

4-1970

Attitudes of Youth Toward Social Institutions: a Comparative Study

Connie McGonigle
Portland State University

James F. Bakke

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



Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

McGonigle, Connie and Bakke, James F., "Attitudes of Youth Toward Social Institutions: a Comparative Study" (1970). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 732.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.732>

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

(ATTITUDES OF YOUTH TOWARD SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS)

A Comparative Study

Connie McGonigle
Research Practicum
April, 1970

INTRODUCTION

In August, 1968, after a series of confrontations in the city parks between young dissidents and the police, the Mayor of Portland called upon the Metropolitan Youth Commission to form a special study committee to explore the areas of conflict and to recommend ways in which municipal government might constructively respond to the young people in the community. The independent research project on the alienation of youth, the results of which are reported here, was an outgrowth of the interest generated by the request from the Office of the Mayor. Under the auspices of the Metropolitan Youth Commission (MYC), a special office within the executive branch of city government concerned with the needs of youth, a questionnaire was constructed measuring both the attitudes of young people toward established social institutions and measuring the degree of personal alienation of the respondent. ~~A research consultant from the Department of Psychiatry of the University of Oregon Medical School, Dr. John Marks, directed the development of the questionnaire. The items measuring personal alienation have been drawn from the "alienation cluster" on a scale constructed and refined by Chein and Associates in their research on juvenile heroin addiction in New York City.~~ In addition, items were included which would provide substantial information on personal background of the individual, e.g. family cohesiveness, social class, delinquent history, and drug use.

In spring, 1969, data was collected in four high schools in the metropolitan area (pop. 380,000). The student members of the MYC arranged for students in each school to distribute the questionnaires in classrooms and to interpret the nature and purpose of the research project to those in the sample populations. Student rather than teacher-administration of the questionnaire was considered

an important factor in assuring those participating of the confidentiality of individual responses. However, since the students were free to select the specific classes to be sampled, the population was not carefully randomized. The questionnaire was also completed by a small number of persons who were contacted at the Charix Coffee House, a popular meeting place for young people identified with the city's hippie community. The Charix sample permits a comparison of the attitudes of those still attending school with a slightly older group of peers who have "dropped out" of the mainstream of community life.

In the fall of 1969, when the present writers became involved in the project, the research sample was extended to include a fifth public high school and a special ungraded secondary school, Vocational Village, whose enrollment includes high school drop-outs and youth referred by school or juvenile court officials. The respondents from the fifth high school were a random sample of the total school population which, in turn, is a cross-section of the middle and lower-income groups in this community. The composition of this school and unique features of its program will be more fully described in a later section of this paper. The sample drawn from Vocational Village is also considered unbiased because the questionnaire was administered in English classes, a required subject for all enrollees.

The data collected during the two time periods, spring 1969 and fall 1969, has been analyzed separately. Since the four schools of the original sample differ in terms of the ethnic and socio-economic status of their enrollments, a comparison of responses by schools to ascertain relationships between social status and alienation has been a major focus of the data analysis. Factual information about the socio-economic characteristics of the individual schools

has been drawn from city census reports and research conducted by Portland's School District #1.

PART I

SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF AREAS UNDER STUDY

and

THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO ALIENATION SCORES

In the following section, the four schools from which samples were drawn for the first phase of the study will be compared in terms of the socio-economic characteristics of their respective geographic areas. From the information available, it is possible to rank the schools according to the prevalence of disadvantageous conditions and then to consider the responses on the questionnaire in terms of this ranking.

Jefferson High School's geographic boundaries encompass an area that has the greatest prevalence of negative conditions of the areas under study. Thirteen percent of the area's residents are non-white. There is a higher concentration of Negroes in parts of the Jefferson district than in any other section of the city (with the exception of a small area within Grant High School's boundaries to be considered later). Income is under \$3000 for 17% of Jefferson-area families.¹ In 1967, a study by School District #1 indicated that there were more students at Jefferson whose families were receiving welfare assistance (10.8%) than in any other school in the district.² These figures would not have changed appreciably before the present research was undertaken. The Jefferson area is fairly homogeneous in regard to income since the great majority of its families have modest incomes. There are proportionately fewer families with an annual income in excess of \$10,000 than in the other three schools' areas; in only three of this section's twelve census tracts does the number of families who enjoy this comparative affluence approach twenty percent.³ Finally, there are also more pockets of high juvenile and adult crime rates within this school's boundaries.⁴

The Grant High School area is the most heterogeneous in the study, largely because it includes two census tracts at its western boundary, where it touches the Jefferson district, which compose the core area of Portland's ghetto (Albina).

One of these, ~~tract 23A~~ (pop. 3241) is distinguished by having a high incidence of every negative social phenomenon measured by city and county research groups after the 1960 census. For example, in one-third of the area, 15-19 persons per thousand receive Aid to Dependent Children. In another one-third of the tract, the ADC rate per thousand is 10-14 persons. One-half of 23A has an adult crime rate of 15 per 1000 persons, the highest measured rate in any residential area, and one-quarter of the tract has a 5-9 per 1000 persons crime rate.⁵ The non-white population of the Grant area as a whole is less than 1%, but most of the Negro families are clustered in the very low income area described above or in the neighborhoods immediately east of it.⁶ ~~In contrast to 23A and parts of the tracts adjacent to it,~~ most of the Grant district has lower rates of crime and fewer welfare recipients than many areas of the city. School District #1's research found that only 1.1% of the Grant student body received welfare aid.⁷ There are also several upper-income neighborhoods that contrast sharply with the ghetto area from which Grant also draws students. In two of the area's fourteen census tracts, over 30% of the families have income in excess of \$10,000, and in several other neighborhoods over 20% of the families have a comparable income.⁸ In the entire area, 10% of the families have income under \$3,000.

Parkrose, which is located in the northeast corner of the city and has an autonomous school administration, is a middle-to-low income area which is racially homogeneous. It had roughly the same proportions of poverty and affluence in 1960 as the Grant area. Only 12% of the families have income under \$3000, but in only one of its five census tracts do as many as 30% of the families have income over \$10,000. While recent census data is unavailable, we know that Negro families have been moving eastward into the Grant area as the Negro population has expanded. It is therefore supposed that Grant now has a higher

proportion of low income families than Parkrose. The fact that the Parkrose area had a much smaller rate of change of residence in the five years preceding the census than any of the other areas would seem to reflect greater stability and perhaps greater insulation from the social forces bringing change to other parts of Portland.⁹

Wilson High School is located in a comparatively new residential area on the west side of the city. As Table I illustrates, the Wilson area has only negligible rates of those conditions that are associated with residential blight. In four of the five census tracts in that district, over 30% of families have incomes in excess of \$10,000 per year. In a ranking of the schools in the study on the basis of freedom from disadvantageous social and economic conditions, Wilson High School is first followed by Parkrose, Grant, and Jefferson in that order.

Table I¹⁰

Socio-Economic Conditions by School Areas

Income Under \$4000	Jefferson	Parkrose	Grant	Wilson
Income Under \$3000 ^a	17%	12%	10%	less than 1%
Change in Residence	45%	3%	39%	30%
Broken Families ^a	15%	—	18%	less than 1%
Non-white Population	13%	less than 1%	less than 1%	less than 1%

^a % of individuals from families in which one or both adults has been or is divorced.

^b Figures derived from computation of total population per census tract.

(Hypothesis #1 was that the profiles of scores on the questionnaire in individual schools would reflect a positive relationship between favorable socio-economic conditions within the school's boundaries and attitudes toward social institutions. Further, it was hypothesized that negative attitudes would be expressed more often in schools whose students were drawn from the economically disadvantaged areas of the city. "Disadvantaged areas" were defined as those with the highest incidence of: 1) incomes under \$3000, 2) broken families, 3) non-white population, 4) families receiving ADC, and 5) adult and juvenile crime.)

Before considering the differences in responses among the schools, the characteristics of the entire sample from four schools will be reviewed. The mean age of the 488 subjects was 16.7 years, and the sample population was 58.4% female. The mean grade level completed was 10.8 with 15% having completed the 9th and 10th grades, 30% having completed the 11th grade, and 33% having finished the twelfth.¹¹ In the first part of the questionnaire, which sought to measure social alienation, students were asked to indicate what they thought of each social group or institution listed. Possible responses were "Good", "Somewhat Good", "Don't Care", "Somewhat Bad", and "Bad". These responses were ranked for machine scoring with "Good" assigned four points, "Bad" assigned zero points, and 2.00 representing the neutral position.

The most favorable attitudes were toward parents for whom the mean score was 3.4 (slightly better than "Somewhat Good"). "Your city" and the YW/YMCA also received comparatively positive ratings. Table II illustrates the order in which each school and the alienated group from the Charix ranked the institutions in terms of positive attitudes. The mean responses of the total sample are included as a base of comparison. While no institution is given a negative

Table II

Ranking of Mean Responses Reflecting
Attitudes Toward Social Institutions

	Total	Grant	PR	Jeff	Wilson	Charix (alienated)
Armed Forces	2.32	2.49	2.55	2.45	1.86	1.29
City Officials	2.38	2.66	2.49	2.40	2.16	1.00
U.S. Govt	2.57	2.79	3.09	2.46	2.17	1.62
Police	2.57	2.76	2.79	2.47	2.48	1.62
Older Generation	2.74	2.93	2.90	2.59	2.66	2.35
Boy/Girl Scouts	2.83	2.92	2.86	2.82	2.71	2.70
School	2.88	3.15	3.13	2.31	3.28	2.33
Churches	2.98	3.05	2.99	3.09	2.78	2.62
Business	2.98	3.24	2.98	3.05	2.70	2.10
YM/YWCA	3.08	3.23	2.90	3.13	3.02	2.79
Your city	3.14	3.37	3.26	3.00	3.17	1.85
Your parents	3.44	3.49	3.51	3.41	3.39	3.20

ranking by the total sample, i.e. less than 2.00, the attitudes toward many do not reflect unqualified enthusiasm. (On the other hand, as Table II indicates, the attitudes of the alienated in the sample are markedly more negative than the total group's. It is significant, however, that the alienated tend to be most negative toward those institutions that are looked upon least favorably by the total group.) The only great difference in the rank order of opinion is in regard to the way in which the two groups view "your city", the alienated group being significantly less positive than the total sample.) In the case of both groups, more positive attitudes are attached to groups with which the youth have had the most personal contact and the most negative toward institutions

more remote in their individual experience, e.g. Armed Forces, City officials, U.S. government.

Item #11, which asked about attitudes toward hippies, has been excluded from the analysis of attitudes of social alienation illustrated in Table II because hippies do not represent an established social group comparable to the others on the questionnaire. The mean response of the total group to this item was 1.70. The alienated group's response was 3.2, reflecting this group's strong identification with the hippie subculture.

In regard to the differences among schools, Jefferson students, the most disadvantaged of the subsamples, and Wilson students, who represent the most advantaged group, were similar in showing the least favorable attitudes among the four schools. Whereas this was the expected result for Jefferson students, it is the reverse of what was expected from the Wilson group. Thus, Hypothesis #1 is disconfirmed, and its reverse can be asserted: "the most advantaged students show the greatest alienation from societal values. However, the lack of consistency in results of the questionnaire means that this assertion cannot be made unequivocally." Grant High School students registered the most favorable attitudes. The research hypothesis anticipated much more similarity in attitude between Grant and Wilson students than actually resulted.

Looking first to the ways in which Grant students' more positive attitudes differed from those of students in other schools, the data indicates that there was less difference between Grant and Parkrose than between Grant and any other school. Student's t-test has been used to compute statistically significant differences at the .05 level of confidence. Differences were significant at the .05 level only in Grant students' more positive attitudes toward business

and industry and the YM/YWCA. Grant and Wilson differed significantly on five items: the Armed Forces, older generation, U.S. government, business and industry, and city officials. Grant students saw the institutions in general as "Somewhat Good" with only a few mean responses falling into the "Don't Care" category. Grant and Jefferson differed on most of the same items that Wilson and Grant did, and Grant was also significantly more positive than Jefferson toward "your school" and "your city". (See Table III)

The greatest differences were between Grant and the alienated group. The only items on which Grant students did not register significantly more positive feelings were the ones on church, parents, and Boy/Girl Scouts. The attitudes of Grant students and Charix respondents were most polarized on the subjects of "your city", hippies, and business and industry. The mean response to the item on hippies at Grant was 1.81, which was considerably more negative than the attitudes expressed toward any of the established groups.

Parkrose rated the Army and the U.S. government significantly more favorably than did Wilson students. Like Grant, Parkrose differs more with Charix group than with any of the other schools. There were significant differences between Grant and the Charix on ten items; Parkrose differs from the Charix on nine items.

Table II indicates that of the four schools, Wilson's attitudes toward established institutions were least favorable. Jefferson would be ranked next, and the differences in mean responses between Wilson and Jefferson are very slight on several items. In contrast to the pattern observed with Grant and Parkrose, there are significant differences between Wilson and the Charix on fewer items than between the Charix and any of the other three schools. Wilson and Jefferson differ significantly on only four items. Wilson students gave

Table III

Significant Differences in Attitude Toward Social Institutions
(quoted in "t" scores)

Item	G-PR	G-W	G-J	G-C	PR-W	PR-J	PR-C	W-J	W-C	J-C
Army		3.18		3.53	3.27		3.79	-3.19		3.66
City Off.		3.40	2.03	6.94			5.59		4.09	5.29
U.S. Govt		3.70	2.22	3.90	5.26	3.83	5.22			2.69
Police				3.69			3.52		2.65	2.71
Old. Gen		2.20	2.78	2.45		2.11	2.19			
Scouts										
School			5.90	3.07		5.06	2.94	6.33	3.85	
Churches								-2.03		
B and I	2.52	4.43	2.39	5.02			3.20	-2.51		3.89
YM/YWCA	2.32			1.99						
City			3.19	6.64			5.62		5.45	4.34
Parents										

Note: Negative t-scores indicate that the first of the two schools had a less favorable mean response than the second school.

J-Jefferson, G-Grant, PR-Parkrose, W-Wilson, G-Charix

their school a much more positive rating than did Jefferson's but were more negative toward the army, church, and business and industry. In both Wilson and Jefferson responses, it is to be noted that, even when they are significantly more positive than the alienated group, the degree of difference is often not as great as is the case with Grant and Parkrose responses. / For example, $t = 5.45$ between Wilson and the Charix on attitude toward "your city", and $t = 6.64$ between Grant and the Charix on the same item. On the item about attitudes toward police, there are no significant differences among the four schools, but each of the schools differs significantly with the more negative Charix group.

CONCLUSIONS TO PART I

The fact that students from the most disadvantaged area consistently registered negative attitudes, at least in comparison to two of the other schools, was an expected result of the research. It is interesting to note that this occurred despite the fact that special variables aimed at influencing attitudes have been in operation at Jefferson High School. Jefferson was identified by the school district as a "trouble spot" several years ago because of interracial conflict between students, more severe disciplinary problems than in other city high schools, and some highly publicized fights allegedly started by Jefferson students during athletic meets in other parts of the city. When federal funds became available under Title I of the Aid to Elementary and Secondary Schools Act, the school district inaugurated a special program at Jefferson to promote attitudinal change. One of the major goals toward which district officials report there has been substantial progress is in improving communication and understanding between students, faculty, and parents. Parental involvement in school affairs has been achieved by employing these parents in part-time jobs as teachers' assistants, tutors, etc. An Interpersonal Relations Project has made funds available for regular student/faculty retreats, and the traditional curriculum has been broadened to include classes that attract the interest and commitment of more students. The guidance staff includes a clinical psychologist, and more intensive diagnostic and counseling services are available for students. These and other facets of the program have been part of a concerted effort to alter the image of Jefferson held both by adults and adolescents who are part of it and in the wider community.

The fact that attitudes at Jefferson are as positive as they are may reflect the effects of this program. An interpretation of the results of the present research should at least acknowledge the possible influence of this special "attitudinal change" program. That is, Jefferson students could be as positive in outlook on social institutions as they are not because of but in spite of the relative deprivation of the families in the area. Unlike students in many disadvantaged areas, those currently enrolled at Jefferson have been experiencing expensive and innovative educational programs under the direction of some of the most highly qualified teachers and administrators in the district. Their feelings, which are not as negative as expected, may therefore reflect not what is typical but what is possible, i.e. deprived youngsters who might otherwise develop feelings of isolation and hostility will respond at least neutrally toward the establishment when such an identification is facilitated by new opportunities.

Gottlieb's study of the vocational and social aspirations of poor youth in three Eastern urban areas (1968) seems to support this interpretation. He contends that the alienation of poor and middle-class adolescents must be distinguished in terms of the cause of withdrawal. The middle-class youngster rejects what he sees as a crass, commercial culture, and "...the choice of involvement or estrangement is usually with him."¹² In contrast, the lower class adolescent who adopts deviant behavior has been forced into this role because his opportunities for upward mobility are so limited. "The poor adolescent, and this is probably most true of urban Black males, does not reject the middle class style of living....Given the choice he would gladly exchange his current status with the disenchanting of Harvard, Vassar, and Yale."¹³ In Gottlieb's conclusions, he

submits that poor youth want to be middle class:

"It is not I believe a question of a lower class value system or subculture which contains elements opposed to or in conflict with legitimate means and ends. It is not, as is frequently the case among middle class adolescents, an opposition to that life style which is called middle class. Rather, the poor adolescent finds himself alienated because he is without resources and referents which have become increasingly important for goal attainment in our society." 14

While Jefferson High School students are probably not as poor as a group as were those in Gottlieb's study nor is the Portland ghetto as isolated a community as its counterpart in a larger metropolitan area, these youngsters and their families represent one of the most deprived groups in this community. The special educational program, which was initiated at Jefferson because of increasing tensions and undesirable behavior, made available some of the resources and referents to which Gottlieb refers above. While there may be other determinants of the social attitudes of Jefferson students, the upgrading of the educational program within the last three years can be considered a major influence. On the other hand, the negative-leaning attitudes of Wilson students can be understood in terms of the phenomenon of middle-class alienation in which youth who can afford the luxury of choice adopt attitudes even less favorable to the status quo than their more disadvantaged peers.

In respect to what conclusions are to be drawn about the comparatively positive attitudes of Grant students, it is observed that economic advantage is the characteristic that most distinguishes these from others in the sample. There is also more heterogeneity among the Grant population, certainly when it is compared with Wilson, and the broader base of comparison may influence Grant attitudes in a positive direction.

Considering the research results in broad, general terms, we find the most negative attitudes among those at either extreme of the socio-economic scale, i.e. ★

among those who are economically able to exercise some choice in adopting or rejecting societal values and those who may feel relatively "locked out" of the system. However, a comparison of the attitudes of high school students to those of the alienated group at the Charix makes clear that the attitudes of even the most negative students are not "alienated".

FOOTNOTES

1. Portland's Residential Areas: An Initial Appraisal - Blight and Other Factors. Community Renewal Program. Portland City Planning Commission, Oct., 1965.
2. Unpublished information compiled by the Research Division of the Administrative Offices of School District No. 1; Portland, Oregon.
3. Population and Housing (A Summary and Extension of Selected 1960 Census of Population and Housing Data by Census Tract for the Portland Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area) Metropolitan Planning Commission; Portland, Oregon, June, 1963.
4. Portland's Residential Areas, op. cit., no page reference.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. School District Research, op. cit.
8. Population and Housing, op. cit.
9. Ibid.
10. Portland's Residential Areas, op. cit.
11. Since all respondents except the twenty at the Charix Coffee House were currently enrolled in school, 33% of the total sample could not have completed the twelfth grade. This figure is assumed to reflect a misinterpretation of the question by the respondents, i.e. those enrolled in the twelfth grade at the time of the data collection incorrectly indicated that they had completed that grade.
12. David Gottlieb, "Poor Youth: A Study in Forced Alienation," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XXV, No. 2 (April, 1969), p. 92.
13. Ibid., p. 92.
14. Ibid., p. 118.

ALIENATED YOUTH

PART II

by:

JAMES F. BAKKE

ALIENATION AND DRUG USE IN THE FIRST SAMPLE

In part I of this paper data from Grant, Parkrose, Wilson, Jefferson and Charix were used. A further analysis of this sample's data investigated the correlates of alienation and of drug experience. Responses from the questionnaires were run through the computer three separate times.

The first two divisions were concerned with determining alienation. In division 1 institutional alienation was derived from the sum of items 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11(scoring reversed so 4=0, 3=1, 2=2, 1=3, 0=4, no response =9), 12, 13, 15, 16, and 17. (see appendix for questionnaire) Two subsets were made, subset 1 being made up of those cases where the sum of the responses was equal to or less than 30, and subset 2 those cases where the sum was more than 30. Data on any case where any one of the items had no response were discarded. A score of 30 or less is considered to indicate alienation. The two subsets have been compared to determine if a "profile" of the more alienated youth can be determined statistically.

In division 2 social alienation was derived from the sums of items 28, 29(scoring reversed so 3=0, 2=1, 1=2, 0=3, no response =9), 30, 31, and 32. (see appendix) Again two subsets were made, subset 1 being those cases whose score was less than 8, and subset 2 being those cases whose score was 8 or more. As before cases where any one of the items had no response were discarded. A score of 8 or more is considered to indicate alienation. The two subsets were then compared as in division 1.

In the third division data from cases where the responses indicated drug usage were analyzed for the purpose of determining if the drug user has a "profile" that is alike or different from that of the non-user, the alienated, or the non-alienated. In this analysis, a drug user is considered to be a respondent who indicates taking drugs more than once.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The responses of subset 1 were compared with those of subset 2 for each item in all three divisions. For items 1, 3, 40, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 71, 72, 74, and for social alienation, the critical ratio (CR) was computed with $CR=1.96$ being significant. For all other items cross tabulation subsets were made against the responses. Expected frequencies were computed for each cell using marginal proportions and N for each item. The degrees of freedom were then computed for each of these chi-squares. The significance of chi-square was determined by reference to standard mathematical tables.

ALIENATION

When the responses of the institutionally alienated were compared with those of the socially alienated it was found that there was no significant difference between the two. Thus it appears that institutional and social alienation are essentially congruent. Therefore, for the balance of the report, while the institutional alienation scores are used to determine the alienated, social alienation is included in the meaning of "alienation."

The alienated respondent is found to be older (16.89 years of age as compared with 16.43), more likely to be a male, and somewhat farther along in school (11.03 grade level as compared with 10.74). He is more likely to come from Charix, Wilson, or Jefferson, and less likely to be from Grant or Parkrose.

Items 5 through 17 inclusive (see appendix) measured institutional alienation. The alienated respondent was to a statistically significant degree, more negative on all items except for rating the hippies better than did the non-alienated.

In the section on social alienation the alienated tend to agree that most people won't really do anything to make this a better world. They reject the idea that what parents want their children to do are for the child's own good.. They do not reject the idea that most people would be better off if they were never born. They agree that parents are always looking for things to nag their children about.

Scores were also computed to indicate feelings of powerlessness and numbness. Powerlessness equals items 18(reversed), 20 (reversed), 21, 24, and 26(reversed). (see appendix) Numbness equals items 19, 22, 23(reversed), 25, and 27(reversed). (see appendix) Higher scores on each scale indicate increased feelings of powerlessness or numbness. Critical ratios were computed for these scores with a CR=1.96 being considered significant.

In comparing the relative feelings of powerlessness and numbness, the alienated person is found to feel less powerful and somewhat, but not significantly, more numb than the non-alienated. On individual items he feels that he understands why he does things, disagrees that what a person makes out of life depends on him, tends to feel that life is boring, and that when things go bad, he does not try harder.

The alienated youth is strongly in favor of legalizing marijuana and is also in favor of reducing the penalties for its use or possession.

If he had a personal problem, he is most likely to talk it over with a friend of the opposite sex. The non-alienated respondent indicates a preference for talking to a parent or a friend of his own age and sex.

The alienated go to church or to club meetings less frequently than the non-alienated. He is less likely to live at home with both parents, has been arrested more frequently, and is less likely to agree with his parents regarding goals for his future.

The drug usage section reveals that he is more frequently a user,

especially of marijuana. He is also more likely to have used it in the last year and to have used it more frequently than the non-alienated. In addition, he is more likely to have used speed, hallucinogens, and opiates.

The alienated youth differs from the non-alienated in his views of community problems in that he is somewhat more concerned about a lack of recreational and cultural opportunities, greatly less concerned about hippies and the drug traffic, more concerned about school courses, and police methods. Both groups rate racism as the most important problem, with poverty, pollution, and drugs next in importance (see table 1, below).

Table 1, community problems as rated by respondents ranked on a 1-10 scale.

Problem	Alienated	Non-alienated	Drug user	Non-user
Pollution	3.99	4.06	4.09	3.91
Recreation & Cultural	6.43	6.91	6.56	6.76
Curfew	7.63	7.79	7.41	7.82
Drug Traffic	4.49	3.04	4.77	3.17
Poverty	3.26	3.18	3.25	3.13
Racism	2.94	2.85	2.85	2.86
School Courses	6.43	7.80	6.39	7.55
Traffic Cong.	6.57	6.94	6.61	6.87
Police Mthds	5.19	6.19	5.25	6.06
Hippies	7.63	5.92	7.37	6.37

Question 47 (see appendix) asked the respondents to indicate from 1 to 10 how they rate the list of goals given. The alienated want

more to have serenity and somewhat more to have power. They also wanted less to be useful, somewhat more to have money, and less to have a close family. Both groups listed being happy first and being loved second. Having prominence, money, and power were rated at the bottom of the list by both. (see table 2, below).

Table 2, goals as rated by respondents ranked on a 1-10 scale.

Goal	Alienated	Non-alienated	Drug user	Non-user
Serenity	5.13	5.99	5.18	5.78
Power	8.08	8.53	7.95	8.57
Happy	2.78	2.96	2.80	2.89
Useful	4.64	3.97	4.34	4.16
Liked	5.37	5.08	5.34	5.12
Admired	6.21	6.10	6.29	6.10
Money	7.08	7.63	7.21	7.58
Prominence	7.43	7.13	7.39	7.25
Close Family	5.01	3.84	4.78	4.12
Loved	2.95	3.06	3.09	2.93

DRUG USE

The drug user is older than the non-user (16.93 years of age as compared with 16.57 years old), is more often male, and is most likely to be from Charix.

He feels less favorable toward his school, the city, armed forces, the older generation, the U.S. Government, and the police than the non-user. He is more favorable to the hippies, and less favorable to parents, the YMCA and YWCA, and to city officials. He also tends

to be less favorable to the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts, although not to a significant degree.

Considering the social alienation items, he is found to think that most people will not work for a better world, that what parents want their children to do is for the child's good, that most people would be better off not being born, that nobody really cares for anyone else, and that parents are always looking for things to nag their children about.

The drug user did not have significantly different responses from those of non-users on items relating to powerlessness and numbness.

As could be expected the drug user thinks that marijuana should be legalized and that penalties for its use or possession should be reduced.

The drug user reports that if he had a personal problem, he would talk it over with an opposite sex friend rather than with a parent.

The user attends clubs less often and goes to church far less often than the non-user. He is less likely to live at home with both parents and more likely to live independently or in a foster home. He is less likely to agree with his parents regarding his goals in life and is also likely to have moved more often in the past five years.

The user is also more likely to have been arrested, and more frequently for a drug offense than for a traffic offense.

In terms of community problems, he does not consider the drug traffic or hippies as being as important a problem as does the non-

user, and feels that school courses and police methods are more a problem. Both groups agree on racism as the number one problem with poverty next(see table 1).

The user sees serenity as a more important goal than does the non-user and is more concerned with being a power in people's lives. A close family is not considered as being as important for them.

As with the alienated-non-alienated sample, being happy and being loved were most important with power, money, and prominence being least important(see table 2).

CONCLUSIONS

In comparing the response patterns of the alienated person with those of the drug user it becomes apparent that there is a high degree of correspondence between the two. Both are the older and more male of their comparative subsets. The average drug user's responses on the social alienation section would have put him in the alienated subset. Their respective responses to the social alienation scale were also essentially identical. The alienated tended to feel less powerful and more numb than did the user. However, the total scores for those sections was not found to discriminate between alienated-non-alienated, or user-non-user.

Both groups are in favor of legalized marijuana and reduced penalties, are most likely to talk over problems with an opposite-sex friend, negative toward parents, churches, and clubs and are more likely to have been arrested than non-alienated or non-user respondents. The alienated also was most likely to have used drugs

compared to the non-alienated. Both are less likely to live at home with both parents and to agree with them regarding future goals.

The alienated and the drug user are in close agreement regarding community problems and their goals ~~as shown by tables 1 and 2~~, being in agreement in 9 of 10 items on each.

THE SECOND SAMPLE

The second sample used in preparing this paper was gathered from Vocational Village and from John Adams High School.

John Adams was selected for the survey as it was felt to be representative of the total high school population of the city. It is a new, experimental and innovative school which by design serves a cross-section of racial, social, and economic groups.

Adams opened in September, 1969 with approximately 1300 students, grades 9-11. This was some 200 more than had been anticipated. The student body is drawn from parts of three existing high school districts, Grant, Jefferson, and Madison, plus all or part of eight elementary districts.

At the time of the 1960 census, 12% of the population in what is now the Adams district lived on under \$3,000 a year. Three of ten 1960 census tracts reported that slightly over 20% of the families had incomes over \$10,000 and two others had almost 20% of the families at the \$10,000 level. The non-white population was given as 2%. School officials estimate that presently approximately 20% of the families fall within the Federal classification of poverty. The

present Black student enrollment from the district is approximately 22%.

The philosophy, program, and organization at Adams represent a distinct departure from the traditional high school, for the primary curricular objective at Adams is to design an educational program that is relevant to the needs and interests of all students whether headed for further education or not. The aims are to break down the walls between the teaching disciplines and to develop problem-centered inter-disciplinary courses, to widen considerably the range of courses or experiences from which students can choose, and to provide more opportunity for students to explore adult roles and become familiar with the working world.

The student body at Adams is divided into four "houses," each containing some 300 randomly assigned students. Each house is responsible for the basic skills portion of the curriculum. This is taught in a three-period block of time called General Education. Two houses meet for General Education in the mornings and two meet in the afternoons. The rest of his day is the student's own to plan. He may take courses in which he is interested, go to the library, the student lounge, the park that is adjacent to the school, to the electronic learning center, or to a number of other study centers.

Attendance is taken once during the day for official record so a student may, if he chooses, cut some or all of his classes without being counted absent from school. This is proving to be a major problem at Adams as classroom attendance is often poor. While the official attendance lists show from 15% to 20% absent on any given

day, the response to the survey indicates that only about 50% of the students were in class and filled out the questionnaire.

At Adams the survey was administered differently than at the other high schools in that it was done under the supervision of the classroom teachers. This was at the request of the school.

Arrangements were made to have questionnaires administered in one morning house and one afternoon house. One period of General Education was devoted to the task and the questionnaire was filled out in ten rooms simultaneously, giving all students present that day a chance to participate. As already noted, only about one-half of the students responded. Only 325 responses were received out of an anticipated approximately 600.

Vocational Village was selected because its program is designed to reach students who have not been successful in their previous high school experiences. Its student body is drawn from all over the city and so does not represent any geographic subdivision that can be described demographically. A larger number of students live in the Southeast area of the city than in any other area, a probable result of the school's location and the limited transportation available to high school age youth.

Arrangements for taking the survey were made with the director of the Village and with two of the academic subject teachers. The writers were able to administer the questionnaires directly to 57 students representing approximately 50% of the then current enrollment.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

In the second sample data were run through the computer in 5 divisions. The first was institutional alienation done in the same manner as in sample one. The second division compared those who have ever used drugs with those who had not. The third division compares the heavy user. Division four was used to compare the two schools. Division five compared higher social-economic status with lower social-economic status. The same methods of data analysis were used as in the first sample except that the item-by-item comparison of responses by schools used chi-square to calculate significance for items 1,2, 4, through 39 inclusive, 41, 42, 44 through 46 inclusive, 48 through 67 inclusive, 69, 70, 73, and 75.

Social-economic class was obtained by coding question 71 (father's occupation) as follows:

1. Major executive, major professional
2. Business manager, medium proprietor, lesser professional
3. Administrative personnel, small businessman, minor professional
4. Clerical, sales, technician
5. Skilled labor trades
6. Semi skilled labor
7. Unskilled labor
8. Casual labor or unemployed

Levels 1-4 were considered to be the upper class or subset, and 5-8 the lower class or subset.

THE TWO SCHOOLS

In comparing the two schools, the Vocational Village student is considerably older (16.59 years of age as compared to 15.25), and is farther along in school (10.48 grade level as compared with 9.54).

The Vocational Village student tends to have a higher opinion of his school, though not to a significant degree. He is more negative toward the U.S. Government and is decidedly more negative toward the police. He is significantly more negative toward churches and to the YMCA and YWCA with a concentration of responses around "don't care."

There is no significant difference between John Adams and Vocational Village in the social alienation section although the Village student does tend to agree that most people won't do anything to make this a better world.

While powerlessness and numbness scores show no significant differences between the schools, individual items indicate some differing attitudes. The Village student for example, is significantly more likely to reject the idea that he sometimes cannot understand why he does things and to agree that what a person makes out of life depends on him. He is also more likely to feel that not all people are intended to be happy in life. His response to "There are days when nothing seems to matter" is mixed, tending to concentrate toward mostly disagree and away from mostly agree.

The Vocational Village student is strongly in favor of marijuana and for reduced penalties for its use or possession. He is very

much more likely to have used all drugs, more recently, and more often than the Adams student.

The Village student goes to meetings of clubs and organizations and to church services considerably less often. He has been arrested more often and for more serious offenses. If he has a personal problem, he is more apt to talk with an older member of his family and less apt to talk to some other older person.

The Vocational Village student is significantly less interested in pollution as a problem than the Adams student, although it still does rank as the number two problem. He tends to see recreational and cultural facilities, the curfew, and police methods as greater problems, but not to a significant degree.. He sees school courses as more of a problem. Both schools rate pollution, racism, poverty, and drugs as being very important, with hippies, school courses, and the curfew being of lesser importance. (see table 3)

Table 3, community problems as rated by respondents-ranked on a 1-10 scale.

Problem	Vocational Village	John Adams
Pollution	3.61	2.58
Recreation & Cultural	6.39	7.01
Curfew	6.83	7.60
Drug traffic	4.37	4.07
Poverty	3.71	3.26
Racism	3.35	2.80
School Courses	6.74	7.71
Traffic Cong.	5.82	6.47
Police Mthds	5.18	5.95
Hippies	6.68	7.23

In the section on goals the Village student differs significantly in that he is more concerned with being happy and less concerned with being useful. He tends to be less concerned with having power and more being loved. Both groups rate being happy and being loved as first or second in importance with prominence, money, and power last in that order(see table 4, below).

Table 4, goals as rated by respondents-ranked on a 1-10 scale.

Goal	Vocational Village	John Adams
Serenity	6.25	6.14
Power	8.72	8.20
Happy	2.43	3.23
Useful	5.12	4.14
Liked	5.17	4.92
Admired	6.26	6.35
Money	6.87	7.44
Prominence	6.83	6.96
Close Family	3.90	4.31
Loved	2.48	3.02

ALIENATION

In comparing the alienated versus the non-alienated student from the two schools, the same scale is used as in the first sample and the same statistical methods used.

The alienated student is somewhat more likely to come from Vocational Village, is older (15.58 years old as compared to 15.33),

and is somewhat farther along in school (9.77 grade level as compared with 9.62 - not significant however). Interestingly, sex is unrelated to alienation in this sample (chi-square = 0.01). This contrasts with the first sample where it was found that the alienated case was significantly more likely to be a male.

The alienated student is more negative toward his school and his city. He is highly negative toward the armed forces, the U.S. Government, and to the police, the most significant response being that they are "bad." He is also negative toward teachers and other officials, the most significant response being "don't care." As can be expected, the alienated student is more favorable to hippies than the non-alienated. He is very negative toward churches, somewhat less negative toward business and parents, "doesn't care" about the Boy Scouts or Girl Scouts, the YMCA or the YWCA. He is highly negative toward city officials.

The alienated sample receive higher scale scores of powerlessness and numbness though not to a significant degree. The section measuring feelings of powerlessness shows only one significant difference in responses. He says that when things go wrong, he is not likely to try harder. He tends to disagree with the statement that what a person makes out of life depends on himself.

Among the items bearing on numbness, the alienated tend to disagree with the statement that they are sure of their feelings and, to a significant degree, feel that life is boring and that most of their experiences are not interesting.

As is expected, the alienated person is strongly in favor of legalizing marijuana and reducing penalties for use or possession.

The alienated indicate strong social alienation in that they tend to agree that most people won't do anything to make a better world, strongly disagree that parents want things that are good for their children, tend to agree that most people would be better off not being born and that parents are always looking for things to nag them about.

If he has a personal problem he is more likely to keep it to himself and less likely to talk it over with a parent than is the non-alienated.

The alienated goes to meetings of clubs or organizations and to church far less frequently, his most significant response being "never."

He has been arrested more frequently though there is no significant difference in the seriousness of the charges compared with the non-alienated.

He reports that he is much less likely than is the non-alienated to agree with his parents regarding goals for his future.

The section on drug usage shows that he has used more drugs, more recently, and more frequently except that there was no significant difference in response for the use of inhalants and hallucinogens in the last year.

In the community problems section, the only significantly different responses were that the alienated are less concerned about the drug traffic and hippies, and are much more concerned about police methods. They are more concerned with the curfew but not significantly. Both groups agree in that they rank pollution, racism, poverty, and the drug traffic in that order as the four most important problems (see table 5, below).

Table 5, community problems as rated by respondents-ranked on a 1-10 scale. Sample 2-John Adams and Vocational Village.

Problem	Alienated	Non-alienated	Drug user	Non-user
Pollution	2.87	2.65	3.15	2.62
Recreation & Cultural Curfew	6.66	7.08	6.11	7.15
Drug Traffic	7.17	7.68	6.66	7.71
Poverty	4.74	3.65	5.66	3.68
Racism	3.46	3.21	3.58	3.26
School Courses	3.00	2.82	2.88	2.88
Traffic Cong.	7.47	7.66	7.32	7.64
Police mthds	6.50	6.23	6.01	6.47
Hippies	4.92	6.43	4.88	6.10
	7.73	6.81	8.04	6.90

Table 6, goals as rated by respondents-ranked on a 1-10 scale.

Goal	Alienated	Non-alienated	Drug user	Non-user
Serenity	6.13	6.21	6.11	6.17
Power	7.92	8.55	7.97	8.36
Happy	2.99	3.17	2.76	3.19
Useful	4.31	4.27	4.61	4.21
Liked	5.07	4.91	4.82	5.00
Admired	6.20	6.36	6.35	6.34
Money	7.27	7.25	6.74	7.52
Prominence	6.93	7.04	7.35	6.83
Close Family	4.73	3.98	4.72	4.11
Loved	2.98	2.99	2.90	2.94

The section on goals shows the alienated to be more concerned with power and less with having a close family. Both groups agreed that being loved was most important, followed by being happy. Prominence, money, and power were ranked 8th, 9th, and 10th in importance by both groups (see table 6, above).

DRUG USE

In categorizing a respondent as a drug user the criteria used is that any case who reports taking drugs six or more times is considered to be a user. These were analyzed in the third division.

The user is older (15.95 years of age as compared to 15.31), and farther along in school (10.10 grade level compared with 9.56). He is much more likely to come from Vocational Village than from John Adams. The sex of the respondent is unrelated to drug usage (chi-square = 0.15) unlike the first sample where users were most often males.

The user feels less favorable to the armed forces, U.S. Government, the police, parents, and city officials. He is more favorable to the hippies. His attitudes toward the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, and the YMCA and YWCA is less favorable with a noticeable trend to respond "don't care."

In the social alienation items, the user disagrees that what parents want their child to do are for the child's own good and agrees that they look for things to nag about. There is a tendency to agree that some people would be better off not being born.

The user tends to agree, though not significantly so, that he is the master of his fate. He rejects the ideas that he cannot always understand why he does things and that he tries harder when things go bad. There is a tendency to agree that some days nothing seems to matter and there is significant agreement that most of life is boring.

As expected, he is strongly in favor of legalizing marijuana and reducing the penalties for its use or possession.

A personal problem is very likely to be kept to himself and very unlikely to be talked over with a parent.

He is less likely to go to meetings of clubs or organizations or to go to church than is the non-user. He has moved more frequently and is somewhat less likely to live with both parents. Arrests are more common among users and more are for drug charges and felonies than among non-users.

The user sees the lack of recreational and cultural opportunities, the curfew, and police methods as greater problems than does the non-user. Hippies and the drug traffic are seen as less of a problem. Both groups rate racism, pollution, and poverty 1st, 2nd, and 3rd in that order(see table 5, above).

The user's goals differ from the non-users in that he is significantly more interested in having money and less interested in being a prominent person. He is somewhat more concerned with happiness and somewhat less concerned with having a close family. With both groups, being loved and being happy are most important, and money, prominence, and power are least important.

THE HEAVY DRUG USER

Division 2 compared the heavy (see p.19) drug user with the occasional or one time user.

The heavy user was found to be somewhat older, farther along in school, and more likely a male than the occasional user, but he did not otherwise differ significantly.

Therefore, it can be said that the extent of drug use does not seem to be related to the degree of alienation as measured by this survey. For the balance of the paper, when the term "user" is used, both the heavy user and the occasional user are included in the meaning.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Division 5 formed two subsets based on the father's occupation (see page 12 for explanation). The purpose was to attempt to determine whether or not there is a relationship between socio-economic class and alienation or drug usage.

The lower class respondent is somewhat older (15.54 years old as compared with 15.34 - not significant), slightly farther in school (9.77 grade compared with 9.58 - also not significant) and is more likely to be from Vocational Village. Sex is not related to class in this sample.

There were no significant differences with regard to institutional alienation although there was a tendency to be less positive to the school and to be more positive toward the U.S. Government.

The social alienation items likewise revealed no significant differences. There was a tendency for the low group to agree that most people won't do anything to make a better world and that most people would be better off not being born. The low group did have a significantly higher (more alienated) rating on the total social alienation scale.

The low group agrees that what a person makes of his life depends on him and that getting what you want is mostly a matter of getting the breaks. They also tend to reject the idea that some people are intended to be happy and others aren't. They also see life as boring.

The low income person is less concerned with pollution and tends to be less concerned with the drug traffic. He is less

concerned with being useful and more concerned with having a close family.

He is less likely to go to meetings of clubs or organizations and has been arrested more frequently than a higher status person.

There were no significant differences under drug usage although the low status person did tend to use amphetamines, opiates, and barbiturates more often than a higher status person.

CONCLUSIONS

As with the first sample there is a strong similarity of the profile of the drug user compared with that of the alienated.

Both the alienated and the drug user are older than the non-alienated and the non-user, and are farther in school. Unlike the first sample, the sex of the respondent was not a factor.

In the items measuring alienation, the drug user's responses would put him in the alienated subset. Most responses to other items are essentially similar from one to the other.

Both are negative toward the armed forces, U.S. Government, the police, parents, and city officials. As expected, both are favorable to the hippies. They tend to not care about Boy and Girl Scouts, and the YMCA and YWCA.

They agree that parents look for things to nag them about, that what parents want their children to do are not for the child's own good, and that most people would be better off not being born. Life is seen as boring and most experiences are not considered to be interesting.

Neither is likely to go to church or to attend meetings of clubs or other organizations, or to have lived in the same house for the past five years, or if they have personal problems, to talk to anyone about them. Both are more likely to have been arrested than the others in the survey.

Both are highly in favor of legalized marijuana and reduced penalties for its use. They do not consider that hippies or the drug traffic are as important as problems than do the others.

Police methods, pollution, racism, and poverty are the most important problems in their eyes.

Their goals are similar in that they are less concerned with having a close family and more concerned with being happy and being loved. Having money and being prominent are not seen as being very important goals.

Overall, the drug user - alienated youth seems to be a socially isolated individual who is very negative toward parents and their values, and rejects most of what the older generation accepts, and accepts activities and values that are rejected or not stressed by them as being important. It is interesting that in both samples, being happy and being loved were far more important than money, power, and prominence, the latter seemingly being the older generation's goal at the expense of the former.

The attitudes of those in the low socio-economic status cases seem to be closely parallel to those in the alienated and drug user cases. They too, are older and somewhat farther along in school and seem to be socially isolated. This suggests a relationship between low status, drug use, and alienation. This would be consistent with the study by Gottlieb referred to in Part I.

It should be stressed that while the attitudes of the low status person differ from those of the high status person, there is not a great difference in the use of drugs. He does tend to use amphetamines, opiates, and barbiturates more than the high status person but not to a significant degree. It can only be speculated as to whether this is a choice of preference or of economics.

SOME POSSIBLE IMPLICATIONS

If we are to understand the phenomenon of alienation and so be able to deal with it constructively, we must be able to isolate, study, and understand the factor or factors causing alienation. This study has pointed out some characteristics of the alienated. Whether or not these characteristics are causes or symptoms is not shown and should provide the basis for future more intensive studies.

It is striking that in each of the several schools and at Charix that the alienated, the drug user, and the low socio-economic status person was older and farther along in school than was the comparative case. The school progress seems naturally to follow from the age factor however, there is an implication that alienation and drug use result from some factor in the growing up process. The relationship of status is not clear.

The family relationships in this group are shown to be less favorable than appears to be the case for the non-alienated, non-user. They feel that parents are not looking for what is good for their children, they nag them, do not agree on goals, and that they cannot talk to them about personal problems. It is significant also that the alienated and the user is less likely to live at home with both parents, to have moved more often, and that he places less value on having a close family. There is an obvious need to determine what happens in a family to cause such a reaction in the children. We also need to learn what can be done about it. Realistically, much is already known about the causes, solutions are the difficulty.

The alienated are bored with life and quite cynical about what people will do to improve conditions. They themselves, say that when things go bad they don't try harder. Coupled with their rejection of institutions these attitudes would seem to provide a basis for unrest such as we see today. They seem not to see any way to improve conditions through the normal avenues of change set up by our society.

Rejection of the norms and values of the older generation is not confined to the alienated. As shown by tables 2 and 6, money, power, and prominence are rejected by all the respondents. Being happy and being loved are their major goals. The problems they are concerned with are racism, poverty, pollution, and the drug traffic. Culture and recreation, and school courses don't rate very high. (tables 1 and 5)

It would appear from this that the young are as a whole, highly idealistic, which is to be expected. At the same time they seem to reject those goals which society tends to equate with the ability to gain influential positions. The problems that they see as being most important are ones which depend upon action by the older generation for solution, yet they see the older generation as being unlikely to do anything about it.

Alienation of the young has been the concern of the older generation in almost every generation. Many examples can be cited from the past wherein dire warnings are given regarding the "disasterous" behavior of the young. This should not be allowed to dilute the concern for the present. The most alienated possess the capacity

for deviant means of expression, including violence and confrontation. The current activities on and around various colleges are prime examples. This survey reveals that not only the alienated reject much of what our society offers but so do the non-alienated. We cannot pass this off as being just like everyother generation. No other younger generation has possessed the capacity and resources for deviant behavior as has this one and none has been so well publicized when it did act.

Somehow the older generation must come across to the young as being concerned with their goals and values and as willing to sit down with them and seek solutions. At present the use of the police seems inappropriate. The police are used by society to protect some of the very values and ideals which the young reject.

The older generation needs to look at itself and to determine what it was about itself that created today's younger generation. Then it must take the responsibility upon itself to deal with what it has created.

It should also be realized in studying the results of this survey that the most alienated in our city are probably not in school and, if they were, probably would not participate in a survey designed and administered by the "power structure."

APPENDIX

METROPOLITAN YOUTH COMMISSION QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is designed to find out what different young people think of the world and their part in it. It asks questions about you and your attitudes. We don't need to know your names on these questionnaires; they are completely anonymous. However, we would like to have you answer them frankly and seriously. Our object is to report to the community what Portland's young people think and want. Your cooperation will help us in this job.

Don't put your name on the questionnaire. Try to answer each question frankly and truthfully. If you have any questions, ask the person who is giving the test. We'd welcome your comments if you would write them at the end or in the margins.

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|---------|
| 1. Your Age | | _____ |
| 2. Your Sex | Male | _____ 0 |
| | Female | _____ 1 |
| 3. How far have you gone in school? (Give grade completed or years of college) | | _____ |
| 4. Race | White | _____ |
| | Black | _____ |
| | Oriental | _____ |
| | Other | _____ |

Here are some things that people feel differently about. Show how you feel about each by checking one blank on the right for each item.

- | | | |
|----------------|---------------|---------|
| 5. Your school | Good | _____ 4 |
| | Somewhat good | _____ 3 |
| | Don't care | _____ 2 |
| | Somewhat bad | _____ 1 |
| | Bad | _____ 0 |
| 6. Your city | Good | _____ 4 |
| | Somewhat good | _____ 3 |
| | Don't care | _____ 2 |
| | Somewhat bad | _____ 1 |
| | Bad | _____ 0 |

Metropolitan Youth Commission Questionnaire

Page 2

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------|-------|---|
| 7. The Armed Forces | Good | _____ | 4 |
| | Somewhat good | _____ | 3 |
| | Don't care | _____ | 2 |
| | Somewhat bad | _____ | 1 |
| | Bad | _____ | 0 |
| 8. School Teachers and
Other Officials | Good | _____ | 4 |
| | Somewhat good | _____ | 3 |
| | Don't care | _____ | 2 |
| | Somewhat bad | _____ | 1 |
| | Bad | _____ | 0 |
| 9. U.S. Government | Good | _____ | 4 |
| | Somewhat good | _____ | 3 |
| | Don't care | _____ | 2 |
| | Somewhat bad | _____ | 1 |
| | Bad | _____ | 0 |
| 10. The Police | Good | _____ | 4 |
| | Somewhat good | _____ | 3 |
| | Don't care | _____ | 2 |
| | Somewhat bad | _____ | 1 |
| | Bad | _____ | 0 |
| 11. Hippies | Good | _____ | 4 |
| | Somewhat good | _____ | 3 |
| | Don't care | _____ | 2 |
| | Somewhat bad | _____ | 1 |
| | Bad | _____ | 0 |
| 12. The churches | Good | _____ | 4 |
| | Somewhat good | _____ | 3 |
| | Don't care | _____ | 2 |
| | Somewhat bad | _____ | 1 |
| | Bad | _____ | 0 |
| 13. Business and industry | Good | _____ | 4 |
| | Somewhat good | _____ | 3 |
| | Don't care | _____ | 2 |
| | Somewhat bad | _____ | 1 |
| | Bad | _____ | 0 |

Metropolitan Youth Commission Questionnaire

Page 3

14. Your parents	Good	_____	4
	Somewhat good	_____	3
	Don't care	_____	2
	Somewhat bad	_____	1
	Bad	_____	0
15. Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts	Good	_____	4
	Somewhat good	_____	3
	Don't care	_____	2
	Somewhat bad	_____	1
	Bad	_____	0
16. YMCA -- YWCA	Good	_____	4
	Somewhat good	_____	3
	Don't care	_____	2
	Somewhat bad	_____	1
	Bad	_____	0
17. City officials	Good	_____	4
	Somewhat good	_____	3
	Don't care	_____	2
	Somewhat bad	_____	1
	Bad	_____	0

Here are some statements representing common attitudes. Please check to show whether or not you agree with them.

18. I am the master of my fate.	Completely Agree	_____	3
	Mostly Agree	_____	2
	Mostly Disagree	_____	1
	Completely Disagree	_____	0
19. Sometimes I can't understand why I do the things I do.	Completely Agree	_____	3
	Mostly Agree	_____	2
	Mostly Disagree	_____	1
	Completely Disagree	_____	0
20. What a person makes of his life depends on him.	Completely Agree	_____	3
	Mostly Agree	_____	2
	Mostly Disagree	_____	1
	Completely Disagree	_____	0
21. Getting what you want is mostly a matter of getting the breaks.	Completely Agree	_____	3
	Mostly Agree	_____	2
	Mostly Disagree	_____	1
	Completely Disagree	_____	0

Metropolitan Youth Commission Questionnaire

Page 4

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-------|---|
| 22. There are days when nothing seems to matter. | Completely Agree | _____ | 3 |
| | Mostly Agree | _____ | 2 |
| | Mostly Disagree | _____ | 1 |
| | Completely Disagree | _____ | 0 |
| 23. I am sure of my feelings about things that affect my life. | Completely Agree | _____ | 3 |
| | Mostly Agree | _____ | 2 |
| | Mostly Disagree | _____ | 1 |
| | Completely Disagree | _____ | 0 |
| 24. In life, some people are intended to be happy, others aren't. | Completely Agree | _____ | 3 |
| | Mostly Agree | _____ | 2 |
| | Mostly Disagree | _____ | 1 |
| | Completely Disagree | _____ | 0 |
| 25. Most of life is pretty boring. | Completely Agree | _____ | 3 |
| | Mostly Agree | _____ | 2 |
| | Mostly Disagree | _____ | 1 |
| | Completely Disagree | _____ | 0 |
| 26. When things go bad, I try harder. | Completely Agree | _____ | 3 |
| | Mostly Agree | _____ | 2 |
| | Mostly Disagree | _____ | 1 |
| | Completely Disagree | _____ | 0 |
| 27. Most of my experiences are interesting ones. | Completely Agree | _____ | 3 |
| | Mostly Agree | _____ | 2 |
| | Mostly Disagree | _____ | 1 |
| | Completely Disagree | _____ | 0 |
| 28. Most people won't really do anything to make this a better world. | Completely Agree | _____ | 3 |
| | Mostly Agree | _____ | 2 |
| | Mostly Disagree | _____ | 1 |
| | Completely Disagree | _____ | 0 |
| 29. Things parents want their child to do are for the child's own good. | Completely Agree | _____ | 3 |
| | Mostly Agree | _____ | 2 |
| | Mostly Disagree | _____ | 1 |
| | Completely Disagree | _____ | 0 |
| 30. With things as they are, most people would be better off if they were never born. | Completely Agree | _____ | 3 |
| | Mostly Agree | _____ | 2 |
| | Mostly Disagree | _____ | 1 |
| | Completely Disagree | _____ | 0 |

Metropolitan Youth Commission Questionnaire

Page 5

31. Nobody really cares about anyone else.
- | | | |
|---------------------|-------|---|
| Completely Agree | _____ | 3 |
| Mostly Agree | _____ | 2 |
| Mostly Disagree | _____ | 1 |
| Completely Disagree | _____ | 0 |
32. Parents are always looking for things to nag their children about.
- | | | |
|---------------------|-------|---|
| Completely Agree | _____ | 3 |
| Mostly Agree | _____ | 2 |
| Mostly Disagree | _____ | 1 |
| Completely Disagree | _____ | 0 |
33. Marijuana should be legalized.
- | | | |
|---------------------|-------|---|
| Completely Agree | _____ | 3 |
| Mostly Agree | _____ | 2 |
| Mostly Disagree | _____ | 1 |
| Completely Disagree | _____ | 0 |
34. Smoking or possession of marijuana should be considered a misdemeanor instead of a felony.
- | | | |
|---------------------|-------|---|
| Completely Agree | _____ | 3 |
| Mostly Agree | _____ | 2 |
| Mostly Disagree | _____ | 1 |
| Completely Disagree | _____ | 0 |
35. If you had a personal problem, which of the following people would you be most likely to talk it over with?
- | | | |
|----------------------------------------|-------|---|
| A parent | _____ | 4 |
| Friend of your own age and sex | _____ | 3 |
| Friend of your own age of opposite sex | _____ | 2 |
| An adult outside the family | _____ | 1 |
| Wouldn't talk it over with anyone | _____ | 0 |
36. How often do you attend meetings of clubs and organizations?
- | | | |
|--------------|-------|---|
| Never | _____ | 0 |
| Rarely | _____ | 1 |
| Once a month | _____ | 2 |
| Once a week | _____ | 3 |
| More often | _____ | 4 |
37. How often do you go to church?
- | | | |
|--------------|-------|---|
| Never | _____ | 0 |
| Rarely | _____ | 1 |
| Once a month | _____ | 2 |
| Once a week | _____ | 3 |
| More often | _____ | 4 |
38. Where do you live?
- | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|-------|---|
| At home with both parents | _____ | 4 |
| At home with a parent | _____ | 3 |
| With spouse | _____ | 2 |
| Independently (boarding house, apt. etc.) | _____ | 1 |
| Other (Institutions, foster home) | _____ | 0 |

Metropolitan Youth Commission Questionnaire
Page 6

39. How many times have you moved in the past five years?

None	_____	4
Once	_____	3
Twice	_____	2
Three	_____	1
4 or More	_____	0

40. Different people in school and out identify themselves with different groups. Which of the following groups do you identify with? (Check only one)

Squares	_____	0
Hippies	_____	1
Straights	_____	2
Hypes	_____	3
Soshes	_____	4
Hoods	_____	5
Brains	_____	6
Wheels	_____	7
Leftists	_____	8
None of these	_____	9

41. Have you ever been arrested?

Yes	_____	0
No	_____	1

42. What for? _____

43. Here are some problems our community has. Show how important you feel they are by putting 1 along side the most urgent problem and continue numbering until you get to 10 opposite the least important problem:

_____ Pollution	Racism	_____
_____ Lack of recreation and cultural events	School Courses	_____
_____ The curfew	Traffic congestion	_____
_____ Drug traffic	Police Methods	_____
_____ Poverty	Hippies	_____

44. If there are other problems you feel important, enter them here and indicate by a number how they would rank in comparison with the problems above.

45. What public figure in your lifetime have you most admired?

46. Among the people you know personally, whom do you most admire? (Don't give the person's name but identify his relation to you -- boyfriend, older sister, doctor, teacher, etc.)

47. Different people have different goals. Here are some possible ones. Indicate by numbering from 1 to 10 how these different goals stack up for you.

Having serenity	_____
Being a power in people's lives	_____
Being happy	_____
Being useful to the world and others	_____
Having people like you	_____
Having people admire you.	_____
Having a lot of money	_____
Being a prominent person	_____
Having a close family	_____
Being loved	_____

48. Here are some drugs some people use for "kicks." What has your experience been with them? If you have never used any, check here. And skip to question #71. If you have used a drug, answer #49-70.

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------|---|
| 49. Have you ever used marijuana? | Yes | _____ | 0 |
| | No | _____ | 1 |
| 50. Have you used it in the last year? | Yes | _____ | 0 |
| | No | _____ | 1 |
| 51. How extensive has that recent use been? | None | _____ | 4 |
| | Once | _____ | 3 |
| | 2 - 5 times | _____ | 2 |
| | 6 - 10 times | _____ | 1 |
| | more often | _____ | 0 |
| 52. Have you ever used inhalants (glue, solvents, gasoline)? | | | |
| | Yes | _____ | 0 |
| | No | _____ | 1 |
| 53. Have you used them in the last year? | Yes | _____ | 0 |
| | No | _____ | 1 |
| 54. How extensive has that recent use been? | None | _____ | 4 |
| | Once | _____ | 3 |
| | 2 - 5 times | _____ | 2 |
| | 6 - 10 times | _____ | 1 |
| | more often | _____ | 0 |
| 55. Have you ever used unprescribed amphetamines (like "pep pills" or "speed") | Yes | _____ | 0 |
| | No | _____ | 1 |
| 56. Have you used them in the last year? | Yes | _____ | 0 |
| | No | _____ | 1 |

Metropolitan Youth Commission Questionnaire

Page 8

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------|---|
| 57. How extensive has that recent use been? | None | _____ | 4 |
| | Once | _____ | 3 |
| | 2 - 5 times | _____ | 2 |
| | 6 - 10 times | _____ | 1 |
| | more often | _____ | 0 |
| 58. Have you ever used unprescribed barbiturates (like Seconal, Nembutal, "reds," or "yellows") | Yes | _____ | 0 |
| | No | _____ | 1 |
| 59. Have you used them in the last year? | Yes | _____ | 0 |
| | No | _____ | 1 |
| 60. How extensive has that recent use been? | None | _____ | 4 |
| | Once | _____ | 3 |
| | 2 - 5 times | _____ | 2 |
| | 6 - 10 times | _____ | 1 |
| | more often | _____ | 0 |
| 61. Have you ever used hallucinogens like LSD, mescaline, STP? | Yes | _____ | 0 |
| | No | _____ | 1 |
| 62. Have you used them in the last year? | Yes | _____ | 0 |
| | No | _____ | 1 |
| 63. How extensive has that recent use been? | None | _____ | 4 |
| | Once | _____ | 3 |
| | 2 - 5 times | _____ | 2 |
| | 6 - 10 times | _____ | 1 |
| | more often | _____ | 0 |
| 64. Have you ever used unprescribed opiates like heroin, morphine, Demerol, Dilaudid, Codeine pills, codeine cough syrup? | Yes | _____ | 0 |
| | No | _____ | 1 |
| 65. Have you used it in the last year? | Yes | _____ | 0 |
| | No | _____ | 1 |
| 66. How extensive was that recent use? | None | _____ | 4 |
| | Once | _____ | 3 |
| | 2 - 5 times | _____ | 2 |
| | 6 - 10 times | _____ | 1 |
| | more often | _____ | 0 |
| 67. Have you taken some other kind of medicine for "kicks"? | Yes | _____ | 0 |
| | No | _____ | 1 |
| 68. What kind was that? | _____ | | |
| 69. Was it in the last year? | Yes | _____ | 0 |
| | No | _____ | 1 |

Metropolitan Youth Commission Questionnaire

Page 9

70. How extensive was that recent use of unprescribed opiates? None _____ 4
 Once _____ 3
 2 - 5 times _____ 2
 6 - 10 times _____ 1
 more often _____ 0

71. What kind of work does your father do? (Describe what he does, not the company or institution he works for.) _____

72. If your mother works, what is her occupation? _____

73. If you work, what is your job? _____

74. How many hours do you work each week? _____

75. Do you and your parents see eye Yes, completely _____ 4
 to eye on goals for your future? We agree on most goals _____ 3
 Agree on some, disagree on others _____ 2
 Disagree on most goals _____ 1
 Completely disagree _____ 0

76. If you were the mayor of this city, what things would you do to make it a better place for young people to live? _____

77. We hope you have answered truthfully, if not check here _____.