

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 266

TM 001 170

AUTHOR Solomon, Theo
TITLE A Pilot Study among East Village "Hippies."
INSTITUTION Associated YM-YHA's of Greater New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO Monogr-35
PUB DATE Mar 68
NOTE 50p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Age Differences; Content Analysis; Demography; *Drug Abuse; Family Background; Interviews; Jews; Lysergic Acid Diethylamide; Marihuana; Narcotics; Parent Child Relationship; Political Attitudes; Religious Factors; Research Methodology; *Sex Differences; *Social Attitudes; Statistical Analysis; Stimulants; *Surveys; Training Techniques

IDENTIFIERS Alienation; *Hippies

ABSTRACT

"Hippies" were questioned about drug usage, personal background, and attitudes. It is suggested that the "hippie" movement is primarily a symptom of alienation from the dominant values of society, although the nature of the sample precludes firm generalization. (DG)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

A PILOT STUDY AMONG EAST VILLAGE "HIPPIES"

Submitted by:

Theo Solomon
Research Associate

Associated YM-YWHAs
of
Greater New York
33 West 60th Street
New York, N.Y. 10023

Research Department
Douglas Holmes, Ph.D.,
Director

March 1968

Monograph #35

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | page |
|---|------|
| Introduction and Background..... | 1 |
| Objectives and Methodology..... | 2 |
| Findings..... | 4 |
| Content Analysis of Open End Questions..... | 12 |
| Tables - New York Study (Section 1)..... | 18 |
| Tables - E.V.O. Study (Section 2)..... | 43 |
| Conclusions and Observations..... | 47 |

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

The staffs of the Associated Y Community Centers have become increasingly aware of problems associated with drug use among their constituencies. For example, it has been reported that both smoking and selling of marijuana have occurred on the premises of the Community Centers.

Current literature and mass media reports suggest that drug abuse has become a growing problem among all adolescents. It is startling to learn that, as has been suggested, a disproportionately great number of "hippies," by definition "users," come from middle class Jewish homes, at least in the New York metropolitan area.

In response to the concern generated by these reports, the Research Department of the Associated Ys conducted a pilot study among "hippies" relating to their drug abuse. This preliminary study certainly is too small to permit valid generalization; however, even this cursory knowledge about some socio-psychological factors associated with "hippie" participation would provide the basis for a future, more comprehensive study.

Central to the study was the recruitment, training and deployment of five indigenous "hippie" interviewers, who conducted interviews with 51 "hippies" living in the "East Village" area of Manhattan.

As a means to gaining the cooperation of the target group various contacts were made with leaders of the "hippie" community over a two-week period. Objectives of the study were discussed in detail eliciting considerable interest on the part of the leadership. Once interest had been aroused, further discussions focused on the development of criteria for interviewer selection and training, the terms of

financial remuneration for both interviewer and respondent, and the length of time required for completion of the study. It became apparent during these preliminary talks that full collaborative participation would be maintained throughout the study period - as indeed it was. The pilot study began and ended on schedule.

During an initial phase of our study, prior to the interviews, a "hippie" newspaper, The East Village Other, asked the Associated Ys Research Department to analyze the returns from a questionnaire dealing with drug abuse which the newspaper had published in an August, 1967 issue. While recognizing that these respondents represent a self-selected, biased, albeit national, sample, the results are interesting and are included in Section 2 of this report.

OBJECTIVES:

The objectives of this pilot study were:

1. To test the feasibility of collecting personal data from members of the "hippie" community (using structured interviews).
2. To obtain an objective picture of the "hippie" community, in terms of both its members and its social structure.
3. To develop a working definition of the term "hippie."

METHODOLOGY:

Five interviewers were drawn from the "hippie" population to conduct the study. All five (four men and one woman) were college

graduates; moreover, two had received advanced degrees and one had attended graduate school. In addition, those selected were known within the "hippie" community and could not be regarded as potential police informants.

In the "hippie" community, status, and group identification is usually couched in terms of individual personal qualities, the nature of drug use, and the length of time one has been in the community. Seemingly irrelevant are such dimensions as ethnic origin, former or current socio-economic status or particular ideological orientation. These factors were not considered, therefore, in selecting interviewers.

Due both to the "pilot" nature of the study and to difficulties intrinsic to an initial study of such deviant behavior, no attempt was made to develop any rigorous sampling design.

However, based on discussions with members of the "hippie" community, coupled with current prevalence data, certain loose guidelines were established for sample selection. These guidelines were:

1. There are somewhat more males than female "hippies." It was decided based upon the above observation to use an arbitrary ratio of 60% males to 40% females.
2. The majority of "hippies" live in the East Village on a full-time basis. There are, however, "weekend hippies" who frequent the East Village area, but whose residence is elsewhere. It was decided that most of those interviewed would be those living full-time in the East Village environment.

3. Some "hippies" live in "communes" (collective domiciles of from four to twelve persons); moreover, to some degree, there is a polarization of ideology in terms of those who are politically active and those who are not.

It was decided that both of these dimensions be taken into consideration in the selection of respondents.

The stratifications mentioned above were utilized solely for the purposes of obtaining a profile of "hippies" along "representative dimensions." Due to the small sample, no attempt was made however to stratify the population along these dimensions for analytic purposes.

Interviews were conducted among 51 "hippies" during a two-week period from November 1 to November 15, 1967. To assure completed questionnaires, both interviewer and respondent received \$5 for each completed interview. Each interviewer returned at least ten completed schedules. (It was reported that three "hippies" refused to take part in the survey; all others completed the questionnaire.) Respondents were not asked to identify themselves, thereby reducing anxiety on the part of respondents that the documents could be used against them in any legal proceeding.

FINDINGS.

The nature of the study, particularly the sample precludes projection of the universe of "hippies." Thus, the summary of findings must be taken as representative only of those responding to the questionnaire, although suggestive of relationships which deserve further study.

The New York Pilot Study - Demographic Data

The profile of demographic data revealed the following

1. The majority of "hippies" studied were between the ages of 18 and 25. More males tended to be in the 18 to 22 year old category than females. There are more females in both the 13 to 17 and 23 to 25 age range than males. The average age for males is 23.5 years; for females 20.9 years. (Table 1-1)
2. The majority of "hippies" had attended college for some unspecified period of time. Ten percent indicated that they had graduated college. Males had a slightly higher level of education than females. (Table 1-2)
3. The majority of respondents reported the father's annual income to be over \$10,000. More females reported fathers who earned over \$15,000 annually than any other category. Males reported father's annual salary to be between \$10,000 and \$14,999. (Table 1-3)
4. The stated occupations of the fathers seems to be consistent with the general findings related to annual income. Approximately half of the respondents reported the father to be a professional, executive, or administrator. (Table 1-4)
5. Over one-third of the respondents indicated that their parents were Jewish. Males of Jewish

parentage far outnumbered males whose parents were of other religious affiliations. There were a disproportionate number of females whose parents are of some Protestant denominational affiliation. (Table 1-5)

Drug Usage.

Current literature on the subject of "hippies" refers continually to the usage of various drugs as one of the dominant themes of the subculture. Exploration into the nature, frequency, type of drug and usage patterns were pursued in great depth. The following profile emerges from these data:

Marijuana:

1. Within the "hippie" subculture, all respondents report the prior or current use of marijuana. (Table 1-6)
2. Most report introduction to marijuana in their late teens. There is a sizable group that reports introduction in their early teens - some before their twelfth year. Females tend to start somewhat earlier than males. (Table 1-7)
3. Well over half report usage of marijuana for more than three years. (Table 1-8)
4. Over half reported using drugs prior to becoming "hippies." (Table 1-9)
5. Few smoke marijuana as a solitary activity; most use it in a group context. (Table 1-10)
6. Most respondents reported smoking marijuana every day - or whenever it was available. (One-third

of all respondents and one-half of all females admitted to being "high" on marijuana at the time of the interview.) (Tables 1-11, 1-12)

7. The vast majority indicated no single personal source for obtaining marijuana. However, no respondent thought it difficult to obtain the drug whenever it was desired. (Table 1-13)
8. Over half of the respondents admitted "selling" marijuana. (Table 1-14)
9. Almost every respondent reported that he had at one time or other, distributed marijuana to others. Many stated they did so at no cost to the recipient. (Table 1-15a)
10. Among those who distributed marijuana to others, it was reported that one recipient in five was a "first-tryer." (Table 1-16)
11. Respondents indicated that they had introduced marijuana to a large number of "first-tryers." (One third indicated the number of persons "turned on" was between three and five; some indicated they had "turned on" over fifty persons.) (Table 1-17)

Drugs other than marijuana:

1. The vast majority of respondents indicated that they now use or have had experience with hashish and LSD; and to a lesser degree peyote (mescaline) and methadrine. (Table 1-6)

2. Respondents indicated that their use of these drugs occurred at a later age than their use of marijuana. (Table 1-18)
3. The data indicates that most respondents were exposed to drugs in the following order:
 - (1) marijuana
 - (2) hashish
 - (3) LSD (and other hallucinogenics such as DMT, STP, DET)
 - (4) methadrine (and other amphetamines). (Table 1-19)
4. Approximately half the respondents have been using the drugs cited above for between one and four years. (Table 1-20)
5. Among all respondents exposure to heroin has been extremely low. (Table 1-6)

Personal Biography and Interpersonal Relations

The findings in this section relate to the respondent's:

(A) personal history prior to and as a member of the "hippie" sub-culture; (B) the nature of his relationship to his past history.

1. Most respondents indicated that both parents are still alive. However, among males one out of four reported that his father was deceased. More female than male respondents indicated they had step-parents. (Table 1-21)
2. The vast majority of respondents indicated that their parents were of the same religious belief. Mixed (religious) marriages were more common among

parents of female respondents than male. (Tables 1-22, 1-5)

3. Most respondents reported that neither parent was active in religious observance. (Table 1-23)
4. The data indicates that most respondents thought that their parents had "handled" them in a relatively consistent manner. Parental "handling" tended to be more consistent among males than females. Both Jewish males and females felt that parental handling was more consistent than did any other religious group. Parental treatment was perceived to be extremely consistent among Jewish males. (Tables 1-24, 1-26)
5. Males in general, characterized parental "handling" as less rigid and more permissive than females. (Table 1-25)
6. Based on a five-point rating scale (very amicable to very hostile), most respondents characterized the relationship with their parents as more "amicable" than "hostile." Mothers in general were thought to be more polarized in their relationships with their children than fathers; that is, mothers were scored higher on being "very amicable" and "very hostile." Fathers scored higher on being "amicable" and "hostile." (Table 1-27)
7. Respondents were generally divided as to how often they communicated with their parents. Over half indicated that they generally communicate with

parents "a couple of times a month" or more;
almost half "a couple of times a year" or "never."
(Table 1-28)

8. About half of the respondents indicated that they still communicate with friends at home. (Table 1-29)
9. Half of all respondents indicated that at one time they were members of a "straight" organization. (That is, sorority, fraternity, formal or informal association, political club, etc.) More females reported that they were members of this type of organization than males. Of those respondents who reported such membership, two out of three, upon reflection, did not regard this previous association as having been a positive one. (Table 1-30)
10. The vast majority indicated no contact with law enforcement authorities regarding drug use. (Table 1-31) Of those who had been arrested, all report one encounter for possession of marijuana. Although some had been convicted on this charge, no respondent reported being institutionalized.
11. Few of the respondents state that they are anxious about being apprehended by the authorities for illegal drug use. (Table 1-32)
12. The overwhelming majority of the respondents' parents used alcoholic beverages. Of those parents who did drink, one out of three was characterized as being a heavy drinker. (Tables 1-33, 1-34)

13. Respondents, conversely, report little usage of alcoholic beverages. (Table 1-35)
14. Almost one out of every five respondents indicated that at least one of their parents "turned on" (smoked marijuana). (Table 1-36)

SUMMARY AND CONTENT ANALYSES OF OPEN END QUESTIONS
REGARDING "HIPPIE" ASPIRATIONS, MOTIVATIONS AND ATTITUDES

The first portion of the interview focused primarily on the general philosophic orientation of the respondent. This part of the interview came first for two reasons. First, it was felt that questions of this nature would be of the greatest interest to the respondents. That is, it presented the opportunity to espouse a Weltanschaaung to "explain" their current life-style so that "others" may understand a seemingly anti-social posture. Second, it was considered preferable to obtain information of a less personal/emotional nature prior to investigating areas of possible high emotional involvement, e.g., "illegal" drug use and personal relationships. Thus, initial questions dealt with motivation for joining the "hippie" community, perceived advantages and disadvantages in making this commitment, and attitudes about the future.

In terms of the meaning attached to being a "hippie," responses generally can be subsumed under two categories of reaction to alienation from the norms and values of the dominant society. These categories are: (1) perception of powerlessness, and (2) feelings of self-estrangement.

1. Powerlessness: The expectancy held by an individual that his own behavior cannot determine the outcome of events.

Examples mentioned most frequently:

"Doing what you want without interference"

"Doing my thing"

"Find people who wouldn't force me to do things
I hate"

(Responses above are representative of those implying previous restraint regarding the individual's control of events.)

2. Self-Estrangement: The perceived feeling that one is somewhat less than one might ideally be if circumstances in society were otherwise. The feeling of estrangement from some ideal human condition - and, the awareness of the discrepancy between "objective" circumstances and the "ideal."

Examples most frequently mentioned:

"Being free in mind and spirit"/"Sharing a spirit"

"Finding honesty and integrity"

"Having the capacity to love"

"A way of life; no hate, pettiness or greed"

"Innocence;" "Openness and sincerity"

"Self-growth in a natural way"

The above verbatim accounts reflect the search for (and therefore the desire to re-institute) the "ideal" values felt to be at one time commonly held and currently non-existent.

The view that society has not lived up to the "ideal" human condition, and the ensuing feeling of alienation tends to be regarded by many to be the motivation for their commitment to an alternate life-style.

These "ideal" responses are reflected also in statements related to future orientation. When asked "what will you be doing one year from now - and five years from now?" responses included:

"Helping others who need help"

"Working in a Kibbutz in Israel"

"Staring at the sky"

"Working with confused kids"

"Living in a commune/in the country"

The theme of search for the "ideal" human condition is evident regarding "attraction to the movement."

"Reaction to the sterility of present day society"

"Beautiful philosophy of love and peace/brotherhood"

"True individuality"/"Freedom"

"The caring I found among people here"

Analysis of the perceived disadvantages of being a "hippie," showed a tendency for the "hippie" to focus upon the perceptions of society about "hippies" and the society's subsequent overt rejection.

"Straight society is down on you"

"Treatment like second class citizens"

"People take advantage of you"

"People categorize you without knowing you"

"Police brutality"/"Police treat us like Negroes"/Get beaten up"

"Discrimination"

"Economic persecution"

"Lack of common courtesies accorded us"

Focusing again on estrangement, it is interesting to make note of the following interview questions and the general response obtained. The questions were:

"Who was the first person you contacted when you came to this community?"

"Explain briefly, the circumstances under which you were first exposed to drugs."

"How did you first connect?"

"How did you locate your present source of supply?"

"With whom do you live?"

All elicited the same general response: "friends." However, upon probing for the nature of these friendships, it was found that in a majority of cases, friendships were made after a relatively short acquaintance, e.g., 5-10 minutes. Some even stated that it was "friendship at first sight."

Most respondents reported few meaningful prior social relationships, for example, among parents and friends, prior to entering the "hippie" community. Given this background, the facile nature of these "hippie" friendships offers a clue to the attraction this community holds for the alienated. That is, the "hippie" community by its very nature is conducive to establishing quick and immediate friendships, while imposing few of the demands usually associated with meaningful interpersonal relationships.

The analytic framework of "self-estrangement" and "powerlessness" utilized above is not meant to preclude other interpretations of the data contained in the open-end responses. This approach was selected as a means of focusing our attention on the dominant themes regarding the "hippies'" raison d'etre.

Content analysis of responses not compatible with the strict alienation construct detailed above, revealed a conglomerate of motives and perceptions.

In response to questions regarding "attraction to the movement," some stressed hedonistic motivation as the primary attraction.

Examples mentioned most frequently:

"Love"

"Sex"

"Girls"

"Drugs"/"To try drugs"

"Fun"

Secondary attractions stressed purely pragmatic motivations lacking "philosophic" content.

"My friends were here"

"It's cheap to live here"

"I sort of drifted into it"

"I lived/hung out in the West Village"

"I came to stay with my girl friend"

Questions regarding orientation to future planning elicited responses of a hazy and/or non-committal or uncertain nature. More responses of this nature were found in answer to the question, "What do you think you will be doing five years from now?", than, "What do you think you will be doing one year from now?"

Examples mentioned most frequently:

"I don't know"

"It doesn't matter"

"Who cares"

"Living"

"It's a stupid question"

"I don't think that far ahead"

"Probably be dead"

The stress on a "now" orientation of some of the respondents seems to indicate a facet of alienation probably conducive to the "powerlessness" construct. That is, a feeling that the individual does not

have control over future events. However, it seems most doubtful that the primary and secondary motives indicated by some respondents are consistent with a total commitment to the "hippie" credo. These responses appear more indicative of the "use" of certain facets of the "hippie" credo as a convenient umbrella under which strictly self-centered behavior can be manifest.

TABLE 1-1

AGE

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| 13 - 17 * | 14 | 6 | 26 |
| 18 - 22 | 40 | 43 | 37 |
| 23 - 25 | 24 | 19 | 37 |
| 26 - 30 | 18 | 26 | 5 |
| 31 - 40 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| 41 - 50 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |

* Our study indicates that all females in the 13 - 17 year old category are "run-aways" (those residing in the East Village without parental consent).

Those males within the same age category were "week-enders" (members of the hippie community from Friday evening to Sunday evening).

TABLE 1-2

EDUCATION*

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|---------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Grade School | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| J.H.S. | 6 | 3 | 11 |
| High School | 24 | 23 | 26 |
| Some College | 54 | 55 | 53 |
| Graduated College | 10 | 13 | 5 |
| Some Graduate School | 4 | 6 | 0 |
| Completed Graduate School | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |

* Among the group studied, these proportions will not remain constant in that some respondents indicated that they were still attending school. This was true for "full-time" "hippies" as well as "week-enders".

TABLE 1-3

ANNUAL INCOME OF FATHER*

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| under \$5,000 | 6 | 6 | 5 |
| \$5,000 - \$7,499 | 12 | 10 | 15 |
| \$7,500 - \$9,900 | 16 | 19 | 10 |
| \$10,000 - \$14,999 | 31 | 39 | 20 |
| \$15,000 and over | 24 | 13 | 40 |
| DK/NA | 11 | 13 | 10 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |

* In order to place the respondents in some socio-economic perspective, questions related to the respondents' income and income of the father were asked. Information obtained regarding the respondents' income (not presented) was not indicative of any previous lifestyle. This is due in part to a general philosophy which in part places material and financial reward in low-esteem because of the perceived "over-evaluation" placed upon such rewards by the dominant culture. Where respondents indicated that the father was deceased, respondents were asked to give the last known annual income.

TABLE 1-4
OCCUPATION OF FATHER
 (Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Professional | 29 | 28 | 30 |
| Executive and Administrative | 22 | 21 | 25 |
| Clerical and Sales | 18 | 17 | 20 |
| Skilled and Semi-Skilled | 22 | 24 | 20 |
| Other | 9 | 10 | 5 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (49) | (29) | (20) |

TABLE 1-5
RELIGION OF PARENTS
 (Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Jewish | 35 | 47 | 20 |
| Protestant | 22 | 17 | 30 |
| Catholic | 22 | 20 | 25 |
| Atheist | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| Mixed | 16 | 10 | 25 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (30) | (20) |

TABLE 1-6
REPORTED DRUG USAGE
 (Based on all respondents)

| | <u>M A R I J U A N A</u> | | | <u>H A S H I S H</u> | | | <u>L S D</u> | | |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
| Use now | 98 | 97 | 100 | 82 | 81 | 85 | 61 | 58 | 65 |
| Used in the past, but do not currently use | 2 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 13 | 5 | 29 | 39 | 15 |
| Never used | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 20 |
| NA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) | (51) | (31) | (20) | (51) | (31) | (20) |

| | <u>M E T H A D R I N</u> | | | <u>PEYOTE (MESCALIN)</u> | | | <u>H E R O I N</u> | | |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
| Use now | 31 | 29 | 35 | 29 | 29 | 30 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| Used in the past, but do not currently use | 27 | 23 | 35 | 22 | 19 | 25 | 14 | 13 | 15 |
| Never used | 42 | 48 | 30 | 49 | 52 | 45 | 84 | 87 | 80 |
| NA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) | (51) | (31) | (20) | (51) | (31) | (20) |

TABLE 1-7
AGE STARTED USING MARIJUANA
 (Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Under 12 | 4 | 0 | 10 |
| 12 - 15 | 27 | 26 | 30 |
| 16 - 19 | 49 | 48 | 50 |
| 20 - 23 | 18 | 23 | 10 |
| 23 - 27 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| 28 - 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NA | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |

TABLE 1-8
LENGTH OF TIME RESPONDENTS USED MARIJUANA
 (Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| under 2 mos. | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| 3 - 6 mos. | 6 | 3 | 10 |
| 7 mos. - 1 yr. | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| 1 - 2 yrs. | 16 | 16 | 15 |
| 3 - 4 yrs. | 20 | 19 | 20 |
| over 4 yrs. | 51 | 51 | 50 |
| NA | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |

TABLE 1-9

RESPONDENTS REPORTING USE OF ONE OR MORE DRUGSPRIOR TO ENTRANCE INTO HIPPIE COMMUNITY

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Used drugs | 55 | 39 | 66 |
| Did <u>not</u> use drugs | 45 | 61 | 34 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |

TABLE 1-10

SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS IN SMOKING MARIJUANA

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Smoke alone | 8 | 3 | 15 |
| Smoke in group | 71 | 77 | 60 |
| Both | 18 | 19 | 15 |
| NA | 3 | 1 | 10 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |

TABLE 1-11
USUAL FREQUENCY OF SMOKING MARIJUANA

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Every day | 65 | 58 | 75 |
| 6 x week | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| 3 - 5 x week | 14 | 16 | 10 |
| 3 x month | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 - 2 x month | 2 | 0 | 10 |
| less than 1 x month | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| whenever available | 10 | 10 | 5 |
| other | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| NA | 5 | 10 | 0 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |

TABLE 1-12

THOSE REPORTING INFLUENCE OF MARIJUANA AT TIME OF INTERVIEW

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|-------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Yes | 35 | 26 | 50 |
| No | 61 | 71 | 45 |
| NA | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |

TABLE 1-13

RESPONDENTS REPORTING A STEADY "CONNECTION"*

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|-------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Yes | 14 | 16 | 10 |
| No | 84 | 84 | 80 |
| Other | 2 | 0 | 10 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |

* Connection - a person who supplies drugs to others by sale or gift.

TABLE 1-14

RESPONDENTS REPORTING SELLING MARIJUANA

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|-------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Yes | 55 | 68 | 35 |
| No | 45 | 32 | 65 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |

TABLE 1-15
RESPONDENTS STATING THE PROBABILITY THAT THEY
WOULD SELL DRUGS EVEN IF OBTAINED GRATIS
 (Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Would sell | 14 | 13 | 15 |
| Would <u>not</u> sell | 71 | 84 | 50 |
| NA | 15 | 3 | 35 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |

TABLE 1-15a
RESPONDENTS REPORTING GIVING MARIJUANA TO OTHERS
 (Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|---|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Have at times given marijuana to others | 92 | 94 | 90 |
| Have at <u>no</u> time given marijuana to others | 8 | 6 | 10 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |

TABLE 1-16

GENERAL CHARACTERIZATION OF RECIPIENTS OF DRUGS(THROUGH PURCHASE OR GIFT)

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Previous users | 80 | 81 | 80 |
| "First-tryers" | 20 | 19 | 20 |
| | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |

TABLE 1-17

RESPONDENTS REPORTING NUMBER OF "FIRST-TRYERS"TO WHOM THEY HAVE GIVEN MARIJUANA(Based on those who stated they have
"turned on" persons for the first time)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| 1 or 2 persons | 18 | 11 | 29 |
| 3 - 5 " | 33 | 32 | 35 |
| 6 - 10 " | 16 | 14 | 18 |
| 11 - 30 " | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| 31 - 50 " | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| Over 50 | 7 | 11 | 0 |
| Don't remember | 6 | 10 | 0 |
| | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (45) | (28) | (17) |

TABLE 1-18
AGE STARTED USING ALL OTHER DRUGS
 (Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|--------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Under 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 - 15 | 18 | 13 | 25 |
| 16 - 19 | 51 | 52 | 50 |
| 20 - 23 | 24 | 23 | 25 |
| 24 - 27 | 4 | 6 | 0 |
| 28 - 31 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| NA | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |

TABLE 1-19

ORDER OF EXPOSURE TO DRUGS, BY DRUG TYPE

(Based on respondents who reported current or previous use)

| | Marijuana | | | Hashish | | | LSD | | | Methadrine | | |
|--------------|-----------|------|------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------------|------|------|
| | T | M | F | T | M | F | T | M | F | T | M | F |
| 1st exposure | 78 | 75 | 85 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2nd | 14 | 16 | 10 | 54 | 59 | 47 | 17 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3rd | 4 | 3 | 5 | 17 | 21 | 10 | 24 | 20 | 22 | 26 | 17 | 17 |
| 4th | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 10 | 21 | 22 | 27 | 18 | 20 | 17 | 17 |
| 5th | 2 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 21 | 11 | 10 | 18 | 7 | 35 | 35 |
| 6th | | | | 4 | 7 | | 9 | 7 | 15 | 13 | 17 | 17 |
| 7th | | | | | | | 7 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 8 |
| 8th | | | | | | | 2 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| 9th | | | | | | | 4 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 8 |
| 10th | | | | | | | | | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| NA | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total % | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) | (48) | (29) | (19) | (46) | (30) | (16) | (27) | (15) | (12) |

TABLE 1-20

LENGTH OF TIME USED DRUGS, BY DRUG TYPE

(based on respondents who reported current or previous use)

| | Marijuana | | | Hashish | | | LSD | | | Methadrine | | | Heroin | | |
|--------------|-----------|------|------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------------|------|------|--------|-----|-----|
| | T | M | F | T | M | F | T | M | F | T | M | F | T | M | F |
| Under 2 mos. | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 24 | 8 | 42 | 17 | 0 | 33 |
| 3-6 mos. | 6 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 13 | 17 | 6 | 12 | 16 | 8 | 17 | 33 | 0 |
| 7 mos.-1 yr. | 2 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 16 | 15 | 20 | 5 | 20 | 30 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1-2 yrs. | 16 | 16 | 15 | 21 | 17 | 26 | 28 | 23 | 38 | 28 | 30 | 25 | 17 | 33 | 0 |
| 3-4 yrs. | 20 | 19 | 20 | 27 | 31 | 21 | 20 | 17 | 25 | 12 | 8 | 17 | 34 | 17 | 18 |
| Over 4 yrs. | 51 | 51 | 50 | 28 | 17 | 26 | 16 | 13 | 19 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 |
| NA | 1 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total % | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) | (48) | (29) | (19) | (46) | (30) | (16) | (25) | (13) | (12) | (8) | (4) | (4) |

TABLE 1-21
PARENTS LIVING
 (Based on all respondents)

| | | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|--------------------|-------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| <u>Mother</u> | | | | |
| Yes | | 96 | 97 | 95 |
| No | | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | Base | (49) | (30) | (19) |
| <u>Father</u> | | | | |
| Yes | | 82 | 77 | 89 |
| No | | 18 | 23 | 11 |
| | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | Base | (49) | (30) | (19) |
| <u>Stepparents</u> | | | | |
| Stepmother | | 12 | 3 | 26 |
| Stepfather | | 16 | 13 | 21 |
| | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | Base | (49) | (30) | (19) |

TABLE 1-22

MOTHER AND FATHER BELONGING TO SAME RELIGION

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|-------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Yes | 86 | 90 | 80 |
| No | 14 | 10 | 20 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (50) | (30) | (20) |

TABLE 1-23

PARENTS ACTIVE IN RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCES

(Based on respondents whose parents belonged to some organized religion)

| | <u>T o t a l</u> | | <u>M o t h e r</u> | | <u>F a t h e r</u> | |
|-------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
| Yes | 27 | 21 | 23 | 32 | 25 | 29 |
| No | 73 | 79 | 77 | 68 | 75 | 71 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (49) | (48) | (30) | (19) | (30) | (19) |

TABLE 1-24
PERCEIVED HANDLING OF PARENTS
 (Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Fairly consistent | 62 | 68 | 50 |
| Fairly inconsistent | 38 | 32 | 50 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (50) | (30) | (20) |

TABLE 1-25
TYPES OF HANDLING BY PARENTS CHARACTERIZED BY RESPONDENTS
 (Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Extremely rigid | 19 | 13 | 27 |
| Somewhat rigid | 20 | 22 | 18 |
| Not too rigid not too permissive | 24 | 25 | 23 |
| Somewhat permissive | 24 | 27 | 18 |
| Extremely permissive | 13 | 13 | 14 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |

TABLE 1-26

PERCEIVED HANDLING OF PARENTS BY PARENTAL RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION

(Based on all respondents)

| | Total | | Male | | Female | |
|---------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|
| | % (Jewish) | (Non- Jewish) | % (Jewish) | (Non- Jewish) | % (Jewish) | (Non- Jewish) |
| Fairly consistent | 83 | 52 | 93 | 50 | 50 | 53 |
| Fairly inconsistent | 17 | 48 | 7 | 50 | 50 | 47 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (18) | (35) | (14) | (4) | (16) | (15) |

TABLE 1-27

REPORTED RELATIONSHIP WITH PARENTS

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Average</u> % | <u>Mother</u> % | <u>Father</u> % |
|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Very amicable | 25 | 27 | 23 |
| Somewhat amicable | 30 | 29 | 31 |
| Neutral | 20 | 20 | 21 |
| Somewhat hostile | 15 | 12 | 19 |
| Extremely hostile | 9 | 12 | 6 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (99) | (51) | (48) |

TABLE 1-28

FREQUENCY OF COMMUNICATION WITH PARENTS

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|---------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Twice a week | 20 | 26 | 10 |
| Once a week | 12 | 13 | 10 |
| Twice a month | 18 | 10 | 30 |
| Once a month | 8 | 10 | 5 |
| Twice a year | 26 | 23 | 30 |
| Never | 16 | 16 | 15 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (50) | (30) | (20) |

TABLE 1-29

COMMUNICATION WITH FRIENDS

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|-------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Yes | 54 | 57 | 50 |
| No | 46 | 43 | 50 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (48) | (28) | (20) |

TABLE 1-30

PREVIOUS MEMBERSHIP IN RECOGNIZED ASSOCIATIONS/ORGANIZATIONS

(Based on all respondents)

| | | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|---|-------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Yes | | 50 | 43 | 61 |
| No | | 50 | 57 | 39 |
| | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | Base | (48) | (30) | (18) |
| Positive remembrance of organization | | 37 | 30 | 30 |
| Negative remembrance of organization | | 63 | 70 | 70 |
| | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | Base | (24) | (12) | (12) |

TABLE 1-31
PREVIOUS ARRESTS ON DRUG CHARGES
 (Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|-------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Yes | 18 | 23 | 10 |
| No | 82 | 77 | 90 |
| | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |

TABLE 1-32
REPORTED ANXIETY REGARDING POLICE
 (Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Extremely anxious | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| Very anxious | 14 | 9 | 22 |
| Not very anxious | 24 | 28 | 22 |
| Not at all anxious | 20 | 25 | 11 |
| Don't think about it | 40 | 34 | 39 |
| | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (49) | (31) | (18) |

TABLE 1-33

PARENTAL USE OF INTOXICANTS

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| <u>Beer</u> | | | |
| Yes | 81 | 77 | 90 |
| No | 19 | 23 | 10 |
| | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (49) | (30) | (19) |
| <u>Whiskey</u> | | | |
| Yes | 88 | 87 | 90 |
| No | 12 | 13 | 10 |
| | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (50) | (30) | (20) |

TABLE 1-34

RESPONDENTS CHARACTERIZATION OF PARENTAL DRINKING HABITS

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|-------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Heavy | 33 | 33 | 33 |
| Light | 67 | 67 | 67 |
| | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (48) | (28) | (20) |

TABLE 1-35

REPORTED USE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES AMONG "HIPPIES "

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| <u>Beer</u> | | | |
| Yes | 45 | 45 | 42 |
| No | 55 | 55 | 58 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (51) | (31) | (20) |
| <u>Whiskey</u> | | | |
| Yes | 25 | 23 | 36 |
| No | 75 | 77 | 64 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (49) | (30) | (19) |

TABLE 1-36

PARENTAL USE OF MARIJUANA

(Based on all respondents)

| | <u>Total</u> % | <u>Male</u> % | <u>Female</u> % |
|-------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Yes | 17 | 14 | 22 |
| No | 83 | 86 | 78 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base | (47) | (29) | (18) |

SECTION 2

In this section comparisons will be made between the data obtained in our New York study and the EAST VILLAGE OTHER "national" survey. Although the methods of data collection were different in nature - and neither was rigorous in sample selection, certain consistent patterns emerge that are worthy of comment. Unfortunately, comparisons cannot be made on every dimension due to the nature of the EAST VILLAGE OTHER survey which concerned itself primarily with drug usage. The following tables (2-1 through 2-7) reflect data on all dimensions of possible comparability.

TABLE 2-1

AGE OF HIPPIES

| | <u>New York Study</u> | <u>E.V.O. Study</u> |
|-------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | % | % |
| 13-17 | 14 | 15 |
| 18-22 | 40 | } 63 |
| 23-25 | 24 | |
| 26-30 | 18 | 12 |
| 31+ | <u>4</u> | <u>11</u> |
| Total | 100% | 100% |
| Base | (51) | (229) |

TABLE 2-2

EDUCATION

| | <u>N.Y. Study</u> | <u>E.V.O. Study</u> |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| | % | % |
| Grade School | 2 | 2 |
| Junior High School | 6 | 0 |
| High School/High School Graduate | 24 | 26 |
| Some College | 54 | 58 |
| College Graduate | 10 | |
| Some Graduate School | 4 | 7 |
| Completed Graduate School | 0 | 4 |
| Reject | <u>0</u> | <u>3</u> |
| Total | 100% | 100% |
| Base | (51) | (229) |

TABLE 2-3

SOURCE OF CURRENT INCOME

| | <u>N.Y. Study</u> | <u>E.V.O. Study</u> |
|--------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| | % | % |
| Work (full or part time) | 67 | 74 |
| Parents | 24 | 12 |
| Sell Drugs | 18 | 8 |
| Housewife/Student | <u>8</u> | <u>7</u> |
| Total | * | * |
| Base | (51) | (229) |

* Total equals more than 100% because of multiple responses.

TABLE 2-4

EVER SOLD MARIJUANA

| | <u>N.Y. Study</u> | <u>E.V.O. Study</u> |
|-------|-------------------|---------------------|
| | % | % |
| Yes | 55 | 64 |
| No | 45 | 31 |
| Other | <u>0</u> | <u>5</u> |
| Total | 100% | 100% |
| Base | (51) | (229) |

TABLE 2-5

RESPONDENTS REPORTING AT LEAST ONE ARREST FOR MARIJUANA POSSESSION

| | <u>N.Y. Study</u> | <u>E.V.O. Study</u> |
|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| | % | % |
| Arrested at Least Once | 18 | 13 |
| Never Arrested | <u>82</u> | <u>87</u> |
| Total | 100% | 100% |
| Base | (51) | (229) |

TABLE 2-6

RESPONDENTS STATING ANXIETY WITH REGARD TO POLICE

| | <u>N.Y. Study</u> | | <u>E.V.O. Study</u> |
|---|-------------------|----------|---------------------|
| | % | | % |
| Extremely Anxious/Very Anxious | 16 | Yes | 14 |
| Not Very Anxious | 24 | Yes & No | 31 |
| Not at All Anxious/ Don't Think About It | <u>60</u> | No | <u>55</u> |
| Total | 100% | | 100% |
| Base | (51) | | (229) |

TABLE 2-7

PREVIOUS OR CURRENT USAGE OF DRUGS

| | <u>N.Y. Study</u> | <u>E.V.O. Study</u> |
|------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| | % | % |
| Marijuana | 98 | 98 |
| Hashish | 92 | 85 |
| L.S.D. | 90 | 77 |
| Methadrine | 58 | 70 |
| Peyote | 51 | 41 |
| Heroin | <u>16</u> | <u>21</u> |
| Total | * | * |
| Base | (51) | (229) |

*Total equals more than 100% because of multiple responses.

Although comparisons have been made on only a few of the many dimensions covered in the E.V.O. Study and our New York Study, the data indicate that there is a tendency for both groups of data to exhibit more similarities than differences in demographic characteristics and patterns of drug use among respondents. This may be due in part, or wholly, to the self-selected nature of respondents in both studies. In both cases, the respondents, by voluntarily submitting information, show a high interest and involvement in transmitting this information to others. It well may be a manner in which the respondents' "deviancy" from accepted norms could be proclaimed as well as reinforced. Therefore, respondents by the nature of their intensity of interest may be more, or less "deviant" than the total "hippie" population, and not reflective of the actual spectrum of "deviancy" or commitment to the sub-group attitudes.

CONCLUSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The data suggest that the "hippie" movement is primarily a symptom of alienation. That is, most "hippies" in the group studied may be characterized as alienated, removed from, or uncommitted to the dominant values of society. This may stem from and be rationalized by disenchantment with both the prior home environment, i.e., poor familial and primary group relationships, and the perceived discrepancy between society's ethical tradition and its currently-valued activities.

Many of the people studied had exhibited behavior now considered "hippie" well before the advent of the community. For example, many reported leaving home in their teens, using various drugs at an early age, being uncommitted to anything or anybody - and having had a feeling of personal irrelevancy in relation to the norms and values of the dominant society.

If we assume that "hippies" have rejected the dominant values of society, it is then important to ask - to what or whom are they committed? Is commitment purely on a personal basis, i.e., "doing my thing," or are there attempts being made for institutional or social change?

No comparison group was developed in our study, hence no information is available in terms of possible differences between "hippies" and "non-hippies" along dimensions which may be highly relevant to an understanding of the aetiology of "hippieness." Such research certainly is warranted, as the identification of such variables may prove useful in terms not only of learning more about "hippies," but in terms also of identifying possible "latent converts," and the means for early intervention, where warranted.

It is clear that although many "hippies" espouse (and probably adhere to) the tenets of the "hippie" philosophy - some have used the movement as a cover for other less "utopian" forms of behavior, e.g., sexual promiscuity and drug use. Subsequent study should focus on differences to be found among the "hippies" in terms particularly of the nature and concomitants of involvement.

These are only some of the dimensions that must be pursued in depth in order to gain a more objective picture of, not only the "hippie" community, but of the "hippie mentality" - a phenomenon that may be more widespread than is known.