire.

3. Arrangement of questions--When constructing a questionnaire it is advisable that:

---

[4]Ibid., Chapter 6.

> [I]f possible, the first page should be the shortest,
> airiest, easiest-looking page. He [the respondent]
> may also turn the questionnaire over to look at the
> last page. For this reason the last page should not
> be too difficult either--and in no circumstance should
> the last question bear a high number . . . . On all
> but the shortest questionnaires it is advisable to
> group questions into sections by subject matter and
> start the numbering with question 1 for each section.[5]

The questionnaire was constructed with these ideas in mind.
The first and last pages contained far fewer questions than
any of the other pages. The questions on the first page
were selected to elicit the attention and interest of the
respondents, while the last page was constructed so that it
did not contain potentially antagonizing questions such as
those about parents' income and occupations, respondent's
race, career plans, and grade point average, which were all
included in the questionnaire but on the second to the last
page.

3. Questionnaire format--Andrew Greenley of the
National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, has
written:

> As anyone who has engaged in constructing a survey
> questionnaire has known all along, social science
> is, if not an art, at least a rather artistic craft.[6]

The design problems in reducing an original eleven-
page questionnaire down to eight pages (the idea being the
shorter the questionnaire, the better) cannot be called
scientific. Boxes for respondents' check marks were arranged

---

[5]Ibid., p. 48.

[6]Andrew M. Greenley, "Sociology as an Art Form,"
The American Sociologist, 6, 3 (August, 1971), p. 223.

for economy of space as well as for lack of confusion.
"White space," margins, and spacings were manipulated;
questions were grouped together in different units and
arranged sometimes on different pages while trying to main-
tain continuity in subject matter. Special attention was
paid to keep the questionnaire from appearing monotonous by
alternating the format of the subsections within the ques-
tionnaire, so that there would never appear a full page of
unrelieved uniformity of format.

Part VI

As noted in the appendix, Part II, the main sample
in this study was assembled in two drawings, the first
drawing accounting for some 645 names and the second for 219
names. The specifications for the two drawings were the
same, though they were executed about a week apart and
mailings sent about a week and a half apart. The two draw-
ings were necessitated because of an unfortunate misinterpre-
tation of instructions by the group in the university regis-
trar's office which handled the actual selection of names.
Questionnaires to respondents in the first and larger of the
two drawings were mailed at a time when it was uncertain
when the second drawing would be ready for mailing. Rather
than risk losing the respondents in the first drawing entirely,
the first drawing was mailed independent of the second drawing.
When the second drawing was completed and it was evident that
it was still early enough in the academic term to mail and

expect to receive completed questionnaires from this second drawing, the second mailing was sent out, bringing the size of the sample up to the desired number.

The following is the schedule of mailings for the two drawings:

First mailing (including MNC)--

Advance letter	--April 26
First questionnaire	--April 28
Second questionnaire	--May 10
Phone calls	--concentrated on May 11 and 12

Second mailings--

Advance letter	--May 6
First questionnaire	--May 10
Second questionnaire	--May 17
Phone calls	--concentrated on May 18 and 19

For both drawings the interval between the advance letter and the first questionnaire was within the two to five day recommendation of Erdos,[7] while the second questionnaire was mailed out when a record of the number of questionnaires returned showed the return rate slackening. The fact that the second questionnaire for the first mailing was sent 12 days after the first as compared to the seven-day interval between the first and second questionnaires in the second mailing was decided upon when the response pattern for the first drawing affirmed what other mail surveys at MSU had experienced, that the response rate for a mail survey falls off after 7 to 10 days. This shorter interval for the second

---

[7] Erdos, op. cit., p. 10.

drawing was an attempt to compress the collection interval for the second drawing so as to finish data collection before the last week of school in early June, which as expected effectively marked the end of respondent cooperation.

The mailings for the second drawings fell at a less opportune time than the first drawings, being later in the term when students are more involved in the fast moving pace of a ten-week term and also at about the time when mid-term exams are customarily given. The unfortunate timing of these mailings may account for the fact that the raw response rate for the second drawing was 74.7 per cent as compared to 80.0 per cent for the first drawing. In absolute numbers of questionnaires, this difference between the two response rates would have been nullified if 12 more individuals from the second drawing had responded. Considering a) the overall response pattern of the two drawings, which was similar to each other; b) the comparatively small difference in response rates, and c) the closeness of certain key respondent charac-teristics between the drawings (see Part IV), the two drawings were judged comparable enough so that they could be combined and treated as one drawing.

The end result of these procedures was an overall raw return rate of 79.5 per cent, a most gratifying return rate for an eight-page questionnaire, which is longer than some people would consider advisable for a mail survey of this nature.[8] The high return rate was undoubtedly partially

_____

[8]Ibid., p. 12.

the result of the multiple follow-ups and the manner in
which the mailings and the questionnaire was prepared.
Numerous procedures (see Part V) were followed to develop a
questionnaire that was easily understandable, presentable,
and convenient to return. The success of these various
procedures is reflected in the high return rate and the
similarity between the sample and population profiles.

APPENDIX C

REGRESSION INTERACTION ANALYSIS

REGRESSION INTERACTION ANALYSIS BETWEEN THE THREE

MAJOR ALIENATION VARIABLES AND GENERAL

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

For a more complete outline of this analysis, see William Mendenhall, Introduction to Linear Models and the Design and Analysis of Experiments (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1968), pp. 176-181.

The regression interaction analysis is based on the following two models:

Model 1: $y = B_o = B_1 (X_1) + B_2 (X_2) + B_3 (X_3) + e$

Model 2: $y = B_o = B_1 (X_1) + B_2 (X_2) + B_3 (X_3) + B_4 (X_1 \cdot X_2)$

$+ B_5 (X_1 \cdot X_3) + B_6 (X_2 \cdot X_3) + B_7 (X_1 \cdot X_2 \cdot X_3)$

$+ e$, where

y = general political participation,

X_1 = political cynicism,

X_2 = political efficacy,

X_3 = political relevance,

$(X_1 \cdot X_2)$ = interaction between political cynicism and political efficacy,

$(X_1 \cdot X_3)$ = interaction between political cynicism and political relevance,

$(X_2 \cdot X_3)$ = interaction between political efficacy and political relevance,

$(X_1 \cdot X_2 \cdot X_3)$ = interaction between political cynicism, political efficacy, and political relevance.

The null hypothesis is that there is no interaction effect attributable to model 2:

$$H_o = B_4 = B_5 = B_6 = B_7 = 0.$$

The analysis is based on the fact that if interaction is present and contributing substantial information to the prediction of general participation, a regression model with the three independent variables plus its interaction terms would have a smaller sum of squares of deviations than a regression model with only the three independent variables.

If the interaction did contribute substantially to the prediction of general participation, SSE_2, the sum of squares for model 2, would be smaller than that for model 1, SSE_1. Of interest is the drop between SSE_1 and SSE_2, which can be partitioned out of SSE_1 by the following identity:

$$SSE_1 = SSE_2 + (SSE_1 - SSE_2).$$

If $(SSE_1 - SSE_2$ is zero, there is no interaction contribution in model 2. The test statistic utilizes this hypothesized difference between SSE_1 and SSE_2, and is as follows:

$$F = \frac{(s^3)_3}{(s^2)_3}, \text{ where}$$

$$(s^2)_3 = \frac{SSE_1 - SSE_2}{(k - j)} \text{ and } (s^2)_2 = \frac{SSE_2}{(N - (k + 1)}, \text{ with}$$

N = number of observations,

k = number of independent variables in model 2,

j = number of independent variables in model 1.

The expectation is that if H_O is true, the f-statistic will assume a value near 1 and will become larger, the more the interaction of model 2 contributes to the prediction of general participation.

The test statistic is the f-ratio between $(s^2)_3$, the variance of random error for the drop in the prediction error between the two regression models and $(s^2)_2$, the variance of error for the supposedly less erroneous regression model containing the three main variables plus the interaction effects of these variables.

In this particular case,

$$F = \frac{\dfrac{54,027.93 - 53,745.35}{(7 - 3)}}{\dfrac{53,745.35}{822 - (7 + 1)}} = \frac{70.64}{66.03} = 1.07 \text{ with 4 and 814 degrees of freedom}$$