DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 427 CG 004 633

AUTHOR	Geller, Jesse D.; Howard, Gary
TITLE	Student Activism and the War in Vietnam.
INSTITUTION	American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.; Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn.
Pub Date	Aug 69
Note	51p.; Paper presented at American Psychological Associaticn convention, Washington, D. C. August 31-September 4, 1969
EDRS Price	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.65
Descriptors	*Activism, *College Students, Political Affiliation, Political Influences, Political Issues, *Self Concept, Social Factors, Social Integration, Student Adjustment, *Student Alienation, Student Opinion, *Student Participation, Testing

Abstract

The present study represents an attempt to further delineate the sociological and psychological variables that predispose a student to become an activist of the "new left." A total of 103 students participated in the study, 48 experimental and 55 control subjects. Measures used included a self report, an activism index, a Vietnam opinion Survey, Rckeach's Dogmatism Scale (RDS), Rotter's Internal vs. External (I-E) Scale, an Importance of Activities questionnaire, and Stein's Self-Description Questionnaire. The behavioral criterion for identifying student activists which was ccnfirmed in this study consists of: (1) the degree of involvement with sociopclitical issues, and (2) the degree of rejection of the traditional values and institutional authority of the society. The inferences that can be drawn from this study are in accord with the fcrmulations that characterize other literature. Differences on only three of the replicatory demographic variables reached acceptable levels of statistical significance; religion, major field of study, and prospective occupation. While being expremely opinionated, the activists were not found to be ideologically rigid. Activists also have indicated confidence in their ability to influence others. The anti-institutionalization of activists does nct appear to have led to total alienation. (KJ)

STUDENT ACTIVISM AND THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Jesse D. Geller, Ph.D. and Gary Howard, B. A.
Yale University

INTRODUCTION

The present study represents an attempt to further delineate the sociological and psychological variables that predispose a student to become an activist of the "new left."

There are many varieties of contemporary student activism, and a growing number of schemes have been proposed to distinguish among these factions (Newfield, 1966; Keniston, 1967; Peterson, 1968; Kerpelman, 1969).

By requiring that activism be defined independently of political ideology, Block, Haan and Smith (1968) are the first to have succeeded in developing a classificatory system that makes it possible to extricate the correlates of activism per se from those of left wing student radicalism. For the purposes of this study, therefore, activism has been defined in terms of the criteria which they have suggested: 1) degree of involvement with contemporary political and social issues, and 2) degree of acceptance or rejection of the traditional values and the institutional authority of the society. Within this framework, the new left activist[1] can, therefore, be characterized by a deep concern about societal issues, a basic commitment to work for social change, and a willingness to engage in behavior that directly challenges the legitimacy of the prevailing institutions.

This definition recognizes that many students who are not dues-paying members of new leftist organizations should nevertheless be considered student activists. Thus, while in 1966 the organized student left[2] - formal affiliates of SDS, SNCC, SPU, CORE - ammounted to fewer than 15,000 (Peterson, 1966) in a population of six million students, a Harris

---

[1] Despite our recognition that the term activist subsumes both rightist and leftist student activists, henceforth, for the sake of convenience, the term will be used to refer only to activism of the left. Moreover, the terms protester, radical and activist will be used interchangable.

[2] Proportionately, the scope of organized student protest during the Depression was far greater than it is now. Lipset (1966) has noted that during the 30's, the American Student Union, an amalgamated group encompassing most radical student groups, claimed a membership of 100,000 in a college population that then numbered only one and a half million.

poll conducted in the spring of 1968 estimated that there are about 100,000 activists, or somewhere between one and two percent of the college population (quoted in Lipset, 1968).

The size of this disparity underscores the fact that most student demonstrations are composed of ad hoc forces temporarily united around a concrete issue. Even the by-now-famed Free Speech Movement (FSM) at Berkeley, according to Draper (1965), "never considered itself a permanent organization or movement.... The FSM was essentially a United Front plus some added representation, not a membership organization." (p. 160)

In keeping with the precedent established by previous research on student activism, the present study used a naturalistic behavioral criterion to identify the members of the "new left" on the Yale University campus.

During October of 1967, a Yale anti-war group circulated to every male Yale University resident a pledge card which read:

> We are men of draft age who believe that the United States is waging an unjust war in Vietnam. We cannot, in conscience participate in this war. We therefore declare our determination to refuse induction as long as the United States is fighting in Vietnam.

The circulation of these pledge cards created a considerable amount of turmoil, excitement, and conflict over a three-week period on the Yale campus. It catalyzed several mass meetings to discuss the legal implications of such an act. The possibility of severe legal sanctions was communicated to each prospective signer. The act of signing this draft-refusal pledge defines the behavioral criterion of activism for the present study.

In all, 300 undergraduate, graduate, and professional students signed the anti-war draft refusal pledge. This figure represents approximately 4% of the Yale student body and is consistent with the Gallup Poll finding that 7% of male students indicate that they will refuse to be inducted into the Armed Services (quoted in Lipset, 1968). It also lends support to Peterson's (1966)[3] and Braungart's (1966) estimates that student activists

---

[3]Peterson's comprehensive study of the scope of student protest further revealed that campus radicals tend to be concentrated largely at the more selective, academic colleges and universities and almost totally absent at teachers colleges, technical institutes, and religiously sponsored schools. Student rightists, on the other hand, tend to be active primarily at church-related colleges, Southern universities, and technical and other more vocationally oriented institutions.

represent a very small minority of the total student population on any given campus. This percentage, however, falls considerably short of Block, Haan, and Smith's (1968) findings at Berkeley. Of a representative sample of politically unafilliated students, 16% reported that they had participated in peace marches and demonstrations. There are several alternative explanations that can be advanced to account for such a discrepancy. For one, unlike Berkeley, CCNY, and the Universities of Michigan and Wisconsin, Yale does not have a tradition of student radicalism. In fact, Leventhal et al. (1964) concluded from their study of voting preferences at Yale, that during the early 1960's a norm favoring conservatism and the Republican party existed at the university. Another important possibility is that the signing of the draft refusal pledge entails a greater risk than mere attendance at a demonstration and therefore represents an excellent criterion for identifying the most committed of student activists.[4]

The decision by a single individual, to sign the draft refusal pledge, was obviously determined by the interaction of a number of psychosocial variables: his place in the social structure, his motives, his attitudes, the information he possessed, his self-concept, and his values. These and other possible predispositional variables have been dealt with in the growing body of literature on student activism.

Review of the Relevant Literature. The student activist's participation in social change is often popularly viewed as being motivated either by alien political influences or unhealthy psychological forces. Keniston (1967) summarizes this stereotyped view as follows:

> Bearded, be-levi-ed, long haired, dirty and unkempt, he is seen as profoundly disaffected from his society, often influenced by "radical" (Marxist, Communist, Maoist, or Castroite) ideas, an experimenter in sex and drugs, unconventional in his daily behavior. Frustrated and unhappy, often deeply maladjusted as a person, he is a "failure" (or as one U.S. Senator put it, a "reject"). (p. 110).

---

[4] Despite the stringent nature of the criterion it must be recognized that many radicals oppose draft resistance on principle and/or tactical grounds.

This depiction is not restricted to the mass media or the right wing press. Similar interpretations have also been proposed by several prominent social critics (Feuer, 1965; Glazer, 1965; Kennan, 1968; Hook, 1968; Barzun, 1968). In discussing the student revolt over free speech at the University of California, Nathan Glazer argued, for example, that "only homosexuality or perversion, it seemed, could make an issue at Berkeley" (p. 287), while Professor Lewis Feuer maintained that:

> The conglomeration (the FSM) acts as a magnet for the morally corrupt: intellectual lumpen proletarians, lumpen beatniks, and lumpen agitators wend their ways to the university campus to advocate a melange of narcotics, sexual perversion, collegiate Castroism and campus Maoism.(1965, p. 136)

The empirical findings differ strikingly from this stereotype . From his comprehensive review of the literature Keniston (1966) counterposes the following portrayal:

> Compared to his classmates, the typical activist tends to be a better than average student,[5] a committed and dedicated intellectual, ethically or even religiously oriented, and a relatively well-balanced and well-liked person. He is rarely a "failure" in his own eyes or in the eyes of the college community. The better his grade average, the more likely he will be involved in and/or support student activism...whatever evidence is available- and increasing amounts are - suggests that student activists are selectively drawn from the most talented and committed students in the humanities and social science and that they are largely concentrated at the most academic colleges and universities....(p. 337)

Empirical research has also suggested a host of family background and demographic variables which seem to distinguish student activists from their less politically committed peers (Watts and Whittaker, 1966; Braungart, 1966; Westby and Braungart, 1966; Katz, 1967; Trent and Craise, 1967; Peterson, 1967; Flacks, 1967). Flacks (1967) summarized some of the results of these investigations as follows: "students involved in protest activities are characteristically from families which are urban, highly educated, Jewish or irreligious, professional and affluent," and concluded that unlike the campus radicals of the Thirties, who were attracted to radicalism because they were economically deprived or because their economic mobility was blocked, the present student movement is predominantly composed of

---

[5] Heist's (1965) data, moreover, indicate that student protesters are somewhat less likely to drop out of college than nonparticipants in demonstrations.

"...students who have been born to high social advantage and who are in a position to experience the career and status opportunities of the society without significant limitations" (p. 56). Or as Tom Hayden, the former SDS president put it, "They were born with status and affluence as facts of life, not goals to be striven for" (1966, p. 187).

There is evidence to further indicate that, although more radical than their parents, student activists come predominantly from homes with fairly liberal outlooks on domestic and foreign issues[6] (Solomon and Fishman, 1964; Flacks, 1967; Keniston, 1968). A disproportionate number of the peace demonstrators Solomon and Fishman (1964) studied, reported that their parents held views essentially similar to their own and accepted or supported their activities. Data cited by Flacks (1967) suggest that activists may even be somewhat closer than non-activists to their parents' views on controversial issues such as the justifiability of U.S. bombing of North Vietnam.

In contrast to the popular view that the student activist is influenced by alien political forces, Flacks argues that, in light of evidence, "a more supportable view suggests that the great majority of these students are attempting to fulfill and renew the political traditions of their families" (p. 68). By emphasizing the estrangement of activists from various political institutions, we overlook moreover, according to Keniston (1967) "...the more basic commitment of most student activists to other ancient, traditional and credal American values like free speech, citizen's participation in decision making, equal opportunity and justice. In so far as the activist rejects all or part of the power structure, it is because current political realities fall so far short of the ideals he sees as central to the American creed." (p. 112)

Several less frequently replicated demographic variables may also differentiate activists from nonactivists. Birth order, for example, has been found to covary both with participation in leftist activities (Solomon and Fishman, 1964) and with extreme political and economic conservatism (Schiff, 1964). Seventy-five percent of all the

---

6 Conversely, the parents of student rightists, such as the Young Americans for Freedom, are disproportionately Republican and Protestant.

the University of Chicago peace demonstrators Solomon and Fishman sampled, were the oldest child of their sex in their immediate family, while the conservative activists in Schiff's study were, with but one exception, the eldest or only sons in their families. According to Lipset (1967), upperclassmen, despite being more liberal in their attitudes than lowerclassmen, tend to give less time to politics. The greater activism of freshmen and sophomores as well as transfer students, he suggests, may reflect the student's reaction to being released from the pressures of entrance anxiety, or the liberating influences of the university, or even their attempt to find in organizational life a kind of replacement for the collectivity they have just left. Finally, Stouffer (1955) has found a significant relationship between geographical location, urbanization, and degree of liberalism. Individuals in his sample who lived in large urban areas and in either the East or the West tended to be considerably more tolerant, open-minded, and liberal than residents of rural areas, or residents of either the Middle-West or South.

Involvement in radical politics depends not only upon one's place in the social structure but on one's psychological characteristics as well. Therefore, besides attempting to replicate the aforementioned demographic findings, the present study was designed to test the implications of several hypotheses that have emerged from the more clinical and impressionistic studies in the literature.

Generalized Activism. Most investigators seem to assume that student activism represents a relatively enduring personality disposition rather than an intermittent and transitory response to specific external circumstances (Bay, 1967; Sampson, 1967; Block, Haan, and Smith, 1968). If this assumption is to be accepted, it must be demonstrated that activists engage in a variety of functionally related behaviors (e.g. community organizing, picketing, neighborhood canvassing, election campaigning, participation in public demonstrations). Yet, to date, most of the studies in the area have employed only a single, highly topical, behavioral event as their inductive base.

In response to this problem, and despite the obvious face validity of signing the draft refusal pledge as an operational definition of activism, it was felt necessary to

develop supplementary measures of activism which would enable us to determine whether the single behavioral criterion, does in fact, covary with an extensive and sustained commitment to political dissent. These data would simultaneously enable us to differentiate between those signers (and possibly nonsigners) who are basically committed to reforming prevailing institutions and those for whom signing the draft-refusal pledge represents an isolated, ephemeral instance of political defiance.

Political Knowledge and Sophistication. Bay (1967) has hypothesized that the liberal or radical activist orientation tends to be rooted less often in irrational ego-defensive motives and social acceptance anxieties than are more conservative, less action-oriented views. Keniston (1967) has similarly concluded that activists tend to have greater sensitivity to and knowledge of historical trends and events than nonactivists. The various studies conducted at Berkeley, furthermore, suggest that students who show a concern for ideas, an appreciation of theory and knowledge, and broad intellectual concerns are also more prone to be on the left, and favorable to activism (Heist, 1964; Somers, 1965; Watts and Whittaker, 1966).

On the other hand, Sidney Hook (1968) has characterized the dominant mood of the Columbia University protesters as one of "irrationalism"; Jacques Barzun has accused militant activists of showing "a distrust and neglect of reasoning" (1968), and George Kennan maintains that despite the sincerity and idealism of student activists, a "strong streak of hysteria and exaggeration" (1968) colors their view of many problems. In commenting upon the attitudes of Hook, Barzun, and Kennan towards student radicals, Duberman argues that "...all three men equate (and thereby confuse) 'emotion' with 'irrationality'" (1968, p. 66). Yet, even such an enthusiastic supporter of student radicals as Jack Newfield acknowledges that they are sometimes "hopelessly romantic" and that, "Segments of the New Left are anti-intellectual, sometimes even anti-rational" (1966, p. 17).

In response to this controversy, it was decided to follow up a suggestion made by Sampson (1967) that degree of sophistication on relevant political issues would distinguish committed activists from nonactivist students. In other words, we raised the

question of whether the signers of the anti-war draft-refusal pledge were better informed as to the history and nature of the United States involvement in Vietnam than the general student population. If, in fact, they proved to be more knowledgeable about the "facts" relevant to their activism, we would be in a better position to comment upon the broader issue of the possible irrationality of their beliefs.

Intensity of Issue Related Opinion. Another assumption which runs through the literature, but which has rarely been empirically documented, is that students who are actively involved in a particular social or political issue actually have more intense or extreme issue-related opinions and beliefs than nonparticipants.

Peterson (1968) believes "the radical activists are characterized by a more passionate sense of outrage at perceived hypocrisy, injustice, and wrong doing" (p. 303) than any other student "type" including the hippies and those academically and intellectually oriented students who are left of center in their politics. While Michael Harrington (1966) sees their existential, moralistic, and emotional critique of the U.S. as the basis for a new "conscience politics," Luce (1966) regards their emotionality as an attempt to mask a lack of ideological sophistication.

Given the essentially untested nature of these assumptions, one of the goals of the present study was to compare the intensity and direction of activists, versus nonactivists opinions on issues relevant to the behavioral criterion, i.e., the degree to which they criticize and reject U.S. policies and military strategies in Vietnam.

It must be recognized, however, that vehemence of opinion alone is not sufficient to explain why some act while others who never engage in opposition share the same intensity of feeling and principles. For example, during the free speech rebellion at Berkeley, for every student sitting-in at Sproul Hall there were twenty-one sympathetic non-participating students who approved (either mildly or strongly) of the Free Speech Movement (Gales, 1965). Hence, we turn our attention to the contribution of broader, less directly issue-related personality variables to the decision to sign the petition.

Authoritarianism of the Left. Several authors (Flacks, 1967; Keniston, 1967; Draper, 1965; Luce, 1966) have cautioned against confusing the "new" student left with the "old" left, or in Jack Newfield's (1966) words the "hereditary" left.[7] The hierarchically and centrally organized radical movement of the Thirties was characterized by a strong adherence to formal political ideologies, a preoccupation with ideological correctness, and a great deal of factionalism. Today's student radicals, on the other hand, seem to be more pluralistic, impatient with doctrinaire or ideological formulations of events, rejecting of institutionalized, central organizational control, commited to collective decision-making in small groups, and pragmatic in their focus on specific issues and tactics. Furthermore, unlike radical movements of previous generations, the present radical movement is characterized by an anti-elitist point of view that advocates change originating on the grass-roots level. It is the poor, the oppressed, and the exploited who themselves know best how to deal with their own problems, argues today's student militant.

The existence of these historical trends would seem to lend support to the conclusion that today's left-oriented activists are anti-dogmatic and nonauthoritarian. Moreover, data bearing upon the "intellectual dispositions" (Trent and Craise, 1967) and cognitive functioning (Heist, 1965; Watts and Whittaker, 1966) of the "new" leftists indicates that they are free of the rigidity and intolerance of ambiguity that is said to characterize the authoritarian personality (Adorno et al., 1950; Rokeach, 1960).

---

[7] According to Newfield, the student wing of the old left is now chiefly represented by the Progressive Labor Party.

Nevertheless, Keniston has noted that several 'scholarly analysts, usually men now disillusioned by the radicalism of the 1930's, have expressed fear of the dogmatism, rigidity, and 'authoritarianism of the Left' of today's student activists" (1967, p.110). Lipset has similarly cautioned that in evaluating the reliability of current research on activists it is necessary to consider the possibility that "the attitudes expressed by the deeply committed are more a function of their ideology than of their personal orientation as expressed in deeds. Those leftists who have demonstrated intolerance and other authoritarian traits in practice may still give voice or pencil to liberal values in principle' (1968, p. 50).

Conceptually, the uncompromising moral tone of many student militants might be construed as resembling the closed-minded cognitive functioning that Rokeach (1960) regards as the essential ingredient in general authoritarianism. According to Rokeach, general authoritarianism or Dogmatism, as contrasted to right wing authoritarianism, is best conceived of as a mode of thought or cognitive style rather than as a set of beliefs.[8] The dogmatic personality, from this point of view, can therefore hold any specific beliefs; what is crucial is the tenacity with which beliefs are held, not the beliefs themselves. In this regard, Draper (1965) has acknowledged that although campus radicals do not share a comprehensive political ideology, they are inclined to substitute a dogmatic moral approach for careful political and social analyses.

In light of the scope of this controversy, it would be impossible to justify unequivocably a directional hypothesis. It is clear, however, that a clarification of the issue of authoritarianism is crucial for an understanding of activism.

---

[8] Paradoxically, despite Rokeach's attempt to develop an instrument to measure authoritarianism of all political persuasions, his overall results led him to conclude that the authoritarian individual, at least in modern political systems, is more likely to subscribe to a conservative ideology (1960).

Internal Versus External Locus of Control. The student activists' belief in the value and efficacy of direct socio-political action, their responsiveness to the deprivation of civil rights on and off the campus, and their attachment to leaderless, decentralized, participatory democracy seems to bespeak a repudiation of the fatalistic view that "you can't fight city hall!" The Vietnamese War, however, poses a formidable challenge to the activists' faith in their own actions as being potentially effective in catalyzing change. As Sampson (1967) points out: "The war produces a setting in which almost every day those opposed to it are confronted with the frustrating realization of their own personal ineffectuality in influencing current policy, or in shaping the future of a nation and a world..." (p. 27).

This dilemma parallels the two poles of the locus of control concept (Rotter, 1966) which has been demonstrated to be highly relevant to the issue of student activism. The concept refers to the degree to which individuals perceive events in their life as being determined by their own efforts and skills, or as beyond their personal control, that is as stemming from such forces as luck, chance, fate, or the influence of powerful others. The former pole is defined as a belief in internal control, the latter as a belief in external control.

In a test of the predictive utility of this concept, Gore and Rotter (1963) obtained signed commitments from students at a southern Negro college regarding activities to be undertaken during their vacation in behalf of the Civil Rights Movement. Students who were willing to take part in the march on the state capitol, or to join a Freedom Riders Group, were clearly and significantly more internal than those who were willing to attend a rally, those who were not interested in participation at all, or those who avoided filling out the requested form. Similarly, when Strikland (1965) compared Negroes active in the Civil Rights Movement with inactive Negroes who were matched for education and socio-economic status, she also found activists to be significantly more internal.

Although these data would seem to support the hypothesis that activists are characterized by greater internality than the general student population, there may be a danger in generalizing findings derived from studies of black activists to white activists. As Charles Hamilton (from Lipset, 1968) points out, black activism tends to be instrumental, that is, directed toward securing attainable goals and reforms. The activism of affluent white students, on the other hand, tends more often, to be expressive, that is, primarily oriented toward voicing their rejection of the current power structure. Moreover, although most commentators tend to regard student activists as political optimists, another speculative trend in the literature points to an alternative hypothesis (Howe, 1965; Block, Haan and Smith, 1968). For example, Block et.al. maintain that:

> They are not optimistic about the effects their protests will have on society. Although their protests seek to dramatize social issues, their behavior is based on a concern for personal integrity and authenticity. They feel compelled by their need for fidelity to speak out forcibly on issues they view as morally wrong; not to do so would be to participate in what for them is common hypocrisy. (p.211)

Given this controversy, it was decided to explore whether the activists in our sample are characterized by greater internality than a representative sample of the general student population.

Values and Life Style. The hypothesis that activists share a clearly distinguishable set of values and pursue an atypical style of life is another recurrent theme in the literature. Flacks (1967) maintains that student activists can be distinguished from their peers by their adherence to the following complex of values: romanticism, anti-authoritarianism, absence of moralism, anti-dogmatism, a strong sense of community, anti-institutionalism, intellectualism, and humanitarianism, as well as a tendency to deemphasize or positively devalue personal achievement, conventional morality, and conventional religiosity. With few exceptions, this list of values is agreed upon by most of the investigators of student activists, including Solomon and Fishman (1964), Bay (1967), Sampson (1967) and Keniston (1968). It may well be that although today's activists do not share a well formed, comprehensive political ideology, the above (ostensibly nonpolitical) configuration of values might in itself constitute a powerful ideology.

Irving Howe (1965) has criticized the emphasis on "personal style" among many of the new left political activists suggesting that style has in many instances taken precedence over the content of the revolt, i.e., that the existential act of rebellion, whatever its forms has come to be enough. Keniston (1968) has broadened the discussion of this issue by introducing the concept of "post modern style" to describe an approach to the world which student activists seem to be evolving. Characteristics which Keniston ascribes to this emergent life style include a focus on process rather than program, a self-conscious effort to remain open and responsive to change, interracialism, internationalism, an ambivalence toward technology, a psychological commitment to non-violence, an abhorence of exploitative and artificial relationships. Keniston would seem to be agreeing with Richard Schaull's (1967) conclusion that the ultimate goal of the radical activist is to discover "a new form of personal existence, for himself and for others" (p. 194).

Because of the importance of these considerations, the present study assessed possible differences between signers and non-signers on such issues as privatism, careerism, professionalism, and unconventionality.

Motivation. Speculations regarding the motivational bases of student activism abound in the literature. Most of these psychodynamic formulations revolve around two related issues: the adolescent's personal struggle to move from dependence to independence and the question of whether his politically defiant behavior is rooted primarily in an identification with or rebellion against parental values. The sympathy or hostility which the theoretician feels towards student activists clearly comes through in the way in which he interprets this issue.

A popularly held view, according to Keniston (1968), asserts that radicalism is symptomatic of: "a violent rebellion against and hatred of all male, paternal, and societal authority," and that the student activist is "displacing the conflicts of his family onto society and the world, 'acting out' intrapsychic conflict in his external behavior" (p. 47). This explanation clearly implies a pathological basis for radicalism, almost as though it were equivalent to such anti-social behavior as juvenile delinquency and devoid of

moral-ethical justifications. Furthermore, this explanation overlooks the possibility that: "Rejection of major <u>societal</u> values does not necessarily imply rebellion against parental attitudes." (Block, Haan and Smith, 1968, p. 215)

This formulation stands in marked contrast to Solomon and Fishman's (1964) description of activism as a form of "pro-social acting out", which reflects to some degree of synthesis of both identification with and rebellion against parental values. Flacks (1967) has succinctly presented a similar view: "They (student activists) are not, on the whole, repudiating or rebelling against explicit parental values but rather acting out those values which their parents explicitly believed, but did not have the courage or opportunity to practice or fight for" (p. 68).

The extensive involvement of student activists in the civil rights movement has led Keniston (1967) to offer yet another formulation of the identification issue. Activists as a group, he has suggested, "seem to possess an unusual copacity for nurturant identification that is, for empathy and sympathy with the underdog, the oppressed and the needy. Such a capacity can have many origins, but its most likely source in upper-middle class professional families is identification with an active mother whose own work embodies nurturant concern for others" (p. 120). This hypothesis is consistent with Reisman's belief that leftists are more comfortable with "femine" concerns than politically conservative students whom he regards as being threatened by such emotions as compassion and pity (quoted in Lipset, 1968).

Other motivational variables, inherent and induced, which have been posited as being relevant to activism include risk talking, exhibitionistic needs and the need for recognition (Solomon and Fishman, 1967). Also, Frank Pinner (1968) has suggested that many college students join activist groups as a means of overcoming the anxiety and loneliness produced by their isolation from family and high school friends. In this sense, activism could be seen as an expression of dependency or affiliative needs. Finally, as with the hippies, an aesthetic quest or a search for something to affirm, has been considered to be an important factor in affecting a student's propensity for activism (Keniston, 1968).

In an attempt to add some clarity to what is at present a highly speculative picture, the present study posed the question of whether any differences in motivation could be discerned between activists and nonactivist students.

METHODOLOGY

Preliminary Considerations: Any attempt to study objectively the psycho-social origins and correlates of student activism is beset with methodological difficulties. The issues are rarely, if ever, accessible to study under controlled experimental conditions, and, consequently, most previous research has been either journalistic, or naturalistic and postdictive. Such approaches are subject to a number of criticisms and limitations.

When research instruments are administered during or immediately after a demonstration or protest rally, soliciting the unsuspecting subjects' cooperation is difficult, and the likelihood of nonuniform methods of test administration is great. Moreover, when subjects are aware that they are being questioned as members or representatives of a particular group, they may attempt to present themselves in a manner which they view as consistent with the public image of that group. In keeping with this, the responses of student activists to attitude surveys and psychological tests may be influenced by the popularly known findings of social scientists as well as the familiar image created by the mass media. Lipset has also warned that: "It is often their (student activists') ideologies rather than their true sentiments which are dictating their answers" (1968, p. 50). It may be because of some of these methodological problems that Coles (1964) concluded that traditional attitudinal and motivational psychology could not be useful in differentiating between those who would act and those who would not.

Although the present study shares some of these general limitations, the specific problem of subject contamination was partially overcome by masking the selection criterion for activist subjects. Like the control subjects, they considered themselves to have been randomly selected from the college population.

Subjects. Given the assumption that signing the draft refusal pledge would have different implications for undergraduate, graduate, divinity, law and medical students, it was decided to restrict our sample to undergraduates. The decision to render the sample more homogeneous was also guided by the belief that it would make the findings easier to handle conceptually, since it has been found that older activists, those in their middle twenties, seem to form a separate psychosocial population from the younger students (Solomon and Fishman, 1964; Keniston, 1968).

From a pool of 150 undergraduate signers of the draft refusal pledge, 38 participated as subjects in this study. Their names were randomly drawn from a list published in the Yale Daily News, a campus newspaper. The control sample consisted of 39 nonsigners drawn randomly from the general undergraduate population.

The students who eventually participated in the study were recruited by a standardized telephone call which outlined in very general terms the nature of the research (i.e., student attitudes toward the war in Vietnam) but which did not inform them of the real reasons for their being selected. The telephone call proved to be quite effective in soliciting cooperation: of the 51 signers contacted 94% (48) agreed to take part in the study, and of the 58 control subjects contacted 95% (55) agreed to participate. The proportion of students who actually attended the testing sessions were 79% and 71% respectively for activists and controls. Because of the similarity in attrition rates in the two groups, it was assumed that lack of attendance was primarily a function of the recruitment technique employed rather than evidence of systematic biases in the sampling of either group.

General Description and Rationale for the Selection of Specific Measures:

Demographic Variables. Information regarding the following biographical variables was provided by self report: class in college, age, birth order, religion, military status, major field of academic study, perceived academic standing, nature of secondary school training (i.e., public vs. private), prospective occupation, marital status, dating habits, mother and father's education, occupation and political affiliations and location of home (i.e., urban, suburban, or rural).

Father's education and occupation were combined to yield a measure of each student's social class as computed by the Hollingshead (1957) two factor index of social position.

The following data were secured from the files of the University's Registrar's office: Verbal and Mathematical college board scores, rank in high school class predicted cumulative grade point average,[9] actual grade point average (GPA), geographical region of the country lived in during childhood, and extent and kind of organizational affiliations. Information bearing upon extent of participation in campus organizations was sought in order to eventually test the validity of Lipset's (1968) hypothesis that characteristics which have been identified as those of leftist activists may characterize the involved generally. In his methodological critique of the existing studies, Lipset argued that leftist activists should be compared with conservative activists and those involved in non-political forms of campus activity.

Generalized Activism. An activism index was developed for this project primarily to determine whether signing of the draft refusal pledge constitutes an adequate operational definition of activism; that is, whether it covaries with a relatively enduring, stable commitment to political and social activism. The index includes 16 different activities typically engaged in by activist students e.g., peace marches, community service projects, and community organizing. No attempt was made to distinguish between instrumental and expressive activities or between those which directly challenge the status quo and those which are "constructivistic" according to Smith, Haan, and Block's definition (1967).

Subjects checked items which depict an activity in which they have participated and their score represents a sum of the total number of positive responses. In the absence of an exact criterion for weighting activities, the scale attributes equal importance to all 16 items. In the present study, odd-even split-half reliability of the activism index, corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula, was found to be 0.70.

As a corollary to the Activism Index, subjects were asked to rate their political self-image on a six-point scale ranging from "very conservative" to "radical."

Attitude Toward the Vietnam War. A "Vietnam Opinion Survey" (VOS) was constructed by the present authors to determine whether activists are characterized by more intense and vehement anti-war opinions than nonactivist students. The initial step in the development

---

[9] A student's predicted cumulative grade point average is computed from a formula which takes into account his high school achievements, college board scores, as well as the university's knowledge about the performance at Yale of students who have previously come from his particular high school.

of the VOS was the writing of 40 diverse items using a Likert format. Several sources were used in obtaining an initial item pool -- political speeches, newspaper editorials, popular news magazines, and a questionnaire developed by Greenwald and Sakumura (1968) for a learning experiment. Only those statements which seemed clearly and unambiguously pro-or anti-administration were selected for the original version of the VOS.

The resulting 40 item scale was then group administered to two classes of male and female undergraduates at Clark University (N=57) and Southern Connecticut State College (N=70). The preliminary items were also given to 10 independent judges for ratings on the clarity of presentation of either pro or anti-administration sentiment. Two criteria were established for inclusion of items in the final form of the VOS: 1) an adequate distribution of responses across the six Likert categories: strong agree, agree, mildly agree, mildly disagree, disagree, strongly disagree and 2) unanimous placement of the item by the judges in either the pro-or anti-administration category. The final form of the VOS consists of those 34 items which satisfied these two criteria, including 15 anti-administration and 19 pro-administration statements. Approximately half of the items were thus reversed to control for acquiescent response set. The scale is scored in such a way that the higher the score the greater the anti-administration sentiment. Sample items are:

1. The U.S. is fighting to prevent the violent overthrow of the legitimate government in South Vietnam.

2. The U.S. government has repeatedly engaged in historical and legal distortions in order to justify its presence in Vietnam.

Cowdry, Cabin, and Keniston[10] have recently subjected the VOS to correlational and factor analytic analyses of coherence and unidimensionality using data from 131 Yale seniors. Within their sample, all 34 items correlated with the total scale score at the $p < .01$ level or better; 22 of the items correlated with the total score at or above .60. A factor analysis with Veramax rotation of the VOS items together with items from Keniston's alienation scales yielded a distinct first factor clearly identifiable as a VOS factor: total VOS score loads .935 on this factor, and each item loads above .470. In other words, the factor accounted for 87.4% of the total variance on the VOS scale. VOS items were not highly loaded on any other

---

[10] Personal communication, 1969.

factor. Such high loadings convincingly established the reliability, coherence, and unidimensionality of the VOS.

Degree of issue-related sophisitication. The "Vietnam Information Survey" (VIS) was developed to determine whether activists have greater knowledge of issue-related facts than non-activists. The VIS is comprised of 30 multiple choice questions concerning a broad range of issues relating to the Vietnam War. An original version of the scale consisted of 34 items taken from popular newspapers and news magazines. The items were selected to represent neutral factual knowledge as independent as possible from opinion-related biases. The 34 item scale was submitted to four independent judges for criticism of item clarity and relevance and also pretested at the two aforementioned colleges. On the basis of the pretest results, four items with poor discriminatory power were eliminated, decreasing the scale to 30 items. A sample item follows:

President Johnson has utilized the _____ resolution to legitamize escalation of the war in Vietnam.

1. Geneva Accords
2. Guam conference
3. Tonkin Bay
4. International Control Commission

Authoritarianism. Rokeach's Dogmatism scale (Form E) was used to explore the relationship between activism and authoritarianism. According to Rokeach (1960), the Dogmatism Scale, in contrast to the F scale, is politically neutral along major conventional right-left dimensions and can therefore be used to measure general authoritarianism and intolerance. Subjects indicate agreement or disagreement with each of the scale's 40 items on a scale ranging from -3 to 13 with the 0 point eliminated to force a preference. The scale is subsequently converted for scoring purposes to a 1- to -7 scale, the total score being the sum of scores across all items. The higher the score the greater the closed-mindedness (dogmatism); the lower the score the greater the open-mindedness. Sample items are:

1. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of what they stand for.

2. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.

Belief in Internal versus External Control. To measure this personality variable (i.e., generalized expectancy), Rotter's (1966) Internal vs. External Control (I-E) scale was included in the test battery. It is a forced-choice test consisting of 23 critical and six buffer items with one statement endorsing the inevitability of events (external control) and one endorsing the view that events can be controlled by personal action (internal control). In each case, the individual chooses the statement he more strongly believes. The scale is scored in terms of the total number of external choices made by the subject; a high score therefore indicates a fatalistic orientation. A sample item follows:

I more strongly agree that,

a) The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.

b) This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

Values and Life Style. Derrer's (1967) Importance of Activities questionnaire was selected to test the hypothesis that student activists share a complex of values and a life style that is distinctly different from non-activists. In choosing this instrument, we were guided by the assumption that finer discriminations could be achieved by comparing preferences for each of a large number of activities of general interest to college students rather than by measuring their attitudes toward globally defined values and roles. The scale was slightly expanded for the purposes of this study. Subjects indicate their evaluation of each of the scale's 21 items on a six-point scale ranging from "very important to me" to "I am opposed to this."

Typical of the scale are the following items: How important is it to you that you: (1) make high grades at Yale, (2) join a fraternity, (3) go on to graduate school. The questionnaire does not yield an overall score; consequently activists were compared to non-activists on the basis of their responses to each of the items. The instrument is designed to extract, however, through such techniques as factor analysis, clusters of preferences that conform to various roles and values.

Motivation. The Self-Description Questionnaire (SDQ), developed by Stein, (1966) in a study of creativity, was used to further delineate the self-image and motivational patterns of the two groups. The fact that the SDQ was standardized, in large measure, on Peace Corps volunteers, would seem to recommend its use in this study. The test consists of twenty paragraphs each of which describes one of Henry Murray's (1938) manifest needs. The following needs are included: abasement, achievement, affiliation, aggression, autonomy, blameavoidance, counteraction, defendance, deference, dominance, exhibition, harmavoidance, infavoidance, nurturance, order, play, rejection, sentience, sex, and succorance. These needs were selected by Stein because they were regarded as potential inhibitors or facilitators of creative ability. Each paragraph includes both specific as well as general manifestations of the need in question. The descriptive paragraph for need achievement, as an example, is: "I accomplish difficult things, I try to overcome obstacles and to achieve a high standard. I compete with others and try to surpass them. I am ambitious and aspiring."

In responding to the questionnaire, the subject is asked to rank the paragraphs from the one which is most descriptive of himself (rank of 1) to the one which is least descriptive of himself (rank of 20). The ranks that the subject assigns each of these paragraphs may be used just as the scores on any personality test or the data may be used to determine the "profiles" (i.e., the patterns of the needs) of various types of individuals. In other words, by employing Q-technique factor analyses,"types" may be extracted.

Procedure. The test battery was group administered in eight sessions over a three week period just prior to and after the Spring vacation of 1968. Hence, nearly a five month interval separated the events which led to the "creation" of the groups and the actual experiment. Each session was attended by approximately 10 students and included both activists and control subjects so as to further mask the selection criterion for activists. Preservation of the anonymity of the students was stressed and guaranteed;

they were given a brief set of verbal instructions, and allowed to work through the battery at their own speed. Each subject completed the entire battery in one session, requiring on the average one-and-a-half hours.

During the testing session, the students filled out in fixed succession the demographic variables inventory, Dogmatism Scale, SDQ, Activism Index, Importance of Activities questionnaire, I-E scale, VOS and VIS. The Vietnam scales were placed last in the standardized sequence in order to utilize the self-motivating nature of these instruments as a counterbalance against fatigue late in the session. The VOS preceded the VIS so that the subject's perceived level of confidence in his performance on the VIS would not effect his opinion responses.

RESULTS

The data collected in this study call for several different modes of statistical analysis. This initial report focuses solely on the relationship between each of the demographic and personality variables, and the behavioral criterion of student activism.

Because of the exploratory nature of this work, all significance levels are based on two-tailed tests, even though the direction of differences for some of the variables was specified.

Demographic Variables - Replicatory and Exploratory. To estimate the degree of association between the demographic variables and the behavioral criterion, the relevant distributions of scores were tabulated in contingency tables and chi-square calculated in each instance. Whenever possible, t-tests were performed. The results of these analyses are summarized in Tables 1 through 4.

Academic Variables. Whereas Lipset (1968) has reported that student activists tend to be concentrated in the freshman and sophomore years, our data indicate that, as a group, the signers of the draft refusal pledge tended to be older but not at a

higher year level in the university than the non-signers. Signers came disproportionately from students who were 21 years of age or older ($X^2=3.96$, $p<.05$). Their mean age was 20.3 years (S.D.=1.6) while the mean age of their nonsigning peers was 19.6 (S.D.=1.1). The obtained t-value of 2.23 is significant at beyond the .05 level. Inspection of Table 1 reveals the essentially chance nature of the distribution of students by semester standing within the two groups.

Insert Table 1 about here

With respect to type of secondary school attended, signers and non-signers were approximately equally distributed. Almost two-thirds of the students in both groups had attended public schools, and in light of the admissions policies at Yale, it is not surprising to find that both groups came to the university with superior academic credentials. Table 2 shows that whether measured by standardized scholastic aptitude tests or rank in high school class, both groups seem to be practically identical in terms of achievement potential. Yet when compared on the basis of Yale's predicted career grade point average (GPA), the difference between the means of the two groups approached but did not reach the .05 level of significance (t=1.68, df=75). The non-signers, as a group, were predicted to achieve a cumulative GPA of 83.43 (S.D.=7.00) while the predicted GPA for the signers was 81.05 (S.D.=5.48).

On the basis of the t-test analyses presented in Table 2, it can be concluded that this predicted difference was not reflected in actual achievements.[11] As can be seen, a significant mean difference was not obtained when the overall grade point averages of the

---

[11] The predicted differences finding is noteworthy, nevertheless, if only because it represents the first occasion of a non-activist group being deemed, by any criterion, as intellectually superior. The discrepancy between predicted and obtained grades on a group level is also important in that it suggests the hypothesis that systematic over or underachievement may be differentially associated with the two groups.

two groups were compared.[12] In addition to the overall analysis, separate t-tests were made comparing the mean grade point averages of the two groups at each year level.[13] Although signers at the junior year level obtained a higher mean GPA than the non-signers, the difference did not reach an acceptable level of statistical significance ($.10>p>.05$). Otherwise, the two groups look quite homogeneous.

Insert Table 2 about here

Although the groups do not differ with respect to actual accomplishments, there is a definite tendency, albeit nonsignificant, for the activists to perceive themselves as better students ($p=.20$). 81% of the signers report that they are in the top half of their class, while 67% of the non-signers so regarded themselves. There are several noteworthy implications of this result. For one, there is a suggestion in this finding that Yale activists are imbued with the "sense of specialness" which Keniston (1968) ascribed to the young radicals he studied. Secondly, an important methodological implication can be drawn from this finding. Such data, it is reasoned, highlight the inadvisability of using subjective reports (Somers, 1964) or indices of outlooks like "intellectualism" (McClosky, 1958) or "intellectual disposition" (Trent and Craise, 1967) as the bases for inferences about actual differences in level of intellectual functioning between activists and nonactivists.

As has been found in previous research, the Yale activists tended to be disproportionately concentrated in the humanities and social sciences and underrepresented in the natural sciences and preprofessional programs ($X^2=14.26$, $p<.01$). Additionally, the activists appear to have opted for different career goals than the general student population. Because more

---

[12] Heist (1965) and Watts and Whittaker (1966) are the only other investigators to have used grade point averages in their comparisons. Both studies were conducted at Berkeley. Whereas Watts and Whittaker reported no significant differences between left activists and a representative sample of undergraduates, Heist found that the cumulative grade point averages of the FSM participants exceeded the all university grade point average.

[13] Due to a change from a numerical to a descriptive (i.e., Honors, High Pass, Pass Fail) grading system during the academic year 67-68, no numerical information was available for freshmen, or for the current year at each of the other semester levels. Thus, it will be necessary to assess freshmen differences either by means of chi-square or it will be necessary to develop a standardized weighting system for each of the grades under the new system. As of now, however, the GPA analyses do not include these data.

than half of the cells in a contingency table based on the raw data[14] would have had expected frequencies of less than five, the prospective occupation categories were combined as follows for the chi-square analysis: humanitarian, expressive and other. The results of this analysis show (Table 3) that whereas the activists are inclined to favor college teaching or careers in the arts, public service and mental health professions, the nonactivist preferences run to the fields of business, law, and the natural or applied sciences ($X^2 = 17.14$, $p < .001$).[15]

Insert Table 3 about here

Organizational Affiliation. Frequency of participation in extracurricular campus activities was estimated from the information provided by the student's transcripts. Every instance of a year long involvement in a campus organization contributed one point to the total group score. From approximately 30 different kinds of activities listed in the transcripts, six categories were derived: political, artistic-intellectual, social service, athletic, religious, and fraternal. The data relevant to this variable are presented in Table 3. It is clearly evident that the two groups are practically identical in terms of the absolute number of their campus involvements. The signers, however, are significantly more often involved in social service and religious organizations[16] and less frequently involved in athletics ($X^2=16.68$, $p<.01$). Both groups evidence considerable involvement in artistic-intellectual organizations and only three students in either group have membership in social fraternities.

---

[14]Siegel (1954) recommends that for chi-square analyses with degrees of freedom larger than 1, fewer than 20% of the cells should have expected frequencies of less than 5.

[15]The actual frequency distributions were as follows:

	Signers	Nonsigners
College Teaching	15	7
Mental Health	5	0
Public Service	5	2
Arts	4	1
Ministry	3	2

	Signers	Nonsigners
Natural Science	0	9
Business	0	4
Law	3	7
Medicine	2	3
Architecture	1	2

[16]The impact of Chaplain William Sloane Coffin on the Yale Campus probably accounts for this finding.

Finally, it is impressive to note that there are no overall differences in extent of membership within political organizations. Closer inspection of this finding indicated that it could be accounted for by the fact that an overwhelming number of subjects in both groups (and of Yale undergraduates in general) join the Yale Political Union as freshmen and thereafter usually terminate their affiliation. Membership in the Political Union does not necessarily reflect any ideological commitments since it primarily serves as a forum for debates between noted political figures, and for the sponsorship of topical lectures. The Registrar's office transcripts, furthermore, only record membership in those political organizations that have been officially recognized by the university, and thus exclude such informal leftist groups as Students for a Democratic Society.

The similarity in absolute extent of organizational involvement inadvertently enables us to implement Lipset's (1968) methodological suggestion that leftist activists should be compared to nonpolitically active students if we are to extricate the correlates of "involvement" per se from those of leftist sociopolitical activism.

Insert Table 4 about here

Family Background Variables. The composite demographic protrait of the Yale activist tends to agree with the results of other studies in other settings. However, contrary to previous findings, only one of the family background variables clearly differentiated significantly between the two groups. In replication of previous findings, a disproportionate number of the signers reported that they were either Jewish (39%) or nonreligious (24%) ($p < .01$). The patterning of the differences on two additional variables, birth order and father's educational level, was also in accord with expectations based on prior research. By conventional statistical standards these relationships could only be considered suggestive, however. There was a higher incidence of first-borns ($.10 < p < .20$) among the signers (63%) than among the nonsigners (47%), and their fathers are more likely to have completed both college and graduate or professional school ($.05 < p < .10$).

Contrary to expectations, we did not find that specific kinds of occupations were particularly characteristic of the fathers of activists, nor did fathers' occupational status bear a systematic relationship to the behavioral criterion.

As expected, a large segment of the activists sample comes from Class I and II (47%) socio-economic backgrounds. However, because the nonsigner group was also skewed in favor of upper socioeconomic status, a chi-square analysis failed to discriminate significantly between the two groups ($p=.20$). In an attempt to carry out a more sensitive assessment of the differences on this variable, a t-test was performed. The results of this analysis also failed to reach a satisfactory level of significance ($t=1.49$, $.20>p>.10$).

The relationship of the behavioral criterion to the following family background variables was either neglible or essentially random: mother's educational and occupational level, mother's and father's political affiliation, geographical location of home, and urbanness. These analyses are sumarized in Tables 1 and 4.

The student activists were not selectively recruited from residents of large urban areas, or from Western or Northeastern states. Rather, like the nonsigners they tended to have lived during most of their childhoods in suburban settings. A disproportionate number of the students in both groups, moreover, come from states that are located in the East. Contrary to Flacks' (1967) findings, there is no evidence of a greater rate of employment among the mother's of the Yale activists, nor is there an overrepresentation of activists' mothers in professional or social service roles. Finally, the overwhelming majority of the parents of both groups of students are affiliated with the Democratic and Republican parties.

Personality Variables - Issue related and beyond. In order to assess the degree of association between the individual difference variables (i.e., postdictors) and the dichotomized criterion variable, biserial correlations were calculated.[17]

In addition to biserial correlations, t-tests for the significance of differences between means of independent groups were performed. Means, standard deviations, biserial correlation coefficients, and the results of the t-test analyses for each variable appear in Table 5.

Insert Table 5 about here

Generalized Activism. It was reasoned that if the act of signing the draft refusal pledge constituted a meaningful basis for selecting activists, significant differences would be obtained between the two groups on the Activism Index. As indicated in Table 5, the results are convincingly supportive of this hypothesis ($t=5.93$, $df=75$, $p<.001$). Simultaneously, the biserial correlation coefficient of .84 lends support to the view that the activists commitment to direct sociopolitical action is sustained and transituational.

Political Self-Image. The behavioral criterion was intended to be predictive of or to be predicted by the perception of oneself as politically "very liberal" or "radical." Further support for the alleged construct and discriminant validity of the behavioral criterion, therefore, comes from its relationship to the political self-image question.[18]

---

[17] Biserial correlations were considered appropriate since the scores from the individual difference measures appear to fall along a normal continuum, and although the student activism ratings fall into discrete categories (i.e., signing versus nonsigning of the draft refusal pledge) it is reasonable to assume that degree of sociopolitical involvement also conforms to an underlying continuous distribution.

[18] Due to a clerical oversight, the Liberal choice was omitted from the scale. This significantly truncated the scale and forced a choice between moderate and very liberal. The effects of this error may either have attenuated or spuriously elevated the obtained differences.

Overall differences in degree of perceived radicalism were highly significant ($p < .001$). The signers are represented only within the very liberal and radical categories. Only three nonsigners described themselves as radicals, while 43% of the non-signers portrayed themselves as political moderates.

Insert Table 6 about here

Intensity of issue-related opinion. Degree of anti-war, anti-administration sentiment, as measured by the Vietnam Opinion Survey, also bore a very strong positive relationship ($r_{bis} = .74$) to the behavioral criterion. In fact, a two-tailed test on the mean difference between the signers and nonsigners yielded a value of 16.23 (df=75) which is significant beyond the .0001 level. In terms of the content of the questionnaire, it is clear that, as a group, the signers are vehemently opposed to the war, and highly critical of the U.S. government's policy statements regarding the war-be they political, moral, or strategic.

Degree of Issue-related Knowledge. Inspection of Table 6 further indicates that the Yale activists tend to be extremely knowledgeable about the people and issues involved in the war in Vietnam ($r_{bis} = .65$). Their VIS mean of 23.55 (S.D. = 2.83) significantly ($t=4.41$, $p < .001$) exceeds the nonsigners' mean of 19.00 (S.D. = 5.57) and is, in fact, the highest heretofore obtained with any student group.[19]

Dogmatism and Locus of Control. As shown in Table 5, the signers and nonsigners are virtually indistinguishable on the Dogmatism and I-E scales. The range of Dogmatism scores for signers was from 70-to-182, with a mean of 129.76 and a standard deviation of 22.68. The nonsigner range was from 97 - to- 169 with a mean of 132.21 and a standard deviation of 18.80. Thus, despite their militancy on the VOS, the Yale activists are neither more authoritarian nor less non-authoritarian, as a group, than a representative sample of the

[19] Personal communication; Cowdry, Cabin, and Keniston, 1969.

general student population. The means of both groups, moreover, are well within the range of scores considered by Rokeach (1960) as indicative of "open-minded" cognitive functioning.

Similarly, both groups tend to be more internal than external. The range of I-E scores for the signers was from 1 to 16 with a mean of 8.86 and a standard deviation of 3.94. The nonsigner range was from 1 to 18 with a mean of 8.76 and a standard deviation of 4.42. These scores are highly comparable to those previously obtained in large Eastern university populations (Rotter, 1966).

Insert Table 7 about here

Values and Life Style. Inspection of Table 7 reveals that activists are clearly distinguishable from the general undergraduate population Yale activists in terms of their dominant value commitments. Significant t-test differences were found on 13 of the 21 "Importance of Activities" items, which is well above what would be expected by chance alone.

On the one hand, activists placed less importance on 1) staying in good standing at Yale, 2) making good grades, 3) being in a fraternity, 4) dressing in the "Yale manner," 5) achieving high status in a particular occupation, 6) pursuing typical extra-curricular college activities, 7) the role of sports in college life, and 8) entering a particular occupation or profession. On the other hand, the Yale activists placed more value than their peers on 1) engaging in political activities, 2) engaging in community service projects, 3) having close friends, 4) developing an intense love relationship with one girl, and 5) having sexual relations. Both groups attributed considerable importance to going on to graduate school, having their own standards and values, acquiring a depth of knowledge at college, formulating life-long friendships at college, and in dating interesting and attractive girls. Finally, both groups attributed minimal importance to drinking, smoking, and to observing religious practices.

Insert Table 8 about here

Embedded within the demographic variables section of the test battery were two questions dealing with degree of heterosexual involvement and frequency of dating. The chi-square analyses of these two items appear in Table 8. As can be seen, activists not

only place more importance on developing an intense love relationship with one girl; they actually appear to be more involved in intense heterosexual relationships.

Insert Table 9 about here

Motivation. The data relevant to the need hierarchies presented by the two groups on Stein's Self-Description Questionnaire can be found in Table 9. While inspecting the table it should be borne in mind that the mean ranking of a need is inversely related to the intensity of the need for the group; that is, the lower the mean, the more the group says the need is descriptive of itself.

It will be noted that out of the 20 comparisons made between the groups, six differences are significant well beyond the .05 level, and in one instance a .10 level of significance was reached, which is well above what would be expected on a chance basis. On the one hand, the signers ranked the following needs as significantly more important than the sample of nonsigners: sentience, nurturance and succorance. The nonsigners, on the other hand, were significantly higher on the following needs: achievement, play and deference. The nonsigners also tended to be more counteractive ($t=1.67$, p .10). In brief, the signers as compared to the nonsigners are more likely to seek out sensuous experiences and to enjoy aesthetic feelings, are more concerned with forming intimate relationships and with helping others, and are more likely to seek out others who will provide them with sympathetic understanding and possibly some direction. Also, they are less oriented toward achieving, less interested in pursuing experiences which have no purpose other than pure enjoyment, somewhat less admiring of and conforming to the wishes of their superiors, and may possibly have less need to prove themselves or make up for felt inadequacies.

DISCUSSION

The implications of our findings will be discussed in relation to three basic issues. Since the entire study rests upon the validity of signing the draft-refusal pledge as a behavioral criterion of generalized activism, we will first direct out attention to this issue. Secondly, we will discuss the relationship of the present findings to previous research on student activism. Finally, and more speculatively, we will suggest several implications and possible explanations of the preliminary trends emerging from this study. Throughout the discussion, we will consider the possibility of future improvement in the methodological approach to the study of political activism.

Validity of the behavioral criterion. A composite portrait of the signer of the draft refusal pledge derived from the evidence generated by this study strongly confirms the efficacy of the behavioral criterion as a basis for identifying student activists. It will be recalled that Block, et.al., (1968) specified two criteria for defining student activism -- degree of involvement with contemporary sociopolitical issues, and degree of rejection of the traditional values and institutional authority of the society. The signers of the draft refusal pledge fulfill the requirements of both criteria. Their high scores on the Activism index reveals a marked willingness to engage in activities which directly challenge the status quo. They defined themselves without exception as either politically "very liberal" or "radical." A large segment of the group are members of social service organizations which engage in community projects such as urban renewal and the promotion of civil liberties. Their considerable factual knowledge about the Vietnam War can also be regarded as evidence of extensive involvement with contemporary issues. In addition, their vehement anti-war anti-administration stance on the VOS as well as their

rejection of traditional middle class values establishes them clearly as members of the "new left."[20]

Relationship to Previous Research. Overall, the inferences that can be drawn from this study are in accord with the formulations that presently characterize the literature. Nevertheless, differences on only three of the replicatory demographic variables reached acceptable levels of statistical significance - religion, major field of study and prospective occupation. Yale activists tend to be selectively recruited from Jewish or irreligious backgrounds. Still to be answered, however, are the following questions: Why are activists more often Jewish or nonreligious?, Do activists differ from their parents in religious preferences?, have activists who say they are nonreligious always been so? If not, which religions were abandoned? It is obvious that the issue of religion is too complex to limit the analyses to a single - item indication of formal preferences or affiliation.

The Yale activists' choice of major, career goals, and reported interests clearly indicate that, like their counterparts at Berkeley, they reject Clark Kerr's (1964) normative and descriptive vision of the multiuniversity's function: The production of managers for an ever-increasing industrial sector. Moreover, although their overall educational goals are those of a liberal education for its own sake, they share the Columbia activists opposition to Barzun's (1968) wish to transform the university into a place of "respite and meditation."

---

[20] Inevitably, however, with a construct as complex as political activism, the criterion is not perfect. Several subjects who satisfied the behavioral criterion of signing the draft refusal pledge did not exhibit a past history of general social and political activism. Conversely, several nonsigners demonstrated as extensive a history of activism as many signers. These considerations suggest the possibility of redefining the groups on the basis of demonstrated generalized activism in subsequent analyses of the data. Pledge-signing could be considered merely an additional item in the Activism index, or the activism items themselves could be regrouped so as to reflect the typology developed by Smith, Haan, and Block (1967) to characterize different orientations to activism. Their classificatory system distinguishes three types of activists -- constructivists, dissenters, and broad spectrum activists. Either procedure might possibly provide a more reliable measure of activism than the single behavioral criteria typically employed in past research.

In accordance with previous findings, activists in our sample tended to be first borns,[21] highly capable students, residents of Northeastern states, and the sons of highly educated and affluent fathers. Each of these trends fell short of statistical significance, however, and the following constellation of family background variables clearly failed to replicate previous findings: mother's educational level, parents' occupational status, and parents' political affiliation. The absence of a greater liberal or leftist orientation among the activists' parents is a major departure from past findings. It may merely be a product of the methodological crudity with which this variable was examined in the present study. A statement of political party affiliation may obscure the more subtle dimensions of parental conservatism versus liberalism. The fact that the above relationships were not convincingly replicated may also be related to the following methodological considerations:

1. Employment of a control sample: Many of the research findings on student activism have been reported without comparison to a comparable sample of nonactivist subjects. Such journalistic reporting cannot separate out significant individual difference predictors from the multitude of situational factors operative in any given setting. By comparing activists to a legitimate control sample and by setting scientific criteria for significance levels, the present study provided a rigorous test of the major trends in the literature.

Moreover, the likelihood of partialing out the correlates of leftist activism from involvement in college life generally was strengthened in this study because of the extensive participation of the control group students in non-political extracurricular activities. A closer examination of the contribution of psychological variables to activism was also facilitated by the control group's resemblance to the activists on many sociological dimensions.

---

[21] The omnipresent first born seems to be assuming the properties of a chamelion. In the literature he has been typically depicted as achievement oriented, (Sampson, 1962) susceptible to social pressures (Becker and Carroll, 1962), more adult-oriented, serious, "good", anxious, and less rebellious than later-born children (McArthur, 1956). Given these previously identified characteristics it would seem reasonable to predict that he would be overrepresented in those groups who abide by and seek to perpetuate established value systems and not amongst the ranks of student activists.

2. Homogeneity of the population. Past studies usually have drawn activist subjects from the total population involved in any specific political or protest activity. This procedure brings in graduate students, professional students, and "nonstudents," as well as undergraduates, producting greater heterogeneity in the sample. The present study considerably decreased the sample variability by selecting only undergraduates. Moreover, since Yale recruits students from only the top 10% of high school graduates, the population homogeneity was further increased. In light of this admissions policy, it might be argued that, a marginal degree of significance is all that could be expected on measures of intellectual ability. The neglible differences on the various indeces of socio-economic background also points to the "elite" nature of the Yale population.

3. Masking of the activism criterion: The precaution has seldom been taken in past research to mask the selection criteria for activist subjects. As was mentioned earlier, the emotional and usually moral nature of their activities inevitably biases the response set of activists recruited in such a manner. This contamination was reduced to a minimum in the present study by masking the selection procedure and by having both activists and non-activist students attend each testing session. With these considerations in mind, we can proceed to discuss the broader implications of this study.

NEWLY EMERGING CORRELATES OF ACTIVISM:

Although they are vehement in their anti-war sentiment, extremist in their political self definition, given to extreme likes and dislikes, and involved in numerous sociopolitical activities requiring intense commitment and opinions, the signers of the draft refusal pledge are not characterizable as being generally more authoritarian or dogmatic than their peers. This is perhaps one of the most intriguing relationships found in the present study. How can activists be so extremely opinionated and yet not ideologically rigid?

One explanation that has been advanced by several authors (Keniston, 1968; Peterson, 1968) is that activism of the sixties is issue-related, pragmatic, unprogramatic, and non-ideological. While they may be politically non-ideological, the evidence provided by this

and other studies (Flacks, 1967; Block, Haan, and Smith, 1968) would seem to warrant the conclusion that activists, nevertheless, embrace a more or less coherent world view or value system which in itself is really quite a powerful ideology. Moreover, as Draper (1965) has pointed out, today's activists don't question the need for generalizations and theory in principle but, rather, "What they reject above all are 'old ideologies' and radical theories, more than they reject ideology and theory itself. A new radical ideology could sweep them, but it is not even on the horizon." (p. 159)

An alternative approach to this question is suggested by Brown's (1965) hypothesis that it is most heuristic to conceive of authoritarianism in terms of the kind of information that is sufficient to induce a change in attitudes.[22] According to Brown, "The authoritarian will reverse his evaluations on the simple say-so of an authority figure" (p. 543). In view of the extensive issue-related knowledge evidenced by the Yale activists, it might be reasonable to conclude that the accumulation of information, rather than the pronouncements of authority figures, serves to make intellectually meaningful and justifiable their goals and strategies. Similarly, it might be argued that they cannot be regarded as dogmatic (i.e., closed-minded) in the sense that they defend themselves against information that might call their opinions into question.

On a more speculative level, it seems that they are reacting with moral indignation to a particular issue or policy about which they are relatively sophisticated, rather than naively overacting to an external situation which treatens some set of irrational ideological presuppositions, or their physical well being. This interpretation suggests that the extreme issue-related opinions of activists are derived from their greater knowledge. It could also be argued, of course, that they have merely been more active in gathering information to support and rationalize their previously, and perhaps, irrationally formulated opinions. Whether Camus' (1958) contention that rebellion breeds awareness is applicable to the

---

[22] In this regard, Mackinnon and Centers (1963) have reported that the authoritarian subjects, in their study, less frequently considered themselves well informed about Russia than the nonauthoritarians, yet were more convinced of the correctness of their opinions. Moreover, Janowitz and Marrick (1953) have noted that participation in political activities tends to be related inversely to authoritarianism.

phenomenon of student activism, however, cannot be determined unequivocably by postdictive studies such as the present one. In light of our findings, the prior interpretation (i.e., that awareness breeds rebellion) might be more probable, or as Shaull has argued, "Revolutionary anger is not produced by privation, but by understood injustice" (1967, p. 19).

The findings of the present study do not support the theoretically postulated relationship between internality, as measured by Rotter's Locus of Control Scale, and activism. The essentially Zero correlation between these two variables, however, replicates the consistent failure of the scale to predict petition signing behavior under classroom conditions (Rotter, 1966; Hamsher, Geller, and Rotter, 1968). Although the relationship between signing a petition in the classroom and signing the draft-refusal pledge is not strong, these two situations might have some factors in common which detract from the predictive utility of the questionnaire. Another important, and more likely possibility is that the orientations of both groups are non-fatalistic. The nonsigners as a group need not defensively resort to an external view of the world to rationalize their failures. They are obviously energetic, productive, ambitious, competitive, and their ego-ideal probably is that of the "Professionalist" (Keniston, 1966). It may also be that the groups are prototypes of the two markedly contrasting styles of life which, according to Schaull, (1967) are emerging in the Sixties - "The revolutionary" and "The technocrat." Tangential support of this hypothesis is provided by the fact that the nonactivists in our sample distinguished sharply between achievement and play on the Stein Self Description Questionnaire while the activist emphasis on sentience implied an attempt to avoid such fractionation and compartmentalization.

The present study, moreover, suggests that activists also have confidence in their ability to influence others. We find the strongest support for this suggestion in the substantial discrepancy between activists and other students on the Activism Index. Being to a much greater degree involved in political and social action, the activists must to some extent have confidence in the potential efficacy of their own behavior. The extreme anti-institutional orientation of student activists is a possible motivational factor in

this life-style of intense political involvement. Anti-institutionalism was exhibited by activists in our sample by their intense opinions against the U.S. government and by their rejection of traditional emphasis on status achievement, careerism, privatism, and conventional behavior.

Intense anti-institutional sentiment alone, however, is not sufficient motivation for a life-style of activism. An alternative and more probable response to anti-institutionalism, for example, would be complete alienation from the mainstream of the dominant culture. Rather than accepting this alternative, the activists in our sample follow a style of life opposite to that ascribed by Keniston (1960) to alienated youth:

> On every level the alienated refuse conventional commitments, seeing them as unprofitable, dangerous, futile, or merely uncertain and unpredictable. Not only do they repudiate those institutions they see as characteristic of our society, but the belief in goodness of human nature, the usefulness of group activities, and the possibility or utility of political and civic activities, closeness and intimacy with others, or even a resolute commitment to action or responsibility. (p.60)

That the anti-institutionalism of activists has not led to total alienation is pointed out in a crucial distinction made by Keniston, (1967): "For the alienated hippie, American society is beyond redemption (or not worth trying to redeem); but the activist, no matter how intense his rejection of specific American practices and policies, retains a conviction that his society can and must be changed" (p. 114). The hippie and the activist are both institutionally alienated in the sense that they reject the dominant middle class values and practices of American society, yet one works actively for change, whereas the other does not. Given his alienation from the mainstream of institutionalized American life, what motivates and sustains the activist in his persistent efforts to work for change?

An exploratory study such as this cannot adequately perform the complex motivational analysis required to answer this question. However, a definite trend emerges from our results which may prove in subsequent research to be crucial to the above issue. Our findings suggest that the sustaining motivational energy for activists is related to the intensity and closeness of their interpersonal involvements. Activists consistently placed more emphasis on establishing intense, intimate interpersonal relationships, and

to a greater extent reported themselves as actually being involved in such relationships.[23] Our evidence leads to the conclusion that activists are institutionally alienated, but not interpersonally alienated. This interrelationship is perhaps a partial explanation for the concurrent intensity of their political and interpersonal involvement. This speculation further suggests that the ideals which the activists are attempting to introject into the mainstream of the culture are perhaps those which they value so highly in relating with one another. Such an explanation would accurately predict the group nature of most previously observed instances of student activism.

The extremely high ranking of sentience on the SDQ by the Yale activists may also explain why they would be attracted by the drama and excitement of confrontation. On the other hand, given such an emphasis one might predict that their commitment to radicalism will be fragmentary and transitory rather than extensive and sustained.

Finally, although the student activists efforts are directed mainly against the authority structures of society, there is little evidence to support the view that their activities represent an attempt to find ways to sustain and give concrete expression to a "hatred of all male, parental, and societal authority." Consistent with this interpretation are the very low rankings given by the activists to the following needs on the SDQ: aggression, defendance, rejection and harmavoidance. Rather, the findings are clearly supportive of Keniston's (1967) hypothesis regarding the feminine or maternal identification of the leftist activist. The Yale activists ranked nurturance extremely high in their need hierarchy. Moreover, they are accepting of their own needs for guidance and emotional support (i.e., succorance). Consequently, it is unlikely that their desire to help others represents a displacement or substitute for the guidance they feel they are lacking.

---

[23] It is impressive to note that while the Vietnam Opinion Survey significantly correlated ($r = -.64$, $p < .01$) in a sample of Yale seniors, with Keniston's Cultural Alienation Scale, its relationship to the Interpersonal and Social Alienation scales was essentially random. (Personal communication; Cowdry, Cabin, and Keniston, 1969)

REFERENCES

Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J. & Sanford R.N. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper, 1950.

Barzun, J. The American University. New York: Harper Row. 1968.

Bay, C. Political and apolitical students: facts in search of theory. Journal of Social Issues, 1967 Vol. 23, 76-91.

Becker, S.W. and Carroll, J. Ordinal position and conformity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, Vol. 65, 129-131.

Block, H., Haan, N. and Smith, M. Activism and Apathy in Contemporary Adolescents. In J. F. Adams, ed., Contributions to the Understanding of Adolescence. New York: Allyn and Bacon, 1967.

Braungart, R.G. SDS and YAF: Backgrounds of Student Political Activists. Paper read at ASA, Miami, 1966.

Brown, R. Social Psychology. New York: Free Press, 1965.

Camus, A. The Rebel: An Essay on Man in Revolt. New York: Vintage, 1958.

Coles, R. Serpents and Doves: Non-violent youth in the South. In E. Erikson, ed., The Challenge of Youth. New York: Basic Books, 1963.

Derrer, D. Academic stresses and personality development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University, 1967.

Draper, H. Berkeley, the New Student Revolt. New York: Grove, 1965.

Duberman, M. On Misunderstanding Student Rebels. The Atlantic, Nov., 1968, 63-70.

Fishman, J.R. and Solomon, F. Youth and Social Action. The Journal of Social Issues, 1964, Vol. 20, 1-28.

Flacks, R.E. The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the roots of student protest. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, Vol. 23 52-75.

Fever, L.S. Rebellion at Berkeley. The New Leader, 1964, Vol. 47, 3-12.

Gales, K. Berkeley Student Opinion: April, 1965. (Mimeographed paper, 1965).

Greenwald, G. and Sakumura, S. Attitude and selective learning. Journal of personality and Social Psychology, 1967, Vol. 7, 383-397.

Glazer, N. What happened at Berkeley. In S. Lipset and S. Wolin, eds., The Berkeley Student Revolt. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1965.

Gore, P.M. and Rotter, J.B. A personality correlate of social action. Journal of Personality, 1963, Vol. 31, 58-64.

Hamsher, J.H., Geller, J.D. and Rotter, J.B. Interpersonal trust, internal-external control, and the Warren Commission Report. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, Vol. 9, 210-215.

Harrington, M. The Prophetic Minority. Introduction, New York: New American Library, 1966.

Hayden, T. Quoted in Comparative Education Review, 1966, Vol. 10, 187.

Heist, P. Intellect and commitment: The faces of discontent. In O.W. Knorr and W. J. Minter, eds., Order and Freedom on the Campus; the Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty and Students. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1965, 61-69.

Heist, P. The dynamics of student discontent and protest. Paper read at APA, New York, 1966.

Hollingshead, August B. Two Factor Index of Social Position. New Haven: Yale University, 1957. (Mimeographed)

Hook, S. The prospects of academe. Encounter, August, 1968.

Howe, I. New Styles in "leftism." In I. Howe, ed., The Radical Imagination. New York: New American Library, 1967.

Janowitz, M. and Marrick, D. Authoritarianism and Political Behavior. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1953, Vol. 17, 185-201.

Katz, J. The Student Activists: Rights, Needs, and Powers of Undergraduates. Stanford: Institute for the Study of Human Problems, 1967.

Keniston, K. The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in American Society. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965.

Keniston, K. The faces in the lecture room. In R.S. Morison, ed., The American University. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

Keniston, K. The Sources of Student Protest. Journal of Social Issues, 1967 Vol. 23, 108-137.

Keniston, K. Young Radicals: Notes on committed Youth. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968.

Kennan, G. Rebels without a program. New York Times Magazine, Jan., 1968.

Kerpelman, L.C. Student political activism and ideology: comparative characteristics of activists and non-activists. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, Vol. 16, in press.

Kerr, C. The uses of the University. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Leventhal, H., Jacobs, R., and Kvdirka, N. Authoritarianism, ideology, and political candidate choice. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, Vol. 69, 539-549.

Lipset, S.M. University students and politics in underdeveloped countries. Comparative Education Review, 1966, Vol. 10, 132-162.

Lipset, S. and Altbach, P. Student politics and higher education in the United States. Comparative Education Review, 1966, Vol. 10, 320-349.

Lipset, S.M. The activists: a profile. The Public Interest, Fall, 1968, 39-51.

Lipset, S.M. Students and politics in comparative perspective. Daedalus, 1968, Vol. 97, 1-21.

Luce, P.A. The New Left. New York: David McKay, 1966.

Mackinnon, W.J. and Centers, R. Authoritarianism and internationalism. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1956, Vol. 20, 621-630.

McArthur, C. Personalities of first and second born children. Psychiatry, 1956, Vol. 19, 47-54.

McClosky, H. Conservatism and Personality. American Political Science Review, 1958, Vol. 62, 27-45.

Murray, H.A. Explorations in personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Newfield, J. A prophetic minority. New York: New American Library, 1966.

Peterson, R.E. The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1964-65. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1966.

Peterson, R.E. "The Student Left in American Higher Education." Daedalus, 1968, Vol. 97, 293-317.

Pinner, F.A. Tradition and transgression: western European students in the postwar world. Daedalus, 1968, Vol. 97, 137-156.

Rokeach, M. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Rotter, J.B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, Vol. 80, (1, whole No. 609).

Sampson, E.E. Birth order, need achievement, and conformity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 1962, Vol. 65, 155-159.

Sampson, E.E. Student activism and the decade of protest. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, Vol. 23, 1-33.

Shaull, R. and Ogelsby, C. Containment and Change. New York: Macmillan, 1967.

Schiff, L.F. "The obedient rebels: A Study of College Conversions to Conservatism." Journal of Social Issues, 1964, Vol. 20, 74-96.

Solomon, F. and Fishman, J.R. Youth and Peace: A psycho-social study of student peace demonstrators in Washington, D.C. The Journal of Social Issues, 1964, Vol. 20, 54-73.

Somers, R.H. The mainsprings of rebellion: a survey of Berkeley Students in November, 1964. In S. Lipset and S. Wolin, eds., The Berkeley Student Revolt. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1965.

Stein, M.I. Explorations in typology. In R.W. White, ed., The Study of lives: essays on Personality in honor of Henry A. Murray. New York: Atherton Press, 1963.

Stein, M.I. and Neulinger, J. A typology of self-descriptions. In M.M. Katz, J. O. Cole and W.E. Barton, eds., The role and methodology of classification in psychiatry and psychopathology. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, Public Health Service Publication No. 1584, 1968.

Stein, M.I. Volunteers for peace. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Stouffer, S.A. Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties. New York: Wiley, 1955.

Strickland, B.R. The prediction of social action from a dimension of internal-external control. Journal of Social Psychology. 1965, Vol. 66, 353-358.

Trent, W.; and Craise, J. L. Commitment and conformity in the American College. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, Vol. 23, 34-51.

Watts, W. A. and Whittacker, D. Some socio-psychological characteristics of members of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement and the Student population at Berkeley. Applied Behavioral Science, 1966, Vol. 2, 41-62.

Westby, D. and Braungart, R., Class and politics in the family backgrounds of student political activists. American Social Review, 1966, Vol. 31, 690-692.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF SIGNERS (N=38) AND NONSIGNERS (N=39) BY AGE, ACADEMIC VARIABLES, AND PROSPECTIVE OCCUPATION

Variable	SIGNERS	NONSIGNERS	X^2	P
AGE[a]				
Under 21	10	30	3.96	$<.05$
21 and Over	18	9		
CLASS IN COLLEGE				
Freshman	4	9	2.54	N.S.
Sophomore	12	10		
Junior	10	11		
Senior	12	9		
SECONDARY SCHOOL				
Public	23	26	.32	N.S.
Private	15	13		
ACADEMIC STANDING[b]				
Top Half	30	25	1.49	$<.20$
Lower Half	7	12		
MAJOR FIELD				
Social Science	13	6	14.26	$<.01$
Economics, Business	0	2		
Natural Sciences	0	9		
Humanities	24	20		
Undecided	1	2		
PROSPECTIVE OCCUPATION[c]				
Humanitarian	15	7	17.14	$<.001$
Expressive	20	10		
Other	3	20		

a. Signers Mean Age = 20.3 (SD=1.6), Nonsigners = 19.6 (SD=1.1); $t = 2.32$, $p < .05$.

b. By Self-Report, Yale does not compute academic rank in class. Missing data: one signer and two nonsigners failed to report this information.

c. Two nonsigners reported that they were undecided about their future occupations.

TABLE 2

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN SIGNERS AND NONSIGNERS ON ACADEMIC VARIABLES

VARIABLE	SIGNERS			NONSIGNERS			t
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	
CEEB							
Verbal	38	694.05	57.53	39	696.00	43.94	.35
Mathematical	38	709.23	68.21	39	709.97	67.52	.07
Rank in High School Class	38	9.76	12.08	39	7.26	11.13	.94
Predicted GPA	38	81.05	5.48	39	83.43	7.00	1.68*
YALE GPA							
Overall	34	81.48	5.46	30	81.72	5.14	.80
Sophomore	12	80.39	6.28	10	82.83	5.74	.98
Junior	10	82.85	4.47	11	79.15	4.58	1.81*
Senior	12	81.53	5.40	9	83.21	5.10	.85

* $p = < .10$.

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF SIGNERS (N=38) AND
NONSIGNERS (N=39) BY ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION

TYPE OF ORGANIZATION	SIGNERS	NONSIGNERS
Political	26	28
Artistic-Intellectual	36	36
Social Service	23	9
Athletic	40	62
Religious	6	0
Fraternity	3	3
Chi Square	16.68	$p < .01$

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF SIGNERS (N=38) AND NONSIGNERS (N=39) ON FAMILY BACKGROUND VARIABLES

VARIABLE	SIGNERS	NONSIGNERS	X^2	P
Birth Order				
Oldest	24	18	2.25	<.20
Other	14	21		
Location of Home				
Rural	5	8	.96	NS
Suburban	25	25		
Urban	8	6		
Area of Country[a]				
Northeast	22	19	.58	NS
South	3	4		
Midwest	5	7		
West	6	6		
Religion				
Roman Catholic	3	5	13.83	<.02
Protestant	6	16		
Jewish	15	7		
Other	5	6		
None	9	5		
Socio-economic Status[b]				
High (Class I)	18	11	6.13	<.20
Medium (Classes II and III)	18	24		
Low (Classes IV and V)	2	4		

PARENTS' EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

MOTHER			FATHER	
SIGNERS	NONSIGNERS		SIGNERS	NONSIGNERS
7	6	Graduate or Professional School Degree	17	16
10	12	College Degree	10	3
13	10	Partial College Training	6	9
8	11	High School Diploma or Less	5	11
X^2 = 1.21	NS		X^2 = 7.99	.05<p<.10

TABLE 4 cont.

PARENTS' OCCUPATIONAL STATUS[c]

MOTHER			FATHER	
SIGNERS	NONSIGNERS		SIGNERS	NONSIGNERS
1	4	High (Class I)	19	14
15	16	Medium (Classes II and III)	17	22
5	3	Low (Classes IV and V)	2	3
$X^2 = 3.72$	NS		$X^2 = 2.96$	NS

PARENTS' POLITICAL AFFILIATION

16	19	Democratic Party	14	16
11	13	Republican Party	12	15
0	0	Independent Political Party	1	0
11	7	No Formal Affiliation	11	8
$X^2 = 1.30$	NS		$X^2 = 1.93$	NS

a. Unclassifiable Subjects: Signers = 2, Nonsigners = 3.

b. Computed by Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position. Signers Mean SES = 20.65 (SD = 10.63); Nonsigners = 24.31 (SD = 11.14); t=1.49; $.20 > p > .10$.

c. Based upon Hollingshead's occupational categories.

TABLE 5

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES AND BISERIAL CORRELATIONS ON THE BEHAVIORAL, ATTITUDINAL, AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES

VARIABLE	SIGNERS (N=38)		NONSIGNERS (N=39)			
	M	SD	M	SD	t	R_{bis}
Activism Index	8.86	2.86	4.71	3.21	5.93*	.86
Vietnam Opinion Survey	203.15	25.45	168.08	33.05	16.23**	.74
Vietnam Information Survey	23.55	2.83	19.00	5.57	4.41*	.65
Dogmatism Scale	129.76	22.68	132.21	18.80	.12	.07
I-E Scale	8.86	3.94	8.76	4.42	.10	.01

* $p < .001$
** $p < .0001$

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF POLITICAL SELF IMAGE ACROSS SIGNERS AND NONSIGNERS

GROUP	VERY CONSERVATIVE	CONSERVATIVE	MODERATE	VERY LIBERAL	RADICAL
Signers	0	0	0	16	22
Nonsigners	0	3	16	15	3

Chi Square = 33.46 $p < .001$

TABLE 7

MEAN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SIGNERS (N=38) AND NONSIGNERS (N=39) ON IMPORTANCE OF ACTIVITIES ITEMS

	SIGNERS		NONSIGNERS			
MORE IMPORTANT FOR SIGNERS:	M	SD	M	SD	t	p
Having close friends	4.82	.56	4.31	.97	2.80	<.01
Love relationship with one girl	4.26	.92	3.35	1.41	3.37	< 001
Having sexual relationships	4.02	.28	3.38	1.04	2.90	<.01
Engaging in political activities	3.92	1.03	2.77	1.22	4.50	<.001
Providing community service	3.42	1.16	2.85	1.00	2.28	<.05
LESS IMPORTANT FOR SIGNERS:						
Joining a fraternity	.05	.89	1.07	.86	5.10	<.001
Dressing in Yale manner	1.00	.76	1.54	.67	3.35	<.01
Playing sports	1.68	.95	2.20	1.28	2.43	<.02
Entering specific occupation	2.65	1.22	3.26	1.26	2.17	<.05
Making high grades	2.80	1.14	3.51	.95	3.10	<.01
Achieving high status	3.13	1.30	3.67	.86	2.57	<.02
Continue in good academic standing	3.81	1.03	4.66	.75	4.05	<.001
Pursuing extracurricular activities	3.26	1.51	4.30	1.41	3.24	<.01
NO DIFFERENCE:						
Having own standards	4.76	.35	4.69	.52	.80	NS
Acquiring knowledge	4.03	1.07	4.26	.59	1.10	NS
Dating attractive girls	3.76	1.13	3.95	.84	.85	NS
Making life-long friends	3.53	1.01	3.67	.92	.63	NS
Going to graduate school	3.31	1.37	3.77	1.19	1.44	NS
Drinking	1.97	.64	1.82	1.12	.60	NS
Observing religious practices	1.87	1.30	1.77	1.26	.03	NS
Smoking	1.50	.81	.99	1.15	1.77	NS

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF DATING PATTERN AND DEGREE OF HETEROSEXUAL INVOLVEMENT ACROSS SIGNERS (N=38) AND NONSIGNERS (N=39)

Heterosexual Involvement	Signers	Nonsigners	χ^2
Married	4	3	12.25**
Engaged	4	0	
Going Steady	9	2	
Divorced	0	1	
None of above	21	33	
Type of Dating			
One girl quite a bit	20	14	8.01*
Several Girls quite a bit	2	7	
Not dating much	12	10	
Not dating at all	0	4	
None of the above	4	4	

* $.10 > p > .05$

** $p < .02$

TABLE 9

t-TEST COMPARISONS OF MEAN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SIGNERS AND NONSIGNERS ON THE SEQ

NEED	SIGNERS (N=38)		NONSIGNERS (N=39)		
	M	SD	M	SD	t
Abasement	15.1	5.4	15.6	6.0	.35
Achievement	10.9	5.5	6.5	5.4	3.49****
Affiliation	5.0	3.9	5.7	5.1	.71
Aggression	16.2	4.4	14.9	5.4	1.16
Autonomy	7.3	4.1	8.7	5.0	1.38
Blamavoidance	10.8	5.3	11.1	5.1	.22
Counteraction	10.1	5.0	8.2	5.1	1.67*
Defendance	13.8	4.5	13.1	5.3	.46
Deference	15.4	4.2	13.2	4.6	2.19**
Dominance	11.1	4.6	10.3	6.0	.60
Exhibition	10.9	5.0	10.1	5.5	.63
Harmavoidance	13.0	4.1	12.0	5.0	.87
Infaavoidance	12.2	4.7	11.6	5.4	.47
Nurturance	5.8	4.6	9.1	4.2	3.19****
Order	11.9	4.9	12.0	5.6	.11
Play	11.4	4.8	9.0	4.7	2.13**
Rejection	12.3	6.6	14.1	5.5	1.26
Sentience	4.9	3.2	8.0	5.3	3.04****
Sex	5.7	4.1	6.3	3.8	.67
Succorance	6.7	4.3	10.4	4.6	3.54*****

* $p < .10$
** $p < .05$
*** $p < .005$
**** $p < .001$