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CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM

This research was undertaken with the purpose of examining whether students, who are high in their attitudinal support for campus protest tactics which are outside of legally sanctioned norms, are uniquely characterized by feelings of powerlessness. While the view that students who support protest are characterized by feelings of powerlessness is accepted by many lay persons and social scientists, methodological and theoretical limitations of past studies have restricted the ability of the results of these studies to be generalized to all American colleges and universities—particularly to the great majority of state and community colleges which provide higher education to the masses of lower- and middle-income families.

One general problem associated with comprehending the attitudes of college students (including nonactivist students) toward protest, has to do with the concepts which have been applied by social scientists and lay persons to activists in their confrontations with authorities. Most of the work on student activists has been guided by various notions of alienation; particularly feelings of powerlessness. For example, certain field research has found that student
activists score high on feelings of anomie.\textsuperscript{1} Typical examples of research findings are that activist students believe that they are less influential within and upon the university than they desire;\textsuperscript{2} are deprived of feelings of identity and significance;\textsuperscript{3} and are merely attempting to gain power through the creation of a community based on participatory democracy.\textsuperscript{4} The question remains, however, of whether characterizations of activists are a sound basis for describing the total student population which acts overwhelmingly within normative standards of conduct. Certainly, inquiry regarding the general normative support conditions for dissent is warranted on the grounds that: (1) subcultural norms—in this case, student subcultural norms—are assumed to play an important role in determining collective acts;\textsuperscript{5} (2) generally, shared attitudes supportive of norm violating behavior often precede or accompany deviant acts by groups;\textsuperscript{6} and (3) expressed attitudes are considered by many social-psychologists


\textsuperscript{2}Lipset, S. M., "The Activists: A Profile." \textit{Public Interest}, Fall 1968, p. 43-44.


\textsuperscript{6}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 85.
to be a form of social behavior worthy of investigation.¹

The idea that alienation is associated with student support for dissent outside of established norms, has several theoretical implications. Students are viewed by some social theorists to be "separated, not only from an ideal sense of community but from any significant relationship to society."² Similarly, many social scientists³ have also contended that the nation's schools have accentuated the student's isolation and estrangement from themselves, others, and their own traditions. They reason that there is diminished opportunity for individual student involvement and capacity for effective action, and that this felt lack of capacity for effective action facilitates the growth of student dissent.

While this line of reasoning may appear logical, there are two research findings which should be considered. The first is that student activism outside of established norms at any given time is likely to involve a relatively small proportion of the students in a very few select colleges and universities. Peterson found that, at most, only 9 percent of any student body were reported as involved


in protest movements.¹ The second research finding which should be considered is that the majority of students in the United States attend college principally to gain occupational entry and these students tend to find their college experience to be "basically satisfying."²

There are other problems as well in relating alienation to student support for protest outside of established channels. One use of the concept of alienation alluded to above, refers to an individual's general sense of powerlessness. With this conception of powerlessness, the felt expectancy of probability held by the individual is that he cannot shape or determine the occurrence of outcomes he desires.³

A review of the literature in regards to alienation as powerlessness and support for student dissent is at best, inconsistent. Watts and his associates⁴ in their study found student activists to be characterized by feelings of helplessness. Keniston⁵ contends

---


²Ibid., p. 38.


⁵Keniston, Kenneth, Young Radicals. (Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1968).
that student protesters believe in the value and efficacy of political action; this would indicate that they do not feel a total sense of powerlessness within their environment.

In regard to black militants, Ransford and Gurin found that those with the highest scores on powerlessness tend to have the highest commitment to overt acts of violence to change the system. Meyer found that the blacks who scored high on militancy tended to possess strong feelings that they could and should shape their destinies. Crawford and Naditch, distinguishing two dimensions of powerlessness, found that the more militant black respondents tended to be characterized by a high sense of personal power but low feelings of control over external forces which affect their achievement of personal goals.

Perhaps, as suggested by Keniston, student dissenters may best be typified by two ideal types. The first, the political activist or protestor works to correct injustices he perceives through the use of demonstrations which he believes are effective in mobilizing public opinion and political pressure. The other type of dissenter, according

---


to Keniston, may be conceived of as culturally alienated; the culturally alienated are convinced that meaningful change of the social and political world is impossible and considers "dropping out" the only real option.¹

The objective of this study is to characterize the student population in regard to their attitudes toward protest outside of established norms for dissent. More particularly, the purpose of this study is to determine if there is a relationship between student feelings of powerlessness and attitudinal support for student protest. Keniston focused on overt and covert dissent only among a few protesters, whereas this study focuses on powerlessness and support for dissent outside of established norms in the total student community.

Related Literature and Research Problems

The objective of assessing whether there is a relationship between student feelings of powerlessness in various circumstances and attitudes toward dissent outside of established norms is confounded by many methodological and theoretical problems. Methodologically, the problems encompass possible errors in both sampling and measurement. Theoretically, difficulties arise in the way the concept protestor has been conceptualized and operationalized and in the number of theoretical orientations which have been used to explain the student protest phenomenon.

Methodological Issues

Considering problems associated with sampling biases of past research, it should be noted that perhaps undue weighing has been given to prominent academic institutions. The students most frequently studied are overt dissenters from elite institutions such as the University of California at Berkeley, Yale University, the University of Chicago, and Columbia University. These universities are not typical in that they may be characterized as "high student prone" institutions. This bias in sampling may impede an understanding of the way in which the student protestor has been theoretically conceptualized and operationalized. Furthermore, biased images of student activists may be mistakenly used to describe students in general in regard to their orientations toward activism outside of established norms. For example, research on student protest has consistently found the typical student activist in the United States to be from relatively affluent liberal parents, involved in the humanities and social sciences, and academically superior to his non-activist counterpart. However, this profile of the student activist has generally been based on data gathered on a limited number of campuses. And of these campuses studied, attention has focused on the Berkeley
student activist. Even publications in foreign languages about the American student activist are likely to focus on Berkeley.

Hence, because of the campuses sampled in previous research, one cannot be sure that the activists are similar to those in the general campus population who support active protest. Neither can one be sure that student activists in all academic communities have the above described characteristics, or whether these particular characteristics are more fitting of students in academic institutions such as the University of California at Berkeley, which have had a historical tradition of supporting liberal-left student issues. In these academically elite schools, this orientation goes back at least prior


to World War II. Perhaps, student activists from these academic institutions with a liberally oriented protest tradition are more likely to be organized for protest and to be politically experienced. In October, 1964, prior to today's higher level of student participation in demonstrations, a study of 600 Berkeley students who held a police car captive "reported that over half of them had taken part in at least one previous demonstration and 15 per cent indicated that they had taken part in seven or more."  

However, one should not assume, even implicitly, that such campuses as Berkeley and Columbia are representative of colleges and universities across the country, let alone of other cultures. Viewing students in all other academic settings as similar to Berkeley activists, may result in mistakenly assuming that support for protest is concomitant with "liberal" or "leftist" political orientations. What may be occurring, is that a biased characterization of the student activist is being applied to all students such that they are seen as "leftist" and alienated against the system.

For example, in their research on the socialization correlates of student activism, Block and her associates\(^2\) heavily weighed student

\(^1\)Lipset, S. M., "The Activists: A Profile." Public Interest, Fall 1968, p. 48.

\(^2\)ibid.

activists to the political left. Her conclusions may thus be the spurious result of recruiting student activists for the study from those arrested in the 1964 Free Speech Movement sit-in at Berkeley, participants in the Experimental College, Tutorial Project, and Community Development Program at San Francisco State College, and those joining the Peace Corps.\(^1\) Perhaps, if one were to study current college student dissenters in Chile, they would be found to be "right wingers" as reported in the press.

Whatever the case, it seems reasonable in summary to state that studies of student activists and protesters have investigated dissent on only a limited number of academic institutions, and have tended to use certain terms synonymously failing to operationally distinguish activists and supporters of protest from one another. Furthermore, researchers in sampling "protestors" have focused on the politically left-oriented protesters by utilizing criteria which eliminated "right-wing" oriented protesters from their samples. This bias then is a result of both measurement and sampling errors. As a consequence, one can conclude that there is a basis for questioning whether the full range of student protesters or supporters of protest are being sampled.

In examining the past research on activists, it is particularly important for this investigation to note that such research has given little attention to the general conditions which aid in and precipitate in the development of the normative support for dissent. In fact,

little attention has been given to the attitudinal support among the
general student community for different types of illegal dissent. A
study in this area would most definitely be warranted since active
student dissent takes place within the general student community wherein
student subcultural norms are assumed to play an important role in
determining collective acts. The findings in such a study would also
provide information on the stances taken toward illegal protest within
the total academic community. Since studies limited to actual activists
have also failed to assess right oriented political dissent, an
attitudinal survey of the general college community may help to assess
the support for right oriented protest on campus.

Conceptual Issues

Theoretically, the research on the sources of student protest
have been guided by two differing orientations or approaches. One
approach has looked to family socialization and status patterns as
the source of student activism. The other approach has emphasized
social psychological characteristics of the activists which are assumed
to be a function of the social systems of which the activist is a
member.

The family status-socialization approach has been based on the
consistency of research findings which have found protestors to be
predominantly upper-middle class. The student protestor is likely to
have a father who is in the upper-professional status positions and a
mother who is educated above the norm for women in general and involved
in a career. In addition, both of the parents of a student protestor
are likely to liberal in their political orientations. Also, the families of the student activists are likely to be characterized by high status and education over at least two generations.¹

Within the family of the student protestor the following structural characteristics are likely to prevail.

(a) "A strong emphasis on democratic, egalitarian interpersonal relations.

(b) A high degree of permissiveness with respect to self-regulation.

(c) An emphasis on values other than achievement in particular, a stress on the intrinsic worth of living up to intellectual, aesthetic, political, or religious ideals."²

The predominant social psychological approaches to student protest have focused on the alienation of the student activists. Unfortunately, the concept of alienation has been used in several ways to explain student activism. Oppenheimer³ conceptualized alienation to mean both the students' lack of decision-making power or powerlessness and estrangement from society. Watts and his associates in their study of activists were interested in alienation as anomie, not knowing what to do or what is expected. Keniston,⁴ in his work, has


²loc. cit., p. 61.


employed a continuum which has utilized two ideal types of student protesters; one being an activist and the other being socially withdrawn. Although Keniston's\textsuperscript{1} use of alienation emphasized isolation from a system and self-estrangement, implicit is the concept of felt power as a cause since the activist is assumed to believe in the effectiveness of his public demonstrations, while the withdrawn student dissenter is convinced that meaningful change of the social and political world is impossible.

Hence, although Oppenheimer and Keniston utilize the concept of alienation in slightly different ways, both utilize a concept of felt power in explaining the phenomena of student protest. That is, protesters are seen to realize their lack of decision-making or powerlessness and are attempting to gain some power over the decisions which affect them. At the same time, however, students may be estranged from the system and severely doubt the efficacy of protest.

It is from dealing with this lack of conceptual clarity in the literature regarding the use of alienation that the main research objective of this study was developed. The main objective of this study was, thus, to assess whether student conceptions of their powerlessness are related to their support for student protest outside of established norms.

Restated, it should be noted that this study focuses on only one typology of alienation—powerlessness—by assessing whether feelings

of power and powerlessness on the part of students contribute to their attitudes of support toward student protest outside of established norms. This study is not directly concerned with the other concepts of alienation such as meaninglessness, or self-estrangement. As will be developed in later discussions, the research focus is on whether certain forms of powerlessness in general cultural roles (e.g., general citizen role) and powerlessness in specific cultural roles (e.g., occupational roles) are related to attitudes of rejection or support for changing societal institutions.

The theoretical tradition for alienation as powerlessness goes back at least to the works of Karl Marx and Emile Burkheim, and have been elaborated upon by the recent writings of C. Wright Mills and Robert K. Merton. While the works of Marx and others are clear in stating that alienation arises from man's "failure to develop self-powers by transacting with the world of things," they are not explicit in specifying whether one's feelings of powerlessness will lead to resignation or revolution or both.

Durkheim's discussion of anomie is clearly related to our primary research objective of ascertaining the extent of support for non-normative behavior designed to attain a given goal in a typical American

---


university. If, as Durkheim\textsuperscript{1} contended, anomie arises "because the division of labor fails to produce sufficiently effective contacts between its members and adequate regulations of social relationships," then high support for non-normative behavior may be an indicator of anomie and powerlessness.

However, in terms of assessing whether student conceptions of their powerlessness in their environment and their student roles may be a social condition which precipitates normative support of illegal dissent, Merton's discussion of the disjunction between cultural goals and the institutionalized means of achieving these goals is most appropriate. Specifically, Merton's\textsuperscript{2} cultural structure is concerned with "that organized set of normative values governing behavior which is common to members of a designated society or group." It is, in this regard, that the primary objective of this study is to assess the extent of support for various levels and types of student protest on the campus of a typical American university.

Merton further specifies the conditions under which individuals will openly challenge the legitimacy of the social norms that he rejects. In the typology which he developed, Merton argues that this

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
form of behavior is most likely to occur when individuals (rebels) are attempting to change the existing cultural and social structure rather than to accommodate efforts within this structure.\(^1\) That is, the "institutional system is regarded as a barrier to the satisfaction of legitimized goals."\(^2\) This particular adaption—rebellion—contains the high expectancy that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve given goals.\(^3\) Merton argues that this adaption of rebellion (as well as his typology of the modes of an individual's adaptation to the stresses produced by society\(^4\)) is a function of the "acute disjunction between cultural norms and goals and the socially structured capacities of members of the group to act in accord with them."\(^5\)

**Theoretical and Research Objectives**

The general proposition advanced below is in accord with the sociological view just discussed that an individual's feelings of powerlessness affects his attitudes about the institutions and social systems of which he is a member.\(^6\) Restated the proposition is as follows:


\(^2\)Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, op. cit., p. 156.


\(^4\)Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, op. cit., p. 140.

\(^5\)loc. cit., p. 162.

\(^6\)loc. cit., p. 156.
General Proposition

Feelings of power in a role are associated with support for deviant norms to change that role.

That is, the greater an individual's feelings of perceived powerlessness in a role, the greater is the likelihood that he will support illegitimate norms to change that role. Conversely, the less an individual feels powerless, the less likely he will value the use of illegitimate norms to change his role.

Derived Hypotheses

Two different forms of perceived role power were conceptualized and operationalized for this study—power in the academic role (an occupational role) and power in the general societal environment (a generalized role). Similar in form to the above general proposition relating feelings of power to support for the use of illegitimate modes of protest are the following general hypotheses:

\[ H_{R1} \]: The greater one's feelings of academic powerlessness, the greater will be one's attitudinal support for various forms of illegitimate protest to achieve student aims.

\[ H_{R2} \]: The greater one's feelings of powerlessness in the general environment, the greater will be one's attitudinal support for various forms of student protest to achieve student aims.

Control Variables

The discussion of family background patterns, which is elaborated upon in the Related Literature section, indicates that certain demographic variables may also be associated with support for student protest. The major variables which have been found in research to be
associated with student support for protest are socio-economic status, sex, and age. One's birth order has also been suggested to be related to alienation and dissent. Should powerlessness not be found to be associated with support for student protest in gross comparisons, there exists the possibility that a true association is masked or depressed by those variables of sex, SES, age, and birth order, which have been shown to partially account for the variance in student protest. Therefore, it is necessary in this study to control for sex, age, SES, and birth order to examine the possible relationship between powerlessness and a student's attitudinal support for protest. The following control hypotheses are therefore made:

When controlling for sex, there will be a relationship between powerlessness and attitudinal support for protest among both sexes.

When controlling for socio-economic status, there will be a relationship between powerlessness and attitudinal support for protest among all SES categories.

When controlling for age, there will be a relationship between powerlessness and attitudinal support for protest among all age categories.

When controlling for birth order, there will be a relationship between powerlessness and attitudinal support for protest among all categories of birth order.

If the hypotheses are to be subjected to test and if the biases of past research samplings are to be overcome, it is important that campuses be sampled with characteristics of a regionally oriented state school where collective protest outside of established norms is rarer than at the high protest-prone institutions which were previously sampled. Student body characteristics associated with high protest institutions (but not Western Michigan University, the site of this study) include increased heterogeneity of students in terms of their ethnic composition, proportion of out-of-state students, and socio-economic background.\(^1\) Characteristics associated with protest-prone institutions (but not Western Michigan University) also include a higher level of student participation in community volunteer programs and a larger number of underground publications and films.\(^2\)

One guiding research purpose of this study has been the selection of a campus from which to draw subjects which are distinctly different from protest-prone institutions. If the results of research on the function of powerlessness are different in high and low protest prone settings, the differences may be attributed to idiosyncratic features of the institutions and not to powerlessness. Should powerlessness in societal roles operate similarly in distinctly different educational systems, the theoretical relevance of powerlessness as a concept is enhanced. This study is a beginning at expanding the universe of academic settings to these the hypotheses.

\(^1\)Michigan Legislature. Committee to Investigate Campus Disorders and Student Unrest. 1970, part 1, p. 44.

\(^2\)Ibid.
Summary of Objectives

Restated, the research objectives of this study are threefold. They are:

1. To assess the extent of support for various levels and types of student disruption and protest in a prototypical American university, i.e., a university with little tradition of over illegal dissent and comprised of a regionally oriented student body population.

2. To assess whether student conceptions of their powerlessness in their environment and their student roles are related to their support for student protest.

3. To assess whether roles associated with sex, age, socioeconomic status, and birth order, which have been found in the literature to be related to protest, function to depress or distort a "true" relationship between powerlessness and protest from being otherwise apparent.

If the above research objectives are attained, the theoretical aim of ascertaining whether support for protest outside of norms is a likely function of powerlessness in societal roles, as contended by Marx and numerous recent theorists, will be elaborated upon. While no one study is likely to result in definitive conclusions, the focus on one concept of alienation, (i.e., powerlessness), the use of a population of students often excluded (i.e., a state supported regionally oriented school), and the study of the phenomenon of support for illegal protest rather than only the act of protest may, it is hoped, contribute to an enhanced awareness of the nature of collective dissent on and off our university campuses.
CHAPTER II

METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

This chapter contains a description of the population, operational definitions of concepts, and a description of the data collection techniques and methods of analyses used in the study.

Description of the Population

In the previous chapter an argument was developed that the schools typically studied for student protest (e.g., Berkeley, Yale, Columbia, etc.) were likely to be different in important ways from locally oriented state colleges. As shown in Table 2.1, institutions recognized for high protest schools are most likely to be cosmopolitan in the sense that they draw a student body which is composed of 65 percent out of state students, while Western Michigan University draws only approximately 7 percent of its students from out of Michigan. Moreover, as a regionally oriented school, Western Michigan University draws 23 percent of its students from Kalamazoo county, 53 percent of its students from the 19 counties of southwestern Michigan, and about

1Michigan Legislature. Committee to Investigate Campus Disorders and Student Unrest. 1970, part 1, p. 44.


3loc. cit., p. 11.

4loc. cit., p. 12.
90 percent of its total student body from the southern counties of Michigan.¹

Given the condition of the higher costs of travel, tuition and fees commonly associated with out-of-state student status, one may conclude that the high protest colleges have students of a more cosmopolitan and heterogeneous socio-economic background (i.e., more students of high and low socio-economic backgrounds) than Western Michigan University. This study depends on a prototype university that is not like the high protest schools from which beliefs about protest have been obtained.

Table 2.1

Student Body Characteristics of High Protest Colleges and Michigan Schools of Higher Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Body Characteristics</th>
<th>High Protest*</th>
<th>WMU**</th>
<th>Michigan*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity of students:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of out-of-state students</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneity of students socio-economic background</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneity of students age</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Western Michigan University. Data on Students Enrolled Winter Semester 1971, p. 12.
Sample

The sample for this study included 221 students stratified by class level and age. As indicated in Table 2.2, the sample and the population parameters of Western Michigan University are very similar. The sample was obtained by administering questionnaires to students in five sociology classes which are generally required for most students and which are known to include students from all class levels and most majors on campus.

Table 2.2

Student Body Characteristics of Western Michigan University, and the Population Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Level</th>
<th>WMU Population*</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data obtained from Western Michigan University. Data On Students Enrolled Winter Semester 1971.
Pre-Test of Instruments

Items for the instruments measuring academic and general environmental powerlessness were compiled from various sources. More specifically, this writer received items from knowledgeable persons in the discipline and from existing instruments that purported to assess some aspect of anomie or powerlessness. Those items that were believed to assess an individual's feelings about powerlessness in the general environment and powerlessness in the student role were compiled. After the items had been compiled, they were carefully edited or revised. Prior to the development of the final instruments (refer to Appendix A), a pretest of 47 items was administered to 80 subjects. These items were intercorrelated and from a cross-matrix analyses, reduced clusters of items were obtained from which instruments were constructed to assess the following variables:

Independent Variable: Student's Perceived Powerlessness

The student's perceived sense of powerlessness, the independent variable in this study, refers to an individual's belief that he cannot shape or determine the occurrence of outcomes he desires. This dimension of powerlessness was broken down into two components, a feeling of powerlessness in the student role, and a general environmental sense of powerlessness.

Powerlessness in the Student Role

In this study, the component of powerlessness in the student role was operationalized by asking the following questions:
13. Students can change university policies regarding student regulations if they become actively involved in attempting to change these rules.
   1. strongly disagree
   2. disagree
   3. not sure
   4. agree
   5. strongly agree

14. Very few people control school policies and the rest of us can only do what they want.
   1. strongly agree
   2. agree
   3. not sure
   4. disagree
   5. strongly disagree

23. If I work hard I will be able to get the good grades that I want.
   1. strongly disagree
   2. disagree
   3. not sure
   4. agree
   5. strongly agree

24. Students can have no say whatsoever in determining the curriculum courses they have to take.
   1. strongly agree
   2. agree
   3. not sure
   4. disagree
   5. strongly disagree

42. Getting good grades is largely a matter of chance and is almost totally dependent on the whims of the professor.
   1. strongly agree
   2. agree
   3. not sure
   4. disagree
   5. strongly disagree

An examination of the pre-test data indicated that the items measuring academic powerlessness were measuring a general dimension of academic powerlessness.
However, an examination of the final data clearly showed that three different components of academic powerlessness were being employed. As shown in Table 2.4, the inter-item correlations were near zero. Therefore, it was decided to analyze the impact of each of the three different measures of academic powerlessness separately rather than combining the items into a common scale assuming uni-dimensionality.

Table 2.3
The Inter-Item Correlations of the Pretest Questions Measuring Academic Powerlessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>13</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4
The Inter-Item Correlations of the Final Items Used in Measuring Academic Powerlessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>13</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Powerlessness in the General Environment

The component of powerlessness within the general environment was operationalized by asking the following questions:

37. A person can and should make plans to control his destiny.
   1. strongly disagree
   2. disagree
   3. not sure
   4. agree
   5. strongly agree

38. Few people make all the important decisions which affect our lives and this greatly determines, more than our plans what we can really do.
   1. strongly agree
   2. agree
   3. not sure
   4. disagree
   5. strongly disagree

41. Significant future events in one's life are predetermined.
   1. strongly agree
   2. agree
   3. not sure
   4. disagree
   5. strongly disagree

66. In general, if a person becomes actively involved in religious, political, or social organizations in the community he can contribute to desired changes in the society.
   1. strongly disagree
   2. disagree
   3. not sure
   4. agree
   5. strongly agree

67. One cannot really blame those who do not try to change to society, since people today cannot really alter the course of political and social events.
   1. strongly agree
   2. agree
   3. not sure
   4. disagree
   5. strongly disagree

An examination of the data indicated that several dimensions of environmental powerlessness were being measured. As shown in Table 2.5,
the inter-item correlations of the pre-test items were near zero.

Table 2.5

The Inter-Item Correlations of the Pre-Test Items
Measuring Environmental Powerlessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>37</th>
<th>38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 2.6—and Table 2.5—several dimensions of environmental powerlessness were being measured. On the basis of the similar low inter-item correlations of the pre-test and final survey it was decided to analyze the impact of each of the three different measures of environmental powerlessness separately rather than combining the items into a common scale which assumes unidimensionality.

Table 2.6

The Inter-Item Correlations of the Final Items
Measuring Environmental Powerlessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>37</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>66*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dependent Variable: Attitudinal Support for Protest

The dependent variable of this study is concerned with attitudinal support for violations of societal as well as university norms governing student protest. Student support or non-support for protest norms refers to a cognitive-affective social-psychological state of individuals. Thus, the focus of inquiry is not with those who are active in a particular social protest, but with those who support and do not support illegal social dissent to achieve social change.

One's attitudinal support for protest was perceived to run on a continuum from strong disapproval of norm violation to strong support for the norm violation, and the questions were structured to reflect this. The form of the question also attempted to focus on the situation. This was done by holding constant the attitude object—support of protest to achieve student aims—and altering the situation within which the protest took place (boycotts, occupying a university building, holding faculty or administration personnel hostages, and bombing buildings and/or faculty offices). Finally because attitudinal support for protest may be of a rightist or leftist political nature, an attempt was made to structure questions measuring the dependent variable in a way which would prevent a bias weighing towards support for protest by only leftists. This was done by stating within the question that the protest tactic could be utilized by either rightist or leftist oriented students, and allowing the student space to state what kind of protest he would support if a certain protest tactic were used.
These components of attitudinal support for protest outside of established norms were operationalized by asking the following questions:

15. How do you feel about using boycotts to prevent regular university business from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., holding classes, athletic events, hearing commencement speakers, etc.
   1. strongly disapprove
   2. disapprove
   3. have no feelings about boycotts
   4. approve
   5. strongly approve
   6. depends on the issue
      If you answered either 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify boycotts

16. ____________________________
17. ____________________________
18. ____________________________

19. How do you feel about students occupying a university building to prevent regular university business from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., holding classes, athletic events, hearing commencement speakers, etc.
   1. strongly disapprove
   2. disapprove
   3. have no feelings about students occupying an university building
   4. approve
   5. strongly approve
   6. depends on the issue
      If you answered either 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify the occupation of a university building

20. ____________________________
21. ____________________________
22. ____________________________

25. How do you feel about students using boycotts to prevent other student initiated events from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., presentation of guest speakers, right or left wing, music program, dances, etc.
   1. strongly disapprove
   2. disapprove
   3. have no feelings about boycotts
   4. approve
   5. strongly approve
   6. depends on the issue
If you answered 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify boycotts

26. ______________________________
27. ______________________________
28. ______________________________

29. How do you feel about students occupying university buildings to prevent other student initiated events from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., presentation of guest speakers, right or left wing, music program, dances, etc.

1. strongly disapprove
2. disapprove
3. have no feelings about students occupying university buildings
4. approve
5. strongly approve
6. depends on the issue
   If you answered 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify the occupation of a university building

30. ______________________________
31. ______________________________
32. ______________________________

33. How do you feel about students holding faculty as hostages to prevent other student initiated activities from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., presentation of guest speakers, right or left wing, music programs, dances, etc.

1. strongly disapprove
2. disapprove
3. have no feelings about students holding faculty as hostages
4. approve
5. strongly approve
6. depends on the issue
   If you answered 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify holding faculty as hostages

34. ______________________________
35. ______________________________
36. ______________________________

39. If several branches of the military were going to be on campus to recruit students for military service and the university said that it would be in violation of school rules to obstruct them, would you

1. obstruct military recruitment by either demonstrating for or against the military recruiters.
2. not obstruct the activities of the military recruiters but sign a petition either for or against military recruitment on campus.
3. not become involved in any way.
If you choose #1, would your involvement have been for ______ or against _____ military recruitment on campus.

40. If you were involved in a campus demonstration and if the university regulations prohibited the use of amplification equipment during the demonstration, would you
   1. support the use of amplification equipment anyway.
   2. not support the use of amplification equipment.
   3. be uncertain of your decision.

43. How do you feel about students holding faculty or administration personnel hostages to prevent regular university business from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., holding classes, athletic events, hearing commencement speakers, etc.
   1. strongly disapprove
   2. disapprove
   3. have no feelings about holding faculty or administration personnel hostages
   4. approve
   5. strongly approve
   6. depends on the issue
      If you answered either 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify the holding of faculty or administration personnel hostages.

44. __________________________
45. __________________________
46. __________________________

47. How do you feel about students bombing university buildings and/or faculty offices to prevent regular university business from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., holding classes, athletic events, hearing commencement speakers, etc.
   1. strongly disapprove
   2. disapprove
   3. have no feelings about students bombing university buildings and/or faculty offices
   4. approve
   5. strongly approve
   6. depends on the issue
      If you answered either 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify the bombing of university buildings and/or faculty offices.

48. __________________________
49. __________________________
50. __________________________
53. How do you feel about students kidnapping students to prevent student initiated activities from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., presentation of guest speakers, right or left wing, music programs, dances, etc.
   1. strongly disapprove
   2. disapprove
   3. have no feelings about the kidnapping of students
   4. approve
   5. strongly approve
   6. depends on the issue
   If you answered 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify kidnapping students

54. ________________________
55. __________________________
56. ___________________________

57. How do you feel about students bombing university buildings and/or faculty offices to prevent student initiated activities from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., presentation of guest speakers, right or left wing, music programs, dances, etc.
   1. strongly disapprove
   2. disapprove
   3. have no feelings about the bombing of university buildings and/or faculty offices
   4. approve
   5. strongly approve
   6. depends on the issue
   If you answered 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify the bombing of university buildings and/or faculty offices

58. ________________________
59. __________________________
60. ___________________________

61. If a spokesman for the President was going to be on campus to explain the widening of the war in Cambodia and Laos and the school administration said that any physical demonstration—either for or against the spokesman—would be in violation of the school code, would you
   1. physically demonstrate in support of the spokesman and the administration.
   2. sign a petition supporting the spokesman and the administration.
   3. attend the meeting but not participate in any physical demonstration.
   4. sign a petition against the government's position.
   5. physically demonstrate against the spokesman and the administration.
   6. not attend the meeting or participate in any way.
The inter-item correlations between the finally selected items measuring support for varying protest tactics showed that the items reflected measurement of a common dimension of support for various forms of protest. Moreover, within all the items measuring support for protest, some questions were more strongly related to one another on the basis of the severity of the protest tactic used. If was, therefore, decided to dichotomize the items measuring attitudinal support for protest into two scales reflecting the severity of the tactics involved. Table 2.7 is the scale indicating attitudinal support for moderate protest tactics.

Table 2.7

The Inter-Item Correlation Between the Finally Selected Items of Support for Moderate Protest Tactics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.8 indicates the items which were finally selected to represent support for extreme protest tactics. As indicated in Table 2.8, the correlations show that the items were measuring a common dimension of support for extreme protest tactics which justifies their inclusion into a common instrument.
Table 2.8

The Inter-Item Correlation Between the Finally Selected Items of Support for Extreme Protest Tactics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>33</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collection of Data

The questionnaires (See appendices) were administered to five sociology classes during the winter term of 1971. This final survey sample utilized two introductory sociology classes, two classes of urban sociology, and one class of race relations. From these five classes, 221 students participated in filling out the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was explained to the students by the research investigator to be part of the ongoing research on student protest which was being conducted under the auspices of Dr. Edsel Erickson through the Center of Sociological Research. Students were told that if they desired information on the questionnaire, it would be provided (in the form of frequency distributions) if it were available, towards the end of the term.

It was specifically requested that students not put their names on the questionnaires in order to assure their anonymity. However, since the questionnaires came in two parts which were not collated it
was requested that the students develop their own symbols, pictures, or numeric combination to be put on the separate questionnaire sheets so that the two parts of the questionnaire could be later colated. The students adhered to the instructions and there was no loss of data.

**Analyses**

The major modes of analyses involved the use of cross tabular percentage analyses. Inter-item correlations for cross matrix analyses procedures were used to select items for the major variables. (See discussion under Major Variables section of this chapter). Correlational analyses was also employed to assess magnitudes of relationships between types of support for protests and types of powerlessness. In as much as cross tabular analyses is generally understood, further discussion of this analyses is presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

This chapter is organized into three parts. The first section presents a description of the extent of support for various levels and types of student disruption and protest along with a breakdown of the kind of issues given support by the students. The second part of this chapter deals with the major question of whether a sense of powerlessness among students is related to student support for protest. The third section elaborates on the central relationship between powerlessness and student support for protest by controlling for several conditions which may act to prevent the observance of a relationship between a student's sense of powerlessness and his support for protest.

Student Attitudes Toward Student Protest

As discussed in Chapter II, twelve questions concerning support for various types of disruption and protest on campus were asked of the students. On the basis of a matrix analysis the responses to these questions were grouped into two categories or potential factors of support. These questions, on the basis of analyses of the contents of the questions, appear to coalesce into two categories based upon the severity of the protest tactic in question. For example, questions concerning boycotts and the occupation of buildings formed one cluster of similar responses. Questions involving support for the taking of
hostages, kidnapping, and the bombing of buildings formed the second category. The level of support for both the "extreme" and moderate types of protest are reported so that the reader will have a more thorough picture of both the extent and kind of student support for protest activities on this "typical" college campus.

Support for Moderate Protest Tactics

As indicated in Table 3.1, 52 percent of the students sampled from this midwestern, regionally oriented, state supported, former teachers college, indicated that they approve generally or give qualified support (dependent upon the issue at stake) to the use of student boycotts to elicit changes in the university. Only about one-third (35.5%) of the students disapproved of student boycotts. Hence, a slight majority of the students sampled supported students using boycotts to achieve their aims.

Table 3.1

Student Support for Student Boycotts to Prevent Regular University Business from Occurring to Achieve Student Aims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disapprove</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>Have no Feelings</th>
<th>Depends on the Issue</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Strongly Approve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It should be noted, however, that support for student boycotts may be tenous since it diminishes considerably when the protest action is directed at preventing other student initiated events from occurring as opposed to preventing regular university business from occurring to achieve student aims. As indicated in Table 3.2, support for the use of student boycotts diminishes to 20 percent while student disapproval of boycotts increased to 70 percent.

Table 3.2
Student Support for Student Boycotts to Prevent Other Student Initiated Events from Occurring to Achieve Student Aims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disapprove</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>Have no Feelings</th>
<th>Depends on the Issue</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Strongly Approve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support for Occupying Buildings

The data reported in Table 3.3 shows that there is less support among students for student occupation of buildings than student boycotts as a vehicle for initiating change or expressing dissent. Even so, about 28 percent of the students sampled indicated support for such action while slightly over one-half of the students (58%) indicated disapproval of students occupying a university building to prevent
regular university business from occurring to achieve student aims.

Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disapprove</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>Have no Feelings</th>
<th>Depends on the Issue</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Strongly Approve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(90)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, as indicated in Table 3.4, support for students occupying a building diminishes when the tactic is used to prevent other student initiated events from occurring. Here three-quarters (76%) of the students disapproved of the tactic while only about one-seventh (14%) of the students surveyed indicated supporting building occupations to prevent other student initiated events from occurring to achieve student aims.
Table 3.4

Student Support for Students Occupying Buildings to Prevent Other Student Initiated Events from Occurring to Achieve Student Aims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disapprove</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>Have no Feelings</th>
<th>Depends on the Issue</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Strongly Approve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(123)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support for More Extreme Protest Tactics

Questions concerning support for various types of disruption and protest on campus seemed to form categories demarcated on the basis of the severity of the tactics, both real and potential, to individuals. As indicated in Table 3.5, a consensus (88%) developed among the students sampled which indicated a clear disapproval of students holding faculty or administration personnel hostages to prevent regular university business from occurring to achieve student aims. Only about 6% of the students supported in any degree this tactic as a means of achieving student aims.
Table 3.5

Student Support for Students Holding Faculty or Administration Personnel Hostages to Prevent Regular University Business from Occurring to Achieve Student Aims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disapprove</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>Have no Feelings</th>
<th>Depends on the Issue</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Strongly Approve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(96)</td>
<td>(98)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again the trend for less support among students for a tactic used against other student initiated events was noted. Here, as shown in Table 3.6, 90 percent of the students surveyed were against other students holding faculty as hostages to prevent other student initiated activities from occurring to achieve student aims. Only 4 percent of the students sampled supported in any degree this tactic as a means of achieving student aims.
Table 3.6

Student Support for Students Holding Faculty or Administration Personnel Hostages to Prevent Student Initiated Activities from Occurring to Achieve Student Aims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disapprove</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>Have no Feelings</th>
<th>Depends on the Issue</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Strongly Approve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(190)</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support for Bombing Buildings

As indicated in Table 3.7, the consensus which developed among the students against the use of tactics of a more severe nature is maintained. Questioned as to how they felt about students bombing university buildings and/or faculty offices to prevent regular university business from occurring to achieve student aims, only about 4 percent of the students surveyed approved in any degree this action. The overwhelming majority of the students sampled—93%—disapproved of bombing to achieve student aims.
Table 3.7

Student Support for Students Bombing University Buildings and/or Faculty Offices to Prevent Regular University Business from Occurring to Achieve Students Aims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disapprove</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>Have no Feelings</th>
<th>Depends on the Issue</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Strongly Approve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(142)</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the students were questioned about the tactic of bombing to prevent other student initiated activities from occurring, the results obtained were the same as when the tactic was to be used to prevent regular university business from occurring. As shown in Table 3.8, 93 percent of the students sample disapproved of the tactic while only 4 percent of the student supported in any form these means of achieving student aims.
Table 3.8

Student Support for Students Bombing University Buildings and/or Faculty Offices to Prevent Student Initiated Activites from Occurring to Achieve Student Aims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disapprove</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>Have no Feelings</th>
<th>Depends on the Issue</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Strongly Approve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(138)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support for Kidnapping Students

The highest proportion of student disapproval was obtained with the question involving the tactic of kidnapping students to prevent student initiated activities from occurring to achieve student aims. As noted in Table 3.9, a consensus of 94 percent of the students sampled disapproved of kidnapping students while only 3 percent of the students approved of this means of achieving student aims.
Table 3.9

Student Support for Students Kidnapping Students to Prevent Student Initiated Activities From Occurring to Achieve Student Aims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disapprove</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>Have no Feelings</th>
<th>Depends on the Issue</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Strongly Approve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(115)</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Student’s Attitudinal Support for Protest

It is apparent from the above distributions that support for the more extreme types of protest tactics was extremely rare. Almost no students supported the holding of hostages, the bombing of university buildings, or the kidnapping of students. There was, however, considerable support for student boycotts, and the occupying of university buildings to achieve student aims.

Since support for extreme illegal protest was rare, further analyses of support for protest will be limited to protest outside of the legitimate norms utilizing support for boycotts and the occupying of university buildings.

As can be seen in Table 3.10, the students sampled at Western generally indicated a high degree of power in their academic role. Students who considered themselves to be high on academic powerlessness were roughly 21 percent of the students sampled. Thus students
who considered themselves to be high on academic power were about three times more numerous at 60 percent than those who considered themselves to be powerless in their academic role

Table 3.10

Feelings of Powerlessness in the Academic Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Power</th>
<th></th>
<th>High Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students can change</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Sure</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university policies if they</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>become actively involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                | Low Power |             | High Power |
|                                | Strongly  | Not         | Strongly   |
|                                | Disagree  | Sure        | Agree      |
| Good grades can be achieved    |           |             |            |
| through hard work              |           |             |            |
| N                              | 4         | 36          | 35         |
| %                              | 1.8%      | 16.2%       | 15.8%      |
|                                |           |             | 52%        |
|                                |           |             | 14%        |

|                                | Low Power |             | High Power |
|                                | Strongly  | Not         | Strongly   |
|                                | Disagree  | Sure        | Agree      |
| Students have no say in       |           |             |            |
| determining their curriculum  |           |             |            |
| courses                        |           |             |            |
| N                              | 7         | 57          | 34         |
| %                              | 2.7%      | 26.2%       | 15.4%      |
|                                |           |             | 44.3%      |
|                                |           |             | 11.3%      |
As indicated in Table 3.11, the students' responses to the items measuring environmental powerlessness were quite variable. However, the items taken as a whole show that about 62% of the students surveyed rank themselves high on power in their general environment. Only about 15% of the students sampled considered themselves to be low on the dimension of power in their general environment.

Table 3.11

Feelings of Powerlessness in the General Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A person can and should make plans to control his destiny</th>
<th>Low Power</th>
<th>High Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions made by few people affect our lives more than our own plans</th>
<th>Low Power</th>
<th>High Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A person can contribute to desired changes through involvement in religious, political or social organizations</th>
<th>Low Power</th>
<th>High Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The issues which students considered warranting use of different protest tactics to achieve student aims were dichotomized into those which were relevant specifically to Western Michigan University. The most frequently mentioned nationally oriented issues included the war in Southeast Asia, racism, poverty, and the threat of increased militarism in the United States. The most frequently mentioned locally oriented issues which elicited support for use of a protest tactic included the high costs of the bookstore, dorm regulations, high tuition increases, and high-handed administration actions. The data, as shown in Table 3.12, indicated that support for the different protest issues were evenly divided between support for locally oriented issues and support for nationally oriented issues.

Table 3.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Student Support for Protest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Socio-Political*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% = 49.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*issues considered to be of a general socio-political nature includes the Vietnam War, racism, poverty, human rights, ecology, militarism, economic exploitation, etc.

**issues considered to be of a local-specific nature include bookstore prices, dorm regulations, excessive raises in the tuition fees, parking accommodations, etc.
The Relationship of Powerlessness to Support for Student Protest

It was hypothesized that students scoring high on the academic and environmental dimensions of powerlessness would be higher in their support for non-normative protest than those students who scored low on those items measuring powerlessness.

Academic Powerlessness and Support for Student Protest

As shown in Table 3.13, analysis of the data relating to academic powerlessness indicates that when the tactics of protest involve a moderate use of coercion, academic powerlessness—measured three different ways—does not significantly (.05 level) affect the level of support for those tactics. That is, students did not differ significantly in their support for moderate protest when grouped by feelings of powerlessness in the role of student. Both groups of students—students of low and high powerlessness—gave similar support to the use of moderate protest tactics.
Table 3.13

Support for Student Protest Outside of Legitimate Norms with Three Different Conceptions of Power in the Academic Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to change university policies</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to get good grades</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to determine curriculum courses</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Opposite to hypothesized direction, therefore, no statistical test necessary to reject hypothesis

NS = no significant differences at the .05 level
Controlling for Sex

As indicated in Table 3.14, the extent of support for protest is a function of sex in the sense that a greater proportion of males than females indicated support for protest. However, a test for difference of proportions of students supporting protest grouped by sex failed to confirm the hypothesis that powerlessness is related to protest support. In other words, the research hypothesis that students who are high on feelings of powerlessness would indicate a greater extent of support for protest than students who feel a sense of power in their academic role was not supported when controlling for sex.

Controlling for SES

As can be seen in Table 3.15, it is apparent that for academic powerlessness, extent of support for protest is a function of socio-economic status which is in accord with the research cited in the Related Literature section. Low SES students were less likely to indicate support for protest than high SES students. However, even when controlling out for high SES there was no clear pattern of association between powerlessness and support for protest; that is, according to the hypothesis, the direction of difference should be that students who are low on feelings of power in the academic roles should indicate a greater extent of support than students who feel a sense of power in their academic roles. While this was true in two out of three cases for high SES students, neither case was statistically significant at the .05 level. Although examination and controlling for students' SES revealed no predicted differences which were
Table 3.4

Support for Student Protest Outside of Legitimate Norms with Three Different Conceptions of Power in the Academic Role Controlling for Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to change university policies</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to get good grade</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to determine curriculum courses</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Opposite to hypothesized direction, therefore, no statistical test necessary to reject hypothesis.

NS = no significant difference at the .05 level, within the sex role. A larger proportion of males than females, however, supported protest when high on powerlessness (.05 level).
statistically significant at the .05 level, 3 out of 9 times the data were in the predicted direction which is slightly more support for the hypothesis relating alienation to support for protest than was obtained when not controlling for SES. If better controls on SES could be made one might conjecture that a stronger relationship between powerlessness in the academic role and support for protest could be obtained. At this time, however, the data does not indicate that academic powerlessness is related to support for student protest when controlling for SES.

Controlling for Age

As indicated in Table 3.16, each measure of academic powerlessness was not found to be associated with support for protest as hypothesized at Western Michigan University when controlling for age. However, age was found to be associated with support for protest. While young students high on feelings of power were more likely to support protest than older students, the dominant pattern which emerged—in 6 out of 9 cases—showed greater support for protest was indicated by those who indicated feelings of high academic power than by those who indicated feelings of low academic power (high on powerlessness) which is counter to the hypothesized direction.
Table 3.15

Support for Student Protest Outside of Legitimate Norms with Three Different Conceptions of Power in the Academic Role Controlling for Socio-Economic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to change university policies</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle SES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SES</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to get good grades</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle SES</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to determine curriculum courses</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle SES</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Opposite to hypothesized direction, therefore, no statistical test necessary to reject hypothesis.

NS = No significant difference at the .05 level.
Table 3.16

Support for Student Protest Outside of Legitimate Norms with Three Different Conceptions of Power in the Academic Role Controlling for Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to change university policies</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-19 years old</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22 years old</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 years and older</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to get good grades</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-19 years old</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22 years old</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 years and older</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to determine curriculum courses</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-19 years old</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22 years old</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 years and older</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Opposite to hypothesized direction, therefore, no statistical test necessary to reject hypothesis.

NS = No significant difference, .05 level.
Controlling for Birth Order

As can be seen in Table 3.17, for academic powerlessness, the extent of support for protest is a function of birth order with later born students indicating more support for protest than first born students. However, when birth order was controlled there was no support for the hypothesis that students low on feelings of power in the academic role should indicate more support for protest than students high in their feelings of academic power. In fact the majority patter (four out of six) indicated a higher support for protest from those high in their feelings of academic power.

General Environmental Powerlessness and Support for Student Protest

When the environmental dimension of powerlessness is related to support for non-normative protest, the data in Table 3.18 indicates slight support for the hypothesis that students low on feelings of environmental power tend to support protest more than students who feel a sense of power in their general environment. One measure of general environmental powerlessness--control over own destiny--was significantly (.05 level) associated with support for protest. One other measure of general environmental powerlessness--make decisions to control own life--was in the direction hypothesized but not at a statistically significant level. One measure of general environmental powerlessness--can produce changes through involvement--was clearly not associated, as predicted, with support for protest. Taken as a whole, the data from Table 3.18 indicates the possibility of a slight relationship between feelings of power in the general environment and support for protest.
Table 3.17

Support for Student Protest Outside of Legitimate Norms with Three Different Conceptions of Power in the Academic Role Controlling for Birth Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to change university policies</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st born</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later born</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to get good grades</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st born</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later born</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to determine curriculum courses</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st born</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later born</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Opposite to hypothesized direction, therefore, no statistical test necessary to reject hypothesis.
NS = No significant difference at the .05 level.
Table 3.18

Support for Student Protest Outside of Legitimate Norms with Three Different Conceptions of Power in the General Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to make plans to control one's destiny</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to make decisions that affect one's life</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to produce desired changes through involvement</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Opposite to hypothesized direction, therefore, no statistical test necessary to reject hypothesis.

** = Difference in proportions as hypothesized, p < .05 level.

NS = No significant difference at the .05 level.
Environmental Powerlessness: Controlling for Sex

The data in Table 3.19 indicates that sex is not significantly (.05 level) depressing a "true" relationship between powerlessness in the general environment and support for protest. However, in 5 out of 6 tests the data was in the predicted direction (though not significant at the .05 level in 4 of the tests). While these results in the direction of the research hypothesis lend support to acceptance of the hypothesis, the weak statistical findings make this acceptance a tentative one.

However, it is of interest to note that sex is clearly associated with support for protest. Males tended to indicate more support for protest than females. This relationship between sex and support justifies the use of sex as a control for its depressing effects on the hypothesized relationship between general environmental powerlessness and support for protest.

Controlling for SES

The data in Table 3.20 indicates that SES is not significantly (.05 level) depressing a "true" relationship between powerlessness in the general environment and support for protest. However, in 7 out of 9 tests, the data was in the predicted direction (though only significant at the .05 level in 2 of the tests). While these results in the direction of the research hypothesis lend support to acceptance of the hypothesis, the weak statistical findings make this acceptance a tentative one.
Table 3.19

Support for Student Protest Outside of
Legitimate Norms with Three Different Conceptions
of Power in the General Environment Controlling
for Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Power to make plans to control one's destiny</th>
<th></th>
<th>Power to make decisions that affect one's life</th>
<th></th>
<th>Power to produce desired changes through involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Opposite to hypothesized direction, therefore, no statistical test necessary to reject hypothesis.
** = Difference in proportions as hypothesized, p < .05 level.
NS = No significant difference at the .05 level.
However, it is of interest to note that SES is clearly associated with support for protest. The middle and high SES levels indicated more support for protest than the low SES. This relationship between socio-economic status and support justifies the use of SES as a control for its depressing effects on the hypothesized relationship between general environmental powerlessness and support for protest.

**Controlling for Age**

The data in Table 3.21 indicates that age is not suppressing a "true" relationship between powerlessness in the general environment and support for protest. Only four out of nine tests of the hypothesis were in the direction predicted. However, two out of these four tests were statistically significant for the age group 17-19. This association between youth and support for protest justifies the use of age as a control variable for its suppressing effects on the hypothesized relationship between general environmental powerlessness and support for protest.

**Controlling for Birth Order**

As indicated from the data in Table 3.22, controlling for birth order does not suppress a "true" relationship between environmental powerlessness and support for protest. Four of the six tests of the hypothesis were in the direction hypothesized although only two of those tests were statistically significant at the .05 level.
Table 3.20

Support for Student Protest Outside of
Legitimate Norms with Three Different Conceptions
of Power in the General Environment Controlling
for Socio-Economic Status

| Power to make plans to control one's destiny | High | | | | Low | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N | % | N | % | P | N | % | N | % | P |
| High Support for Student Protest | | | | | | | | | |
| Low SES | 2 | 25% | 1 | 33% | NS | | | | |
| Middle SES | 7 | 13% | 3 | 75% | ** | | | | |
| High SES | 7 | 37% | 3 | 60% | NS | | | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to make decisions that affect one's life</th>
<th>High</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0= 0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0= 0%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle SES</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to produce desired changes through involvement</th>
<th>High</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle SES</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Opposite to hypothesized direction, therefore, no statistical test necessary to reject hypothesis.
** = Difference in proportions as hypothesized, p < .05 level.
NS = No significant difference at the .05 level.
Table 3.21
Support for Student Protest Outside of Legitimate Norms with Three Different Conceptions of Power in the General Environment Controlling for Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to make plans to control one's destiny</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-19 years old</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22 years old</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 years and older</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to make decisions that affect one's life</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-19 years old</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22 years old</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 years and older</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to produce changes through involvement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-19 years old</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22 years old</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 years and older</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Opposite to hypothesized direction, therefore, no statistical test necessary to reject hypothesis.

** = Difference in proportions as hypothesized, $p < .05$ level.

NS = No significant difference at the .05 level.
However, it is of interest to note that support for protest is a partial function of birth order. Later born, rather than first born siblings, are more likely to indicate greater support for protest. The possibility of an interactive effect between environmental powerlessness and support for protest justifies its use as a control variable for its affect upon the hypothesized relationship.
Table 3.22

Support for Student Protest Outside of Legitimate Norms with Three Different Conceptions of Power in the General Environment Controlling for Birth Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to make plans to control one's destiny</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st born</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later born</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to make decisions that affect one's life</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st born</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later born</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power to produce desired changes through involvement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Support for Student Protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st born</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later born</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Opposite to hypothesized direction, therefore, no statistical test necessary to reject hypothesis.
** = Difference in proportions as hypothesized, p .05 level.
NS = No significant difference at the .05 level.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this research was to examine whether a general sense of powerlessness distinctly characterizes students who are high in their support for campus protest outside of legally sanctioned norms, e.g., boycotts, occupying buildings, kidnapping students, holding hostages, and bombing university buildings. While the view, that students who support protest are characterized by feelings of powerlessness is accepted by many lay persons and social scientists, methodological and theoretical limitations of past studies have restricted the ability of the results of these studies to be generalized to all American colleges and universities—particularly to the great majority of state and community colleges which provide higher education to the masses of lower and middle income families.

Another difficulty of studies of student dissent, in terms of the objectives of this study, has been that they have tended to limit their subjects to actual dissenters and have given little attention to general normative support conditions for dissent. It has been the guiding purpose of this study to focus on support among the general student community for different types of illegal dissent and relate that support to feelings of powerlessness. The rationale for studying the student climate in regard to support for illegal dissent was made on the grounds that: (1) subcultural norms—in this case student subcultural norms—are assumed to play an important role in determining
terms of desired influence on school policies, grade attainments, and curriculum courses. To assess whether student feelings about making over their environment contributes to their attitudes toward student protest, three different measures of general environmental powerlessness were employed. Students were asked questions concerning whether:

1) they made the important decisions affecting their lives, (2) they should make plans for controlling their destinies, and (3) they are capable of contributing to desired changes in society through involvement in religious, political, and social organizations.

Cross correlation matrix analyses were conducted and it was found that each of the general measures of academic powerlessness and powerlessness in the general environment were not redundant measures of the same phenomena. In other words, measures of academic powerlessness and general environment powerlessness are measuring two distinct types of powerlessness which students feel.

The procedures for this investigation involved the gathering of student data in a state university which was selected because of its being a prototype of a locally oriented midwestern state university with little tradition of overt illegitimate dissent. Data is presented which indicates the similarity of characteristics between the prototype institution selected and a profile of the typical state and regionally oriented college in the United States. Data is also presented on high protest prone institutions in the United States. Michigan academic institutions including Western Michigan University, the site of this study, were similar to the composite academic institution in the United States but quite different in certain
collective acts;\(^1\) generally, shared attitudes supportive of norm violating behavior often precede or accompany deviant acts by groups;\(^2\) (3) expressed attitudes are considered by many social-psychologists to be a predisposition to social behavior worthy of investigation;\(^3\) (4) non-normative behavior may be either politically left or right, or of some other ideological stance, and an attempt to study only actual dissenters at any given time may not assess activists of all persuasions operating in a community; and (5) limiting the sample to actual activists—a relatively rare phenomenon—would not provide information on the stances toward deviant protest occurring within the total college community.

To help assess the function of felt powerlessness this study has focused on two important roles in which powerlessness can theoretically be said to be important. The two forms of powerlessness assessed were a feeling of powerlessness in the student role (a major occupational role), and a feeling of powerlessness in the general environment (a generalized role). To determine whether alienation in the student role contributed to support for protest, questions concerning powerlessness in the academic role were aimed at assessing whether students considered themselves capable of changing aspects of their academic role environment such that they could achieve their objectives in


\(^2\)loc. cit., p. 85.

respects to high protest prone institutions. Some of the more specific characteristics typical of protest prone institutions but atypical of Michigan schools, including Western Michigan University where the study was conducted, include: (1) a greater proportion of out of state students, (2) a greater homogeneity of students' age, and (3) a greater heterogeneity of the student body's socio-economic background. Similarly the most outstanding difference between Western Michigan University and protest prone institutions is the high proportion (93%) of students that Western draws from the immediate geographical region as opposed to protest-prone institutions which draw a majority of its students from out of state.

The study sample consisted of 221 students drawn from freshman through senior class levels at Western Michigan University. The students were administered questionnaires during the winter term of 1971 (See Appendix A). Assessment of the data found the study sample to be similar to the larger student body on the dimensions of class composition and sex which is in accord with the assumption of representativeness of the sample.

---

1Michigan Legislature, Committee to Investigate Campus Disorders and Student Unrest. 1970, part 1, p. 44.

2Western Michigan University, Data on Students Enrolled Winter Semester 1971. p. 11.
Summary of Major Findings

Analysis of the data showed, as other studies have indicated, that general support for student protest on campus is quite limited, particularly for the more coercive forms of protest. In fact, there was an overwhelming consensus against the more extreme acts of illegal dissent. Only 5.6% of the students sampled supported the holding of faculty hostages to prevent university business from occurring to achieve student aims. Support for the tactic of bombing university buildings or faculty offices to achieve student aims never exceeded 3.7% of the students sampled, and only 2.8% of the students surveyed supported students kidnapping other students to achieve the aims of some students. Only once—for boycotts—did student support for a tactic exceed 52% of the students sampled. There was also moderate support (28%) for the tactic of occupying buildings. However, when the tactics of boycotts and occupying buildings are used to prevent student initiated events from occurring as opposed to preventing university business from occurring, support dropped to 20% and 15%, respectively.

Although the issues for which students supported different protest tactics generally dealt with the Vietnam War and racism, there was also sizeable concern for university issues such as dorm policies

---

dealing with open visitation and off-campus housing. Dichotomizing support for either general societal issues (Vietnam, racism, etc.) or particularistic local issues (university regulations), the data indicated 50% support for societal issues as opposed to 50% support for issues of local concern. This would seem to suggest that general social-political issues may not always be the focal concern for supporting illegitimate protest among college students.

The findings of this study in regards to the general pervasiveness of powerlessness among college students tend to be in accord with the view held by some social scientists that students are generally satisfied with their college experience\(^1\) rather than experiencing feelings of inadequacy in their student roles. The data indicated that students at Western Michigan University are more likely to indicate high rather than low feelings of power in their academic role. Students high on academic power outnumbered those low on academic power by about 6 to 2.

More important for the general hypothesis of this study, feelings of academic powerlessness were not shown to be significantly associated with support for protest. High support for the more moderate forms of student protest coupled with low feelings of power in the student role never exceeded 31% of those students low on feelings of power in their academic role. This was not statistically different from the 28% high support for student protest obtained from students who had

---

high feelings of power in their student role.

The general finding of no relationship between academic powerlessness and support for protest was not changed significantly when controlling for birth order. In other words, it is clear that failure to control for birth order does not suppress a "true" relationship between academic powerlessness and support for protest.

When controlling for sex it was found that only among males was academic powerlessness associated with support for protest, so again it is concluded that failure to control for sex does not suppress a "true" relationship between feelings of powerlessness in the academic role and support for illegitimate protest.

When controlling for socio-economic status level, it was similarly found that only among the higher SES students did academic powerlessness and support for protest have any association, so again the general hypothesis relating academic powerlessness to support for protest across all categories of SES had to be rejected.

However, the findings that only under conditions of higher SES and male sex did academic powerlessness associate with protest support leads to conjecture that sex and SES may have certain interactive effects. However, such conjecture requires a new sample of subjects for verification or falsification and is beyond the scope of this thesis.

Unlike the clearly negative findings associated with powerlessness in the academic role, the data was occasionally in accord with the general hypothesized relationship between powerlessness in the general environment and student support for protest. Two out of three
tests of the hypothesis were in the direction predicted although only one of these was statistically significant at the .05 level. However, this slight initial support vanished when controls were exercised.

The use of control variables indicated that support for protest was not a general function of high environmental powerlessness but was a function of sex, SES, age, and birth order. That is, males rather than females, higher SES rather than low SES students, later born rather than first born, and younger rather than older students characterized those students where feelings of environmental powerlessness were associated with support of moderate protest tactics. One finding is clear, powerlessness in the general environment is not clearly associated with student protest among students of both sexes, all age groups, and all SES levels. Perhaps, however, as in the case of academic powerlessness, general environmental powerlessness has an impact only under certain limited conditions of SES, sex, age, and birth order as the data in this study suggests. Such a finding, however, must be verified or rejected with new samples.

Limitations of the Study

The results of this study may be due to the limitations of the methodology and sample variability. The pre-test and final survey indicated a considerable amount of sample variability. When the instruments were being pre-tested for the first time, the student's responses indicated a moderately high inter-correlation of the individual items used in measuring the independent and dependent variables. Although there were slight modifications of some questions
for the final survey, the final data produced results with much lower inter-item correlations on the measures of powerlessness than had been anticipated from pre-test analyses. While these results may have been the function of the different samples, it is also possible that the instruments lacked the reliability assumed on the basis of matrix analyses of the pre-test data. Replications of the present study with new samples would help resolve this problem.

Another limitation of this study is that only two dimensions of powerlessness were operationalized and used in this study--feelings of powerlessness in the academic role and feelings of powerlessness in the general environment. Perhaps other dimensions of powerlessness not theoretically conceptualized and operationalized affect student support for protest.

Implications for Sociology

Recently the concept of powerlessness has been used by many social scientists to explain a wide ranging number of ills in society.¹ Focusing only on student powerlessness in the academic role and in the general environment, the data showed powerlessness to not contribute to student support for protest across all sex, age, SES, and birth order categories. However, the data is in accord with further

research efforts to determine if selected conditions of sex, SES, birth order, and age have specific interactive effects with powerlessness to offset support for protest. It is suggested that further research examining the effect of powerlessness in interaction with sex, age, SES, and birth order be conducted. Such research should be accompanied by a sociological rationale if possible. At any rate, at this time the data is not in accord with "across the board" generalizations of a relationship between powerlessness and support for protest.

In accord with the discussion of prior studies discussed in Chapter I and the data reported herein, it is suggested that past studies of support for student dissent and student activism have focused on certain types of elite, protest-prone institutions. Hence, generalizations of these studies to other colleges and universities which are serving the masses of students may not be warranted. If one is concerned with explicating support for student protest throughout the United States or the world, then research which focuses on certain schools—particularly academically elite schools—may have the effect of magnifying or diminishing the general pervasiveness of a given condition. The implication of this for research is the need to encompass greater elements of sample diversity in the study of support for student dissent. While it would be necessary to consider all types of American colleges—junior colleges, regionally oriented colleges, teacher colleges, etc.—to generalize about support for dissent on American college campuses, cross-cultural comparative
studies of foreign universities and colleges would also be beneficial. Such studies could focus on the underlying similarities as well as the differences in both left oriented protest (for example, student protest in Japan) and right oriented protest (e.g., recent student protests in Chile).

In congruence with certain other social scientists,¹ it is suggested that there is a need to consider the school in which the research is being done as a possible confounding variable in the relationship being studied. Especially in the case where the university has had a history of illegal support for radical causes, attendance at these universities may engender certain expectations about appropriate behavior which cannot be made at other colleges and universities.

While this study was concerned with evaluating the extent of protest support and its relationship to powerlessness and not the relationship of powerlessness to those who were actually involved in student protest, further research might determine the relationship between attitudes of support for illegal protest and actual involvement in illegal protest. The work of Keniston would certainly be pertinent in such an endeavor. Whatever the case, however, and in accord with Keniston, not all of those who support protest are likely to actually protest. Hence, further research along these lines

might be helpful in elaborating on the determinants or precipitating forces behind student dissent outside the socially approved norms of the academic community.

Although the results of this investigation need further explanation, they are similar in content to a recent study completed by Hoge on the change in students' value patterns over a seventeen-year period. The results of the investigation at Western Michigan University, the prototype of a locally oriented state university, indicated little relationship between academic powerlessness or general environmental powerlessness and support for protest. Hoge's study in contrast utilized questionnaire survey data from more academically elitist schools in the United States. From an analysis of his questionnaire survey data on male students at Dartmouth College and the University of Michigan Obtained in 1952 and again in 1968 and 1969, Hoge found a decline in privatism which arises from a sense of powerlessness or lack of orientation in large social and political institutions.¹ At the same time, however, there was an increase in some forms of social alienation. Although he uses the term alienation here, his operationalization of social alienation² has a similarity to how environmental powerlessness was operationalized in this research. For example, one item of environmental powerlessness in this study questioned whether


²Social alienation occurs when the individual finds social demands oppressive and thus feels estranged from social institutions.
involvement in religious, political, or social organizations enables one to contribute to desired changes in the society. Likewise, Hoge found increased social alienation from the military system and the ideology supporting use of military power, organized religion, American business, and present-day higher education. ¹

Hence, both of these studies indicated that the importance of the different forms of powerlessness may vary at a specific time, as well as over time. If indeed the forms of powerlessness do vary over time, then it would be necessary to have longitudinal studies of powerlessness over time. It would also be necessary to elaborate on the concept of powerlessness to assess where it is and is not operative. ¹

Possibly, as this study suggests, powerlessness operates in interaction with other variables not yet specified. At any rate, other dimensions of powerlessness may have to be conceptualized and the concept tested on different populations other than college students, e.g., white-collar workers, skilled craftsmen, and non-working populations such as the aged and youngsters in elementary school. Methodologically this may necessitate the use of a scale of powerlessness (presently not in existence) developed from items with relevancy in all segments of society. All of these steps will be necessary to develop an empirically grounded concept from the current construct based on its intuitive appeal.

In summary, this study was concerned with assessing the relationship between two forms of powerlessness—academic powerlessness and

general environmental powerlessness—to attitudes supportive of illegal student protest tactics. No across the board relationship was found to exist between powerlessness and support for protest, and the research hypotheses had to be rejected. However, it was concluded that attitudinal support for protest may have impact under certain interactive conditions with sex, socio-economic status, age, and birth order. Such a conclusion, however, must be verified or rejected with new samples.

Concerning the conceptualization of powerlessness, there are indications from Hoge's and this study, that as currently operationalized and discussed in the literature, powerlessness lacks a general specificity. That is, the particular social conditions under which powerlessness prevails have not been made clear. On the basis of this study, it is suggested that powerlessness may be a multi-dimensional concept—the dimensions of which have not been specified. Unfortunately, this conclusion and the data of this study only serve to reinforce the view that the concept of powerlessness, which has its origins in the works of Marx, lacks theoretical clarity and empirical utility in accounting for attitudes of support for social dissent outside of established norms.
Dear Student:

The number of student demonstrations in colleges have been quite numerous during the last half of the 1960's. Western's student demonstration last spring is an example of this new student involvement.

As part of the ongoing research on student activism in American colleges, we are surveying the attitudes of Western's students. The questionnaire is aimed at ascertaining the attitudes of Western's students in regard to college student protest and its relation to one's home environment.

We ask you to take a few minutes to fill out this questionnaire as honestly as possible. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated and important to the success of this project.

You can be completely sure that your reply will remain anonymous, since we have no way (or need) to identify individual students. Data obtained will be computer analyzed only in terms of group responses to the questions asked.

Any comments you would like to add are most welcome.
1. 1. Female  
2. Male  

2. My class standing is  
1. freshman  
2. sophomore  
3. junior  
4. senior  
5. graduate  

3. My age is _____.  

4. My family income is approximately  
1. below $5,000  
2. $5,000 to $10,000  
3. $10,000 to $15,000  
4. $15,000 to $20,000  
5. $20,000 to $25,000  
6. $25,000 to $30,000  
7. $30,000+  

5. I am the _____ child.  
1. 1st  
2. 2nd  
3. 3rd  
4. 4th  
5. 5th or later born  

6. There are _____ persons in my immediate family  
1. 0-3  
2. 4-5  
3. 6-7  
4. 8 or more  

7. The age difference between myself and my older brother or sister is  
1. 0-2 years  
2. 3-4 years  
3. 5-6 years  
4. 7 years or more  
5. does not apply, I am the first or only child  

8. My parents are aiding my financially  
1. 0%  
2. 1-25%  
3. 26-50%  
4. 51-75%  
5. 76-100%
9. My parents respect my ideas and encourage me to express myself freely
   1. strongly agree
   2. agree
   3. neutral
   4. disagree
   5. strongly disagree

10. I would characterize my parent's ability and desire to assist me financially as
    1. willing and able
    2. willing but not able
    3. able but not willing
    4. neither willing nor able

11. In regards to my plans and goals, I would characterize my parents as
    1. interested and involved
    2. interested but not very involved
    3. not interested and not involved
    4. actively interfering

12. If I took part in a violent protest demonstration against ROTC being on campus and got arrested my parents would
    1. understand my reasons and accept my decision even though they may disagree with me.
    2. accept my reasons and disapprove of my decision but not be too critical of me.
    3. disapprove of both my reasons and decision and show their disapproval in one manner or another.
    4. be very critical of my decision and disown me.
    5. I would not know how my parents would respond.

13. Students can change university policies regarding student regulations if they become actively involved in attempting to change these rules
    1. strongly disagree
    2. disagree
    3. not sure
    4. agree
    5. strongly agree

14. Very few people control school policies and the rest of us can only do what they want
    1. strongly agree
    2. agree
    3. not sure
    4. disagree
    5. strongly disagree
15. How do you feel about students using boycotts to prevent regular university business from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., holding classes, athletic events, hearing commencement speakers, etc.
   1. strongly disapprove
   2. disapprove
   3. have no feelings about boycotts
   4. approve
   5. strongly approve
   6. depends on the issue
   If you answered either 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify boycotts.

16. __________________________
17. __________________________
18. __________________________

19. How do you feel about students occupying a university building to prevent regular university business from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., holding classes, athletic events, hearing commencement speakers, etc.
   1. strongly disapprove
   2. disapprove
   3. have no feelings about students occupying a university building
   4. approve
   5. strongly approve
   6. depends on the issue
   If you answered either 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify the occupation of a university building.

20. __________________________
21. __________________________
22. __________________________

23. If I work hard I will be able to get the good grades that I want.
   1. strongly disagree
   2. disagree
   3. not sure
   4. agree
   5. strongly agree

24. Students can have no say whatsoever in determining the curriculum courses they have to take.
   1. strongly agree
   2. agree
   3. not sure
   4. disagree
   5. strongly disagree
25. How do you feel about students using boycotts to prevent other student initiated events from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., presentation of guest speakers, right or left wing, music programs, dances, etc.
   1. strongly disapprove
   2. disapprove
   3. have no feelings about boycotts
   4. approve
   5. strongly approve
   6. depends on the issue
      If you answered 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify boycotts

   26. ____________________________________________
   27. ____________________________________________
   28. ____________________________________________

29. How do you feel about students occupying university buildings to prevent other student initiated events from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., presentation of guest speakers, right or left wing, music programs, dances, etc.
   1. strongly disapprove
   2. disapprove
   3. have no feelings about students occupying university buildings
   4. approve
   5. strongly approve
   6. depends on the issue
      If you answered 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify boycotts

   30. ____________________________________________
   31. ____________________________________________
   32. ____________________________________________

33. How do you feel about students holding faculty as hostages to prevent other student initiated activities from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., presentation of guest speakers, right or left wing, music programs, dances, etc.
   1. strongly disapprove
   2. disapprove
   3. have no feelings about students holding faculty as hostages
   4. approve
   5. strongly approve
   6. depends on the issue
      If you answered 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify holding faculty as hostages.

   34. ____________________________________________
   35. ____________________________________________
   36. ____________________________________________
37. A person can and should make plans to control his destiny.
   1. strongly disagree
   2. disagree
   3. not sure
   4. agree
   5. strongly agree

38. Few people make all the important decisions which affect our lives and this greatly determines, more than our plans, what we can really do.
   1. strongly agree
   2. agree
   3. not sure
   4. disagree
   5. strongly disagree

39. If several branches of the military were going to be on campus to recruit students for military service and the university said that it would be in violation of school rules to obstruct them, would you
   1. obstruct military recruitment by either demonstrating for or against the military recruiters.
   2. not obstruct the activities of the military recruiters but sign a petition either for or against military recruitment on campus.
   3. not become involved in any way.
   If you choose #1, would your involvement have been for ______ or against ______ military recruitment on campus.

40. If you were involved in a campus demonstration and if the university regulations prohibited the use of amplification equipment during the demonstration, would you
   1. support the use of amplification equipment anyway.
   2. not support the use of amplification equipment.
   3. be uncertain of your decision.

41. Significant future events in one's life are predetermined
   1. strongly agree
   2. agree
   3. not sure
   4. disagree
   5. strongly disagree

42. Getting good grades is largely a matter of chance and is almost totally dependent on the whims of the professor
   1. strongly agree
   2. agree
   3. not sure
   4. disagree
   5. strongly disagree
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43. How do you feel about students holding faculty or administration personnel hostages to prevent regular university business from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., holding classes, athletic events, hearing commencement speakers, etc.
   1. strongly disapprove
   2. disapprove
   3. have no feelings about holding faculty or administration personnel hostages
   4. approve
   5. strongly approve
   6. depends on the issue

If you answered either 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify the holding of faculty or administration personnel hostages

44. ____________________________________
45. ____________________________________
46. ____________________________________

47. How do you feel about students bombing university buildings and/or faculty offices to prevent regular university business from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., holding classes, athletic events, hearing commencement speakers, etc.
   1. strongly disapprove
   2. disapprove
   3. have no feelings about students bombing university buildings and/or faculty office.
   4. approve
   5. strongly approve
   6. depends on the issue

If you answered 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify the bombing of university buildings and/or faculty offices.

48. ____________________________________
49. ____________________________________
50. ____________________________________

51. If the Harris or Gallup poll were to characterize college students as irresponsible and lazy would you
   1. strongly disagree
   2. disagree
   3. not sure
   4. agree
   5. strongly agree

52. If a friend who was not a student called college students decadent and impudent would you
   1. strongly disagree
   2. disagree
   3. not sure
   4. agree
   5. strongly agree
53. How do you feel about students kidnapping students to prevent student initiated activities from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., presentation of guest speakers, right or left wing, music programs, dances, etc.
1. strongly disapprove
2. disapprove
3. have no feelings about the kidnapping of students
4. approve
5. strongly approve
6. depends on the issue
   If you answered 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify kidnapping students
54. __________________________________________
55. __________________________________________
56. __________________________________________

57. How do you feel about students bombing university buildings and/or faculty offices to prevent student initiated activities from occurring to achieve student aims, right or left oriented, e.g., presentation of guest speakers, right or left wing, music programs, dances, etc.
1. strongly disapprove
2. disapprove
3. have no feelings about the bombing of university buildings and/or faculty offices
4. approve
5. strongly approve
6. depends on the issue
   If you answered 4, 5, or 6, please briefly indicate one or more issues that you feel justify the bombing of university buildings and/or faculty offices
58. __________________________________________
59. __________________________________________
60. __________________________________________

61. If a spokesman for the President was going to be on campus to explain the widening of the war in Cambodia and Laos and the school administration said that any physical demonstration—either for or against the spokesman—would be in violation of the school code, would you
1. physically demonstrate in support of the spokesman and the administration
2. sign a petition supporting the spokesman and the administration
3. attend the meeting but not participate in any physical demonstration
4. sign a petition against the government's position
5. physically demonstrate against the spokesman and the administration.
6. not attend the meeting or participate in any way.
62. If I picketed the administration for certain student demands, my parents would most likely
1. support my decision even though they may disagree with me.
2. not support my decision but not be too critical of me.
3. be very critical of my decision and possibly disown me.
4. I would not be sure how my parents would respond.

63. I would rate my relations with my parents to be
1. very good.
2. good.
3. average.
4. strained.
5. broken off.

64. I can't see my relationship between what I am doing in school and what I intend to do in my future occupation
1. strongly agree
2. agree
3. not sure
4. disagree
5. strongly disagree

65. In order to get the job that I want after graduating from college, I feel that I must strive to perform well in my school work.
1. strongly disagree
2. disagree
3. not sure
4. agree
5. strongly agree

66. In general, if a person becomes actively involved in religious, political, or social organizations in the community, he can contribute to desired changes in the society
1. strongly disagree
2. disagree
3. not sure
4. agree
5. strongly agree

67. One cannot really blame those who do not try to change the society, since people today cannot really alter the course of political and social events
1. strongly agree
2. agree
3. not sure
4. disagree
5. strongly disagree
68. How do you feel your parents accept you as a person
   1. for what you really are
   2. for what they think you are
   3. only when you behave the way they want you to
   4. just tolerate me, never accept me
   5. not sure

69. I would consider my participation in campus activities to be
   1. high participation
   2. moderate participation
   3. average participation
   4. low participation
   5. no participation in any campus activities

70. I belong to a fraternity or sorority
   1. yes
   2. no

71. I belong to ____ campus organizations
   1. more than 3
   2. 3
   3. 2
   4. 1
   5. none
APPENDIX B

There are ten numbered blanks on this page. Please write ten answers to the simple question, "Who am I?" in the blanks. Just give ten different answers to this question. Answer as if you were giving the answers to yourself, not to somebody else. Write about the answers in the order that they occur to you. Don't worry about logic or "importance." Go along fairly fast, for time is limited.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.
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