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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

An Overview:

This report deals with the problem of drug use among young people in the United States, and more specifically with use among young people in one rural Ohio school district. When addressing the problem, many difficulties are immediately confronted, including documentation, definition, and focus. In this chapter, data and observations from the voluminous drug literature are presented supported the contention that adolescent drug use is a serious national and international problem which has been increasing for many years. As the reader reviews the material presented relative to the scope of the problem, the difficulty of definition will become clear. This definitional difficulty is confronted more directly in Chapter Two, where the focus of the research is sharpened. Here let it suffice to briefly outline the approach to the drug problem used in this research.

After elaborating the scope of the drug problem the discussion moves on to present a comprehensive theory of teenage drug use. This theory argues that there is a complex of forces which combine to significantly increase the probability of drug abuse among teenagers. This theory further suggests that the institutions of the family, the church, and the school are pivotal in terms of whether or not the teenager becomes a drug user. Having presented that theory, the remaining
chapters of this report present the methodology used to test the theory, the findings from the research based on the theory, and the conclusions reached as a result of the research. With this overview in mind, the discussion focuses on the scope of the drug problem.

The Scope of the "Drug Problem" - International:

In 1970, the Attorney General of the United States asserted that narcotics and dangerous drugs are a threat to the physical and mental health of the country. The threat is especially real for young people, who are turning to drugs in increasing numbers. He went on to point out that demand for and availability of drugs is increasing and that every segment of society is affected by drug addiction. His call was for the active assistance of every citizen, as well as for national and international action. (Mitchell, 1970). Yolles (1969) considers drug abuse to be a health, legal, social, economic, and moral problem. He elaborates to see such abuse as a complex phenomenon involving the interaction of the drug being abused, the person abusing the drug, and the characteristics of the society in which the drug is abused. A "changing society" is, for Yolles, a key factor when researching this significant international problem. World Health (1971) reports that the drug problem is a source of major concern to most societies. In that report, drug abuse is seen as related to how the user feels about his world; and use is seen as an expression of individual character and values of young people. In Europe, for example, the use of psychotropic drugs has been expanding since 1956, including the spread of associated dangers to the individual and society. (Schuster, 1970).
Among the possible dangers considered are irreversible somatic damage and personality degeneration. This growing problem requires national as well as international remediation and repression, according to Schuster.

The British Medical Journal (1967) reports an upward trend in teenage use in England. Dawtry (1968) observes that England's drug problem increased fourfold between 1958 and 1968. During that same period, he reports known heroin use increasing twentyfold. Continuing, he expresses fear of expanding involvement in drug traffic of criminal organizations, as in the United States. The British problem covers a range from misuse to addiction and is especially focused on adolescents. The Journal of the Irish Medical Association (1971) discussed Ireland's drug abuse problem. Their abuse is seen as stemming from the individual's social and emotional problems, and the call is for helping the user to become more socially productive and responsible. Wilson and Byrne (1971) have also looked at drug taking in Ireland. Their survey of 3,344 school children revealed that about 17 percent of the children either had or wanted to take drugs; 20 percent knew someone taking drugs; and 33 percent knew how to obtain them. Boys were more likely than girls to know how to get drugs; and a child's religious denomination tended to affect his responses to survey questions. They projected an increase in teenage use through 1974, although not to the extent seen in the United States.

Rosenberg (1969) has seen a marked change in the pattern of drug addiction in several countries over the past several years, especially in terms of the emergence of younger addicts. He sees
Australia as being on the verge of a major drug problem. However, little is known about the background and personality of these new young addicts. His study of fifty addicts from Sidney under age 31 found use of multiple drugs; involvement in a hippie subculture; a majority from working class families disrupted by broken marriages, alcoholism, and mental illness; and a history of adolescent antisocial behavior was common. Addiction was not found to be related to intelligence, but was seen as stemming from deprived backgrounds and personality problems. A national seminar on Australia's drug problem in 1972 (Medical Journal of Australia, 1972) saw that both younger and older people are involved with drugs in Australia. The participants—age 16 to 21—called for, among other measures, programs which emphasize parental responsibility in the development of social attitudes in children. Focusing primarily on the abuse of cannabis, Miller (1970) looks at the drug abuse problem in Israel. Here, such abuse is seen as etiologically related to a complex of sociological as well as psychological problems. LSD has also been seen as involved in Israel's problem of drugs and addiction (International Journal of Offender Therapy, 1971). In that same discussion, use—especially since the Six Day War—is seen as causally linked to the influx of "outsiders" and to changing social attitudes toward users.

Louria (1968) discusses the drug problem in Sweden and the United States. He sees personality, varying cultural patterns, and user expectations as important elements in use and in the effects derived from psychedelic drugs. The interesting view is posited that the same drug may elicit aggressive responses in aggressive societies.
while yielding passive, introspective responses in peaceful societies. He continues by suggesting that abuse of stimulants is a greater problem in the United States than the abuse of cannabis. Stimulant abuse started in Sweden in the 1940's, and by 1967 the number of stimulant addicts in Stockholm alone was near 6,000. The increase of stimulant use in the United States is also seen as spreading from delinquent groups into college communities and hippie groups, according to Louria. He finally considers the grave implications of a drug oriented society.

Bender (1963) also considers the wave of drug abuse in the United States and what she calls Sweden's epidemic among teenagers. She reports that a similar "wave" took place between 1910 and 1920, suggesting that abuse is not unique to a particular country or to a particular time. Bender points out that users under sixteen years old usually come from broken homes and disorganized neighborhoods. They are withdrawn, unaggressive, and conforming; and their drug involvement is seen as less important than their other social and economic problems. Nonetheless, the most critical factor to deal with, she thinks, is the pusher. In 1970, Birdwood (1970) continued Bender's earlier view of a drug abuse "wave" in Sweden. He sees properties of the drugs, individual factors, and family, social, and cultural factors as relevant to use. In Sweden, he notes that 40 percent of drug abuse cases admitted to hospitals are age 40 or over. Changing social values, however, are making use—especially cannabis use—more acceptable to all groups.
The examples of the international scope of the drug problem could be continued. One could hardly escape knowledge of the problem in Southeast Asia unless he has not been exposed to American TV and newspapers for several years. Bejerot (1970) calls attention to addiction problems in Russia, China, and Japan. Throughout the world, drugs and abuse are a serious problem for many nations and millions of people.

The Scope of the "Drug Problem" - The United States:

Koutsky and Larson (1967), discussing the growing problem in American society of drug and alcohol addiction, observe such dependency across all cultural, educational, and economic levels. Helpem (1968) reinforces the point that drug problems affect people on all socioeconomic levels. He associates use with political, social, and cultural rebellion, and feels that the government's punitive attitude toward drug users and the insufficient attention given to medical, psychiatric, social, and economic factors are seen as related to use by many scientists. Most, however, feel that regulation, enforcement, and police work are indispensible elements in coping with the problem.

Freedman (1970) has addressed the drug problem in United States industry. Before elaborating on that problem, Freedman has made some other observations worth noting. He raises the difficult question of defining terms such as addiction, abuse, misuse, and so on. He suggests that "... definitions depend on objective appraisal; and objectivity is a subjective phenomenon depending on societal mores and other variables. Accordingly, it is more useful to society, which
is so mobile and pluralistic, to make sound assessments of public health and social dangers, rather than to strictly, moralistically, and abstractly construct definitions of different abuses or misuses of drugs (for example). Attempts to define addiction have lead to conflicting opinions between experts and even to self contradiction by individual authorities . . . In industry, as elsewhere, attempts must be made to approach the drug abuse problem in terms of sorting out of the issues of drugs, persons, occasions, desired and undesired outcomes, and appropriate social responses. Society is suffering from an epidemic of drug interest which is far more distracting than actual patterns of drug use and misuse." (Freedman, 1970). Weinswig (1970) has also looked at drugs and industry. He suggests that the reasons for drug use in industry as elsewhere are as varied as the individual users. Bisgeier, (1970) categorizes users as experimenters, recreational users, the user with personality defects, and addicts. In one plant he notes that, even with the difficulty of detection and definition, the abuse rate increased 100 percent to 8 per 1,000 new applicants over a nine month period. This, of course, only accounts for those who either admitted to use or were detected during routine physical examinations. John (1970) expressed concern, too, about the industrial drug problem, suggesting that it presents a real problem for personnel managers. Drugs rob the employee of the motivation to do his job, makes a thief of him to pay for his drugs, and makes him and the drug problem a problem of industrial security. The industrial problem involved people, time, production, and money. Drugs are an industrial problem.
Along with industrial involvement and the increasing involvement of adults more generally, young people are becoming involved in increasing numbers (Smith, 1970). As Rosenthal suggests, drugs are no longer just a ghetto problem. Suburban and rural areas are now face-to-face with it (Rosenthal, 1970). "And now that good kids are becoming involved, people are beginning to care about the problem." (Bloomquist, 1968). As should be clear by now, drug use has been widespread and growing for many years. Randall (1970) says that drug abuse has grown every year since 1957. The Public Information Section of the National Institute of Mental Health believes that as many as twenty million people in the United States may be or may have been involved in the "illegal use" of drugs. (Public Information Branch, National Institute of Mental Health, 1969). Finlater (1970) sets the figure at eight million. He suggests that this includes about 15 percent of all college students, and children from all grades in the public schools. Rogers (1970) estimated the overall use rate to be about 35 percent in all colleges and high schools.

The Scope of the "Drug Problem" - Growing since 1967:

Bloomquist (1967), focusing on marijuana, argues that use is widespread, especially among college students. He sees the drug as posing elements of both stimulation and depression and sees the user as idle and lacking initiative, frustrated, sexually maladjusted, escapist, and often having personality defects. Use is, for Bloomquist, a danger to the individual and others as well as socially harmful the entire community. In 1968, Yolles (1968) saw drug abuse,
especially among young people, as a growing problem. There, sufficient concern is raised to present information on LSD, marijuana, amphetamines, narcotics, and others. He sees use as an attempt, by people, to ward off reality by chemical means.

Mueller (1969) has studied the relationship between alcohol and drug addiction. His report notes a rapid increase in the illegal drug traffic in 1969. In that same year, Friend saw drug use by young, inexperienced adolescents presenting a most ominous pattern. He feels that drug abuse can be related to socioeconomic or racial deprivation, dependence stemming from medical use of drugs, and personality disorders. He calls for education of all young people about the effects of drugs and drug abuse. Brill (1969) also documents the increase in drug taking among young people in 1969. He suggests that 75 percent of drug users are more in need of preventative education than of treatment. He goes on to suggest that use—at least dependent use—reflects the user's view of himself and society.

In 1970, Robbins et al. (Robbins, Robbins, Roosch, and Stern, 1970) report that 23 percent of students at two colleges studied had used drugs, reporting also that most had not. Bruyn (1970) also saw use as a serious problem in 1970. LSD use was especially seen as increasing among college students. He feels that there are sociocultural forces which push young people toward use, including social views of pills as a panacea, emphasis on fun and pleasure, distrust of the establishment, experimental curiosity, search for personal meaning, parental permissiveness, and ignorance of the harmful potential of drugs. He calls for organization, information, education, and
In 1971, Bedworth and D'Elia (1971) assert that drug use to the point of dependence is increasing at an alarming rate among children and young people. They also report increases in disease, death, behavioral disturbances, and illegal acts associated with drug abuse. They feel that the whole community must become concerned about and involved in dealing with the problem. The alarm in 1971 was so great as to prompt Bentel et al. (Bentel, Crim, and Smith, 1971) to refer to the problem as an epidemic. They report a dramatic increase in drug abuse among adolescents and middle and upper class families since 1966. They go on to argue that only when the dominant culture comes to accept a social and cultural model of drug abuse will the drug abuse epidemic be controlled.

In 1970 alone (Goddard, 1970), over 15 billion pills falling under federal drug controls were produced in the United States. This is enough for every person in the United States to have over 70 prescription pills per year. Much of this drug supply, as well as drugs illegally produced, flood the illegal drug market. And there is a market for illegal drugs.

In 1972, Blum (1972) continued to see the drug problem as widespread and increasing. In 1973, Lipp et al. (Lipp, Tinklenberg, Benson, Melges, Taintor, and Peterson, 1973) report that medical students may be among the nation's most enthusiastic drug users. Also in 1973, it was reported (New Yorker, 1973) that use is widespread and open to the public view along Wall Street in New York City as well as in Harlem.
It is noteworthy that the Ohio Bureau of Drug Abuse, the Office of the Attorney General of the United States, and the National Clearinghouse on Drug Abuse Information all reported an inability to document the existence of a drug problem in October, 1973. The difficulty does, however, reflect the nature of research and data collection. Available findings are almost always several months delayed. To document the existence of a problem now, two points will suffice. First, it has been clearly shown that the problem has been growing and gaining momentum since 1967, and in fact since the 1940's. No reasonable argument is seen that would conclude that the increase suddenly and for no apparent reason stopped. It would be nice were it true; but it is not. Second, almost daily one is confronted by news and other reports of young people and adults involved in the use, abuse, and dissemination of drugs. Is there a drug problem? Is it a serious social problem? Unfortunately, yes; it is of international proportions.

The Research Question:

From the above, it is clear that drug use is a serious problem. Simply put, the question is, "Why do people, and especially young people, use drugs and thus become a statistic in the drug problem?" It seems axiomatic that for a young person there was a time when he or she was a nonuser. What accounts, then, for the transition from nonuse to use? The next chapter moves toward a theory of use and thus toward accounting for that transition.
CHAPTER TWO
TOWARD A THEORY OF USE

Introduction

In Chapter One, the research problem was defined in terms of accounting for the difference between teenagers who do and those who do not use drugs. Basically, the problem was seen in terms of accounting for a transition from nonuse to use. First, "use" in reference to teenagers and drugs is intentionally left as a general, somewhat ill-defined concept. Basically, the intent is to consider use as an extremely variable concept, varying from use in terms of minimal exposure to use in terms of self-destructive, physical and psychological addiction. Similarly, "use" is inclusive of the use of one drug or many drugs. Further, no particular consideration was given to the "type" of drugs used, including substances from marijuana to barbiturates and including other substances such as LSD, heroin, uppers and downers, and so on. Finally, use is considered without regard to the manner in which the particular substance is introduced into the body, including ingestion, inhalation, injection, and so on. It should be understood that such a conception of use includes norm violations, violations of the public law or morality, self destructive use, and generally any use which is, for any reason, illegal, self destructive, or otherwise felt to be inconsistent with the health and welfare of the individual or society. This conception of use allows for inclusion
of all of the literature relevant to the "drug problem" regardless of the specific focus or definition given to use or "the problem" by the particular author or researcher. As theoretical consideration is given to the correlates of use, then, this conception of use allows for the inclusion of any and all factors implicitly or explicitly posited as related to use, regardless of the definition or specification given to use. The rationale for this approach involves a decision to view "use" and its theoretical and actual correlates in the broadest possible sense, unencumbered by specific interests, biases, or focus. The point should be made that the theory does not, then, specifically approach concepts such as addiction, abuse, misuse, experimentation, and so on in any particular sense, but rather approaches the problem in terms of "use" as a generalized concept.

The notion of use discussed above breaks with the literature and may be difficult to grasp conceptually. No studies or other materials were found in the literature which approach "use" in this manner. The literature has almost exclusively approached use in terms of some particular degree of use or in terms of some supposed continuum along which use is seen as varying from minimal to severe. The present theory is inclusive of these kinds of approaches but is not exclusive of other possible conceptions of use. Further, there is a tendency to hold an empirical research set which operationally or specifically defines the supposed dependent variable, which in this case is "use." Exception is not here in any way being taken with the legitimacy and necessity of defining variables. In fact, the empirical portion of this research attempted to very clearly define
The variables studied. The point here is that this research set—defining variables—orient one in terms of rigorous and explicit definitions. This orientation, then, perhaps tends to cause one to balk at what is, in relative terms, a somewhat vague definition of use. The noted characteristic of the drug literature combined with this research set may result in resistance to the definition of use offered above. The issue is that the definition here offered allows for inclusion of a very wide range of factors, conditions, and situations thought to be related to use, allowing for a variety of definitional strategies in relation to use. The result is that the definition makes it permissible to look at factors, conditions, and situations related to "the drug problem" unhandicapped by conceptual or definitional restraints. Let it here, then, be emphasized that this conception of use was used for purposes of theory development to allow for the inclusion and everyone's insight and understanding.

Given the above broad conception of use, it follows that a similar conception of the type of substance being used would be held for theory development. This strategy has followed the plan of broad inclusiveness with three notable exceptions, viz., caffeine, nicotine, and alcohol. These exceptions were made since, with some few exceptions, the drug literature tended to exclude them from specific consideration. Even when they have been included (Blum, 1961 for example), they have been included as part of a "continuum" conception of use. Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that caffeine, nicotine, and alcohol are drugs which are used by teenagers. Even though specific theoretical material dealing with them tended not to be included in
the theoretical development below, these three drugs were included in
the empirical stage of this research. The overall strategy for theory
development, then, approached the "drug literature" in terms of a very
broad and inclusive conception of use with no particular regard for
references to the kind of substance being used. The intent is to look
at the correlates of teenage drug use removed from the scope or inten­sity of individual use and from the type of use.

With the above conceptions in mind, the following sections of
this chapter elaborate and articulate the theory of use. The theory
posits a cluster of "push forces" which tend to move the individual
toward alienation, escapism, and personal estrangement. Given these
conditions, the theory also develops a cluster of "pull forces" which
tend to attract the individual into the "youth culture" and use. The
mediating institutions of the family, the church, and the school are
seen as ineffectively and unsuccessfully intermediating between the
push and pull. The result is a structural and social flow toward use
for teenagers. At the same time, the fact is recognized that not all
teenagers use. The theory argues that, for nonusing teenagers, the
mediating institutions are successful in interrupting the flow or
transition from nonuse to use. From this point, the study moved to
empirically examine the differential function of the mediating insti­
tutions for users and nonusers. At this point, however, the discussion
moves to present the theory itself by discussing those factors, con­
ditions, and situations within society and culture which act as
"push forces" toward use.
"Push Forces" Toward Alienation, Escapism, and Estrangement:

General:

At a general level, use is seen as a symptom of profound trouble in society (Baruk, 1970). Pet (1968) sees use as a symptom of crisis society and as firmly attached to and inextricable from the main stream of social ills. Pet goes on to associate use with alienation, escapism, and feelings of powerlessness. Here at the societal level the argument is that things are so (messed up) that society's members are given few viable alternatives to use and/or other escapist measures. Blum (1971) also sees use and escapism as one of the pressing and ultimate alternatives for what he calls our slowed down society. He sees it as accommodation to the inevitable. "Mass escapism at least, would provide an alternative to our competitive, pressured existence. We would resign ourselves to limit ambition and achievement and would accept massive use as a necessary evil of an easier way of life." At this level, use is seen as stemming from problems in the basic social structure. Certain factors, conditions, and situations within society serve as a "push force" on society's members toward alienation, escapism, and so on, with use being seen as symptomatic of the push. As society expands, elaborates, and becomes more complex and differentiated, its members become less integrated and more fragmented. This leads to a decreasing sense of purposefulness, meaningfulness, and connectedness. In turn, people experience an increasing sense of alienation, meaninglessness, despair, and personal
estrangement. In this context, then, use is symptomatic of aliena-
tion, estrangement, and other social forces pushing people to use.
In short, the argument is that society's increasing structural com-
plexity has led to a push or excess demand on its members which has,
in turn, forced some people into withdrawing or escape reactions as
a necessary way of coping. For some, science fiction movies or per-
haps occultism are symptomatic of the push. For others, alcoholism
or mental illness may be symptomatic. For many, however, drug use
is a way of trying to cope. At a general level, it is clear that use
tends to vary positively with the complexity of society to the extent
that use is an available response to the structural push.

Economic Factors:

Brotman and Freedman (1968) suggest that, at a community
level, economic factors are causally linked to use. From a more or
less static perspective, use is seen as related to the relative afflu-
ence or poverty of a community. In a more dynamic sense, use is seen
as related to changes in economic conditions within a community over
time. On a broader societal level, the point can be expanded to argue
that from a dynamic perspective use is related to swings in economic
conditions; while in more static terms, use is related to economic
factors even though they may not shift much over time in specific
localities. Whether the economic factors are considered in more sta-
tic or more dynamic terms or on a community or societal level, the
issue is, of course, the nature of the relationship between those
economic factors and use.
Considering now the nature of the relationship between use and economic factors, Maloy (1970) suggests that extreme poverty is related to use. To the extent that such poverty (as does poverty in general) represents a relatively low access to goods and services as well as to social status, poverty represents a diminished structural connectedness—linkage with society's resources both economic and social—for the poor. This diminished connectedness results, of course, in an increasing sense of alienation and estrangement for the poor at a social level and is consistent with the discussion of structural complexity above. "Poverty" extends the developing argument to suggest that increasing structural complexity involves, as part of the elaborating process, increased economic stratification. This increasing economic stratification has, in turn, led to an increasing distance between those at the top and those at the bottom of the economic structure. To the extent that economic capacity represents a central aspect of one's functional capacity within society, this relatively lowered functional capacity for many of society's members combined with the diminished structural connectedness already noted, represents a further causal elaboration of alienation and estrangement, as introduced. In general, then, poverty represents a further example of society's functional inadequacy for its members, and causally represents a factor leading to an increased probability of use.

Krantz (1972) suggests that the affluence of society is also related to use. This may, at first, seem paradoxical to the above discussion of poverty and use. The apparent paradox fades, however, when one focuses on society as a whole. Just as poverty diminishes
one's connectedness, so does affluence. It—affluence—leads to increased leisure time, fewer functional requirements or demands placed on people, a narrowing role definition for the family, increased specialization, and a general circumscription and limiting of one's position in society. The result is that one's structural connectedness is narrowed and limited. It is important to note that the increased circumscription and limiting applies to one's connectedness to society but not to the individual as a whole person. As was seen with poverty, then, affluence also leads to diminished "structural connectedness" and thus to increased alienation and estrangement and an increasing probability of use. Whereas poverty blocks off one's connectedness, affluence so constricts and limits it as to yield a similar effect.

Given the argument above, one would suppose that use would tend to increase either with increases in affluence or increases in poverty. This pattern has been seen. Frazzine (Frazzine and McDonald, 1972) has noted that use tends to be highest in youth from families with annual incomes of either over $25,000 or under $5,000. At this point, it is clear that the more dynamic position above which relates use to swings in the economy is applicable. This would hold first as a result of changes in the affluent or poverty population and second because of the resulting unstabilizing effect on the "middle groups." This "unstabilizing" would lead to increased insecurity about one's economic and social position and thus to an increased probability of loss of social status and connectedness. The result is, of course, an increased likelihood of alienation, estrangement, and use following the pattern of the argument above. Also, the
more static position relating use to particular economic conditions in particular communities or localities still holds. As Helpren (1968) suggests, use is seen in people of all socioeconomic levels. It has been more specifically suggested (New Yorker, 1973) that use is seen in all kinds of people from Harlem to Wall Street. Theoretically, however, use should be highest among the very affluent and the very poor. This should hold whether one uses a more dynamic or a more static perspective, with the reason being that, as seen above, both high levels of affluence and extreme poverty are concomitant to diminished structural connectedness. Similarly, use should tend to be lowest among the middle classes, given the level of complexity at which the argument currently exists. This should hold especially within those families with broader intrafamily role definitions (Gross, 1958) such as families operating family farms or involved in family-run businesses. Introduction of some further attributes of the middle classes does, however, serve to weaken the idea of a lower use rate within those groups. If one accepts the fact that the middle groups are under greater stress related to maintaining their position as well as experiencing a higher probability of position instability as already noted, it can be seen that they are subjected to position related frustration, fear, discouragement, etc. It is a "treadmill" phenomenon: running faster and trying harder to stay even. This may lead to a special kind of structural push toward withdrawal and escape.

As can be seen, use relates to economic factors through a very complex set of conditions and forces. This complexity has led to
initially paradoxical positions which are only resolved once the nature and impact of that complexity is, itself, more fully appreciated.

Community and Neighborhood:

In the discussion thus far, focus has been primarily on the societal level. Only passing reference has been given to use at the community or neighborhood level. Nevertheless, use is, to us as individuals, most visible within the context of particular communities and neighborhoods. Bender (1963) has noted that, particularly for youth under sixteen years of age, use tends to be most prevalent in neighborhoods which can be characterized as disorganized. In addition to increasing structural complexity and the operation of economic factors, neighborhood and community disorganization is, then causally linked to use. As with society, the functional adequacy of communities and neighborhoods involves the ability of those neighborhoods to meet and cope with the needs, problems, and vulnerabilities of their members. This capacity of a community or neighborhood to provide for and cope with the functional requirements of people may be seen as the level of social organization. The community must, in some way, be directly or indirectly organized so as to provide for the basic needs of its members, e.g. food, clothing, housing, health care, education, and so on. In addition, the organization of the community must be such that it can directly or indirectly perform other functions and provide other services related to recreational needs, police protection, social opportunities, intracommunity communication and participation, and the like. As can be seen, the "organization" of a community is a very
complex matter and is essentially related to the welfare and well-being of the community's members. Following the thread of the argument above, the level of a community's "organization" is an index of that community's members' levels of connectedness in a multidimensional sense, including aspects from the physical to the social, from the emotional to the intellectual. What is essentially seen here is a further elaboration, articulation, and definition of the concept of structural connectedness. It has to do with individuals' levels of integration into the ongoing social process at the community level. As was argued for the societal level, failure to establish and maintain this "connectedness" leads to personal estrangement and use. It follows, then, that the level of organization in a community is related to the "connectedness" of that community's members; and in turn, the level of connectedness is related to the level of alienation and estrangement experienced by a community's members, which is in turn related to use. Bender's observation is, therefore, theoretically consistent insofar as use tends to be positively related to the level of community and neighborhood disorganization.

Wilson (1969) has suggested that communities may, themselves, become drug-oriented. Following on this suggestion, the theoretical validity of the point is clear. It was argued earlier that problems in the basic social structure have led to escapist and withdrawing reactions for many people. From that point, the reasoning process gradually led to the community and neighborhood level, suggesting that neighborhood disorganization can be seen as the proximate cause of use. Combining the notions of escape and withdrawal with neighborhood dis-
organization, it can be seen that, over time, neighborhood disorganization could become so continuing and severe that escape and withdrawal would be the "natural mode" of coping for the members of a particular community. When this happens, use will tend to be a primary manifestation of what has for that community become the "norm." When use becomes the norm, it may be properly argued that the community is, itself, drug oriented. At that point, the very nature of the community itself is at issue. As opposed to being a vital, elaborating, organizing system, the community may be seen as approaching an inert state. In far less extreme circumstances, Lecker and Pigott (1970) have observed the tendency of communities toward inertia in reference to coping with drug abuse and the associated adolescent alienation. The whole area of organization versus disorganization, or vitality versus inertia within communities is only reinforced by Blum's (1972) earlier reference to our "slowed down society." At this point we may only conclude that use is related to the level of disorganization within a community and correlatively to the level of action-inertia within that community.

Culture:

If "culture" is seen as values, beliefs, and mores of a people, it can be seen that culture is an essential and important dimension of human existence from the societal to the neighborhood level. Thus far, focus has been on the structural complexity of the society at levels from the societal to the neighborhood. In addition, consideration has been given to the nature and impact of economic and social
organization at the various levels. Focus now shifts to the cultural dimension of human life with the argument commencing with the observations that drug use is, to a large extent, a culturally determined behavior. (British Medical Journal, 1967). At the extreme, Skousen (1969) sees use as one of the many indications of the cultural disintegration and as related to violence and crime. He goes on to suggest that, for the user, drugs are an escape from the pressures of reality and from the difficulties of living. He sees use as a direct result of the casual and permissive attitude of many officials and of society in general. His argument is that, over time, society is gradually relaxing if not abandoning its values and standards. It is this relaxation and possible abandonment which is seen as symptomatic of cultural disintegration. Blum (1970) takes a more moderate position. His studies of drug use in 247 nonliterate societies suggest that use tends to vary from culture to culture, reflecting varying cultural values.

At first, the two positions here presented may appear to be irrelevant in reference to each other. The relevance becomes clear, however, when the question is raised as to whether or not an industrialized, urbanized society such as the United States or Great Britain represents a single, unitary culture. Alternatively, such an urbanized, industrialized society perhaps, in fact, represents a collection of "cultures." Consistent with the theoretical posture taken here, it would be argued that it is the tendency of a system such as a society to elaborate, articulate, and differentiate over time. Given this ongoing process culture, then, would also be seen as elaborating, articulating, and differentiating over time. The eventual result of this ongoing,
on-growing process would be the appearance of numerous cultures or at least numerous "subcultures" which are only more or less consistent with and similar to each other. Given the existence of multiple subcultures, Blum's suggestion applies to the extent that use could then vary from subculture to subculture. Of course, the "disintegration" observation would also be applicable. The tendency would be away from a single "integrated," unified culture and toward a "disintegrated," disunified set of subcultures. Cohen (1971) introduces a concept which, in the current theoretical context, represents a counterflow to the disintegration process. Cohen discussed the process of "cultural exchange" in which the values, beliefs, and mores incident to a particular culture tend to exchange with those of what might be thought of for conceptual purposes as neighboring cultures. On a nation to nation basis, the concept of cultural exchange is not particularly difficult to grasp. Within a single society, however, the concept becomes somewhat more ambiguous. Nevertheless, it can be seen that, within a given society, one can think in terms of cultural exchange or, perhaps, more appropriately "subcultural exchange." With this perspective, Cohen goes on to suggest the rate of "subcultural exchange" is increasing. The dual processes of disintegration and exchange result in a cultural flux and flow which has the effect of attenuating established values without the appearance of new and more suitable values to replace them (Cohen, 1972). Given the process of cultural disintegration combined with the counter process of accelerating subcultural exchange as well as the gradual attenuation of established values, the result is what might loosely be thought of as a cultural vacuum. The result is an
increase in value and behavioral exploration, fads, and what gives the appearance of rejection of traditional cultural values. It is clear, however, that the process does not reflect "rejection" of traditional values; rather, it reflects a lack of initial acceptance and integration of those values.

Given the above state of affairs in reference to culture, the system of direction and prohibition tends to break down. A part of the function of culture is the direction of people in terms of effective and "appropriate" behavior patterns and coping styles. In addition, culture serves the function of prohibition in reference to particular behavior patterns and coping styles. Given the flow of the theoretical development to this point, the result is a cultural failure to fulfill its function in terms of directing people in coping with the structural push forces discussed above and in terms of dealing with the resulting alienation and estrangement. This, combined with a lack of prohibition against use as an acceptable coping mechanism, withdraw and escape into use is an acceptable vehicle for dealing with the push of the system. In general, "it appears that many young people are becoming more alienated and less accepting of traditional systems . . . . One must view the increasing incidence of drug use as a symptom of a much broader social transition and turmoil rather than a causative factor of this turmoil." (Ruch and Zimbardo, 1971). Use, then, would tend to vary positively with the disintegration of culture and with the acceleration of cultural exchange, and negatively with the level of acceptance of traditional values.
Morality:

Thus far, it has been argued that increasing structural complexity and increasing social and economic stratification have led to and have been accompanied by increasing cultural disintegration. Implicit in the argument is the notion that, historically, society tended to be more integrated and thus reflect a more uniform and integrated culture. From this position, one can argue that there was a strong tendency for society to reflect a somewhat unified and consistent body of values, beliefs, and norms. The point need only be accepted that the values, beliefs, and norms—i.e. culture—of an earlier day tended to be more unified and uniform than they are today. It is, then, this earlier, more unified and more integrated state of culture which is here being referred to as "traditional culture." The values associated with traditional culture are, then, what are being referred to as traditional values. Elaboration and specification of these "traditional values" will be handled contextually as the discussion progresses. At this point, it is only reasserted that use reflects changing traditional values (Richards, 1968). This includes the decay of customs and beliefs that bound groups of people together (Cohen, 1972). This is, however, not to suggest that the subcultural groups discussed earlier are not "bound together." It only suggests that they are so bound by changing and nontraditional customs and beliefs. Using the earlier concept of "cultural exchange," it can be seen that subcultural groups today tend to be bound together by customs and beliefs which are in a continuing and constant process of fluxuation.
and exchange. In addition to being nontraditional, then, the binding culture tends to be relatively unstable. From this point, it has been rightfully suggested that what has emerged is a new morality (Herz, 1970). It is a morality of relativity rather than of absolutes (Starratt, 1972), a private versus public morality (Lindesmith, 1968). This brings drug use and the judgment to use into the area of individual social character and values (World Health, 1971), to the level of personal philosophy (Wurmser, 1970). The result and cause has been disintegrating ethical standards which, acknowledging the value judgment, have been seen as eroding (Rabe, 1970). The emphasis has been on immediacy, self actualization, and transcendence (Adler, 1970) and a general orientation to a disorganized style of life (Ramirez, 1968). The overall result for teenagers is, then, the replacement and substitution of traditional moral guides with a dependence of youth on youth for moral guidance.

At the individual versus cultural level, drug use is seen as a reaction to the success ethic (Demos, 1969), to a task oriented culture (VanKam, 1968), and to the ethics of materialism (Demos, 1969 and Rabe, 1970). Theoretically, the current argument does not justify the term "reaction" but would rather see materialism, the success ethic, etc., as examples of traditional culture with the nonacceptance of these values reflecting a movement away from tradition. For many of the using subcultures, however, it has been observed that "reaction to tradition" is itself an emerging value. At a more general level, the movement away from tradition involves an increasingly low valuing of power held by people insofar as men's power is traditionally re-
lated to hard work, success, and material wealth (Gouldner, 1970). It would seem that the theoretically integrating concept here is competition and a reaction to or movement away from the competition ethic. To whatever extent man's nature includes competitiveness, it is not argued here that the flow is against the nature of man. It is rather being argued that the emerging culture of youth is away from competition relative to materialism, conventional success models, personal material wealth, etc. This holds with the earlier argument insofar as competition tends to be an aggressive, outgoing, external manifestation of human motivation. To the extent that use reflects withdrawal, escapism, and estrangement, traditional competition could be counter to the dynamic of use. In this context, use is seen as an alternative to competition. To the extent that users have opted for that alternative, it may be concluded that there is an increased probability that users as a whole tend to be less competitive than non-users, at least in terms of the traditional, external goals and objects of competition.

The above discussion has highlighted cultural and associated value changes. In part, the new morality—if in fact it is new and not just more visible—involves changing sexual values. Traditional law, at least in principle if not in fact, placed high value on chastity and premarital virginity. These values tend to be contrary to values of immediacy, self expression, and so on. It is, then, not surprising that the emergence of use has been correlated with changing sexual values (Richards, 1968). Discussing his research, Walters reports that, "The most distinguishing differences between users and
nonusers, the most difficult to explain, occurred in the realm of sex. Among both men and women almost half of the nonusers had experienced intercourse. In contrast, almost eighty percent of those in the user group and one hundred percent of the heaviest users were sexually experienced. Apparently in sex and drugs it all comes down to personal taste, since users and nonusers alike expressed satisfaction with their sex lives." (Walters, Goethals, and Pope, 1972). Exception is taken here with Walters only insofar as he suggests that the observed differences are difficult to explain. The theoretical development thus far has argued for changing values which gradually move away from the traditional culture. If this is kept in mind, it can be seen that both use and nontraditional sexual behavior represent a move away from the traditional norm. Similarly, nonuse and sexual behavior more consistent with traditional norms represent a behavioral pattern more consistent with traditional culture. The fact that nearly half of the nonusing group had been involved in sexual intercourse suggests that even the traditional prohibition operates in something less than a powerful manner. Nevertheless, the absence of such a prohibition is incidental to what will be below characterized as a counterculture. In fact, the absence of such sexual prohibition may represent one of the strong appeals of that counterculture. Be that as it may, Walters' findings can be understood if one realizes that the emerging subscultures do not carry the prohibitions of traditional culture such as nonuse and sexual abstinence prior to marriage. At a minimum, it may be concluded that users and nonusers tend to have sexual values somewhat different from each other and that nonusers
are somewhat less likely to have experienced sexual intercourse than users.

Culture and Politics:

Use has been seen as related to greater involvement in "cultural" activities (Freedman and Brotman, 1969 and Brotman, Silverman, and Suffet, 1970). The suggestion is, of course, that users are more inclined toward music, art, theater, and literature and similar interests than are nonusers. If these kinds of activities are seen as an increased orientation to fantasy, involvement in sensory modalities, and as an orientation to the aesthetic, the argument is consistent with the present posture. As was argued above for science fiction and occultism, the "cultural" activities serve as a vehicle for escape from the pressure and push of society and as a vehicle for withdrawing from reality. With "culture" serving this functional end, it is not surprising that use has been found as a correlate of such activities.

Politics and political involvement represent an area of controversy in terms of whether or not such involvement and activity are correlated with use. Politics and political involvement have been seen as related to use (Brotman, Silverman, and Suffet, 1970). At the same time, use has been related to a low valuing of politics (Kielholz and Battegay, 1967). The present theoretical development would support the argument that use is either unrelated to or negatively related to the valuing of politics and political involvement. Insofar as such activity and involvement reflect an orientation to ongoing society, traditional culture, competitiveness, and so on, the theoretical thrust
here would opt away from such activity. On the other hand, to the
extent that politics and political involvement can be used as a vehicle
for activities in opposition to or counter to the ongoing society and
traditional values, it is possible that some of the subcultural groups
may be active in politics. The argument here would involve the same
two aspects discussed above in reference to traditional culture in
general. Movement away from traditional values, norms, etc., would
also tend to reflect movement away from politics. At some point, how­
ever, the particular subgroup may develop a value such that politics
is held as an appropriate reaction to tradition. One is reminded here
of Frank Young's (1966) theory of reactive subsystems. Young's argu­
ment is that some subgroups may have low centrality or relative impor­
tance in the overall system or society. If, at the same time, these
subgroups are highly differentiated, i.e. are intellectually and
socially sophisticated, they will tend to also be highly reactive in
reference to the incorporating system—the society as a whole. From
this perspective, one might expect that such subcultures found on uni­
versity campuses, for example, would tend to be highly reactive and
would tend to express that reactiveness through political involvement.
Nevertheless, it would be argued here that political activity and
involvement are related to relative centrality and differentiation as
opposed to use per se. The theoretical posture, then, argues that any
relationship between political activism and use is likely to be spur­
ious.
Subcultures:

As can be readily seen by even a casual observer, present day life in the United States tends to emphasize youth. This results in a generalized cultural orientation to youth. This inclination has led to the emergence of a youth culture, or more properly in the context of the current discussion, a complex of youth cultures. Traditionally, youth have held the position of waiting to obtain membership in the main stream of American life. With the emphasis on youth and the above social and cultural processes, contemporary America finds the emergence of many similar subgroups whose membership is almost exclusively comprised of youth and which tend to be self-directing and self-oriented. These subgroups, then, tend to take on or generate their own values, beliefs, and norms which, as discussed above, tend in many respects to be counter to those of traditional culture. If these subgroups are taken as a whole, one may appropriately think of them as a youth culture or counterculture. The emerging youth culture (Barton, 1968 and Bues, 1972), then, is not only a subculture but is also a counterculture appealing strongly to youth (Lochaya, 1970). Use, then, tends to be concomitant with and encouraged by the counterculture (Jones, 1967). Thus the youth subculture tends to be drug taking and anti-social (Glatt, 1969) to the extent that much of its behavior tends to run counter to traditional norms. The appeal of the subculture, however, is strong because involvement in it offers a teenager both identity within the group and an identification within society (Berger and Potterfield, 1969). This offering of identification is combined with
other factors already noted to make the appeal very strong. Such involvement, however, tends to push if not demand use (Lindesmith, 1968). As use continues, the teenager "may become increasingly alienated from traditional American political and social behavior, attitudes, and values, and will show signs of absorption into the counterculture." (Christie and Hochman, 1972). The counterculture, then, "... acts as a vehicle for norms including drug use, leftist politics, greater self-expression, libertarian attitudes, nontraditional sexual mores, and hostility toward the military establishment." (Christie and Hochman, 1972). To the extent that use tends to be related to involvement in the counterculture, then, use will also be related to the strength of the appeal of the values and norms of the counterculture for the teenager.

Media and Music:

At a more general level but still oriented to the youth culture, newspapers, T.V., and other media are seen as stimulating if not encouraging use among youth through sensational coverage of drugs, users, and the drug problem. The argument is that the media have tended to emphasize the exotic, the spectacular, and the pleasurable while underemphasizing the negative, the destructive, and the deplorable. Given the great impact of the media on youth, the effect has been to stimulate undue curiosity and experimentation (Skousen, 1969 and Louria, 1967). Using the concept of cultural exchange, it might also be argued that the media have served to further accelerate the rate of cultural exchange in terms of use and other nontraditional
values, beliefs, and norms. Along the same lines, popular songs and singers are extolling the virtues of use (Twomey, 1967). The effect here is similar to that of the media. A "major function in the increased acceptance of drugs among the receptive segments of Americans ... was the impression that it, use, was the 'in' thing to do.

This notion was conveyed in great part by rock singers and popular magazines." (Robbins, Robbins, and Stern, 1970). An incidental point can be made that the prevalence of T.V. ads for proprietary drugs also relates to increased use (Goddard, 1970). This perhaps relates to socialization but probably more exactly, in the present context, relates to cultural exchange and the media's power to encourage if not induce value change and value generalization.

The above arguments, of course, only hold if nonusers and users have equal exposure to the media or if users have greater exposure to the media than do nonusers. If one were to find that nonusers had greater exposure to the media than do users, any force of the above argument would be lost. Wurmser (1970) has argued that growing up in front of T.V. tends to make kids passive, receptive people. The argument is, of course, one of conditioning during the formative years. Presumably, such conditioning would result in the child, as a teenager, being more receptive to both the impact of the media and to external social stimuli such as that of the counterculture. On the other hand, it has been noted that users' activities tend away from T.V. and sports and toward cultural and social activities (Freedman and Brotman, 1969). At least in terms of T.V., then, the argument suggests that users actually are experiencing less exposure to the
media than are nonusers. The orientation to "culture" would tend, however, to suggest a greater exposure to music and the impact which it may have. At a minimum, the research findings in this area are quite confused and tend to be inconclusive. Theoretically, the impact of the media and music should be considerable. The nature of that impact and the direction of that impact, however, may be in fact self-canceling. The suggestion is that the receptive segment of the population is exposed to a mixed orientation which sometimes extols and promotes use while at other times depreciating and influencing youth away from use. Careful research should be directed to the amount of exposure to the media, the nature of that exposure, the impact of that exposure, and the relationship of these three factors to use and/or nonuse. Also, careful attention must be paid to the possible effect of intervening factors such as certain groups having more leisure time than others and thus more time to be exposed to the media. If this were the case, the amount of leisure time may, in fact, be the determining factor to the extent that it relates to alienation and estrangement as discussed earlier. Similarly, alienation might be an intervening factor insofar as alienated youth may tend to be more receptive and susceptible to the suggestion of use as a vehicle for escape than are youth who are less alienated and estranged.

Public Action and Laws:

It is abundantly clear that the conceptual areas here developed are highly intertwined and interrelated. This is evidenced by the fact that none of the numerous sources cited dealt with only one dimension
or level of causality. Public action and reaction is a case in point. It cannot, other than conceptually, be separated from community action versus inertia discussed earlier. Similarly, this action and reaction is, itself, a function of culture insofar as the values and norms of traditional society call for action and reaction in relationship to violation of those norms or behavior contrary to the accepted belief, e.g. people should not violate the law, people should address their problems directly rather than attempting to avoid or escape from them, etc. Public policies (Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Brotman and Freedman, 1968), popular attitudes toward use (Bloomquist, 1967), and the stance of the community and state in relation to use are, it is argued, important factors related to use. The nature and effect of such policies and actions are, however, a point of controversy. One cannot help recalling McGregor (1960) and his Theory X and Theory Y. There he draws the issue in terms of the nature of man and whether he is basically bad and must be controlled or whether he is basically good and needs to be encouraged. In the controversy, one can see use as a direct result of social and public permissiveness (Giordano, 1968). Further, use is seen as related to a lack of public moral concern about use (Skousen, 1969). This does, of course, reflect a view of the nature of man as needing to be controlled. Permissiveness, then, would be seen as contrary to effective and established ways of dealing with errant behavior. Those with a more abstract flair see use as representing an increasing tolerance for abnormal behavior (Letourneau, 1967). On the one hand, the point of increasing tolerance may be quite valid. On the other hand, however,
it should be clear from the above discussion that the flux and flow of culture over time results in changing definitions of normality and changing standards of "normal behavior." Traditionally, then, use would be seen as a form of "abnormal behavior." For a large segment of society, however, use is not, today, seen as "abnormal." In the other camp are those who see use exacerbated by harsh adult reaction including judicial reaction to use (Maloy, 1970). This view is extended to hold that use, in part, is a reaction to the use of harsh laws to repress some political and religious groups, ideas and beliefs (Laughlin, 1967). To some extent, this point is probably also valid and is consistent with the current theoretical development. To the extent that laws and public policy are a vehicle of social control, the control of rebellious subgroups or of groups which are perceived to be unacceptably deviant from the traditional norm would be a function of such laws and policies. As discussed earlier, subgroups with relatively low centrality in the overall society may tend to react to traditional values and norms. Given this tendency, it is consistent to argue that they would, similarly, tend to react to any efforts on the part of the greater society to repress or control them. Looking at the two positions--excessive permissiveness and excessive harshness--it can be seen that both views theoretically hold validity in reference to use. The problem is, of course, that use does not represent a behavioral manifestation of a single or uniform counterculture. Rather, it represents a behavioral manifestation which a complex of "countercultures" share in common. For some of these subgroups, use may be a result of excess permissiveness insofar as were laws and
public policies less permissive, they would tend to be less inclined to use. These groups are, obviously, those which are more traditionally oriented to obeying the law and complying with public policy. For other subgroups, however, harshness of laws and policies may equate with increased reactiveness and thus with increased use. The conclusion is left that public policies and laws are related to use, but the nature of that relationship is complex and variable from subgroup to subgroup. To the extent that the impact of laws and public policies tend to be mixed and varied, those laws and policies probably tend to have a self-canceling effect when all groups are considered as a whole. This would not argue for the abandonment of laws and policies in relation to use, but would rather argue for a more complex development and administration of such laws and policies oriented to the multiplicity of subgroups whose behavior is to be controlled.

At another level, a lack of understanding or ignorance of drug laws is seen as a contributing factor to use (Daniels, 1970). On the other side are those who see use as a rebellion of youth against adults and adult authority (Maloy, 1970 and Berger and Potterfield, 1969). A stronger form of this side of the argument holds that, at a societal level, users distrust (Bruyn, 1970), express hostility (Berger and Potterfield, 1969), are dissatisfied (Tseng, 1970), and are aggressive (Mason, 1958). These characteristics can, of course, be seen as manifest symptoms of estrangement and alienation. These feelings lead to nonconformity and a tendency to reject social conventions (Holloran, 1972). In its hardest form, this argument sees users
using mostly because it is illegal (Blaine, 1970 and Pet and Ball, 1968). This point is, of course, consistent with the ideas of rebellion and reactiveness discussed earlier. At the poles, the arguments here developed hold that, on the one hand, nonusers will remain nonusers if they really understand the law; and on the other hand, users are users precisely because they do understand the law and strongly object. A middle of the road position argues that American people simply disregard those laws which they feel tend to control things which are actually a matter of individual morality and choice (Hollister, 1969).

As with the arguments above, the controversy here results from a failure to fully appreciate the complex nature of society and of the subgroups within it. If the point is not taken too literally, one might consider, conceptually, the idea of a continuum along which the various youth oriented subgroups can be placed. At one end would be those groups more aligned with traditional norms and values and more closely oriented to law as a form of societal control. On the other end of the continuum would be placed those groups which tend to react to any effort of the greater society to control their behavior. In the middle, then, would be those groups which tend to ignore laws and public policies, tending neither to comply nor react. If the operation of the continuum is, in part, dependent on knowledge of drug laws held by the subgroups, then, knowledge of drug laws is related to use but in a mixed and varied manner.
Models and Aspirations:

From another perspective, the discussion gradually begins to look at reasons why some teenagers remain nonusers, remain more oriented to traditional culture, and generally tend more to accept the values and goals of traditional society. From this perspective, use is seen as an absence or decreased availability of suitable and effective adult models for many teenagers (Rabe, 1970). To the extent that adults are the conveyors to youth of traditional culture, this argument is quite consistent with the main theme of the arguments already presented. It is further suggested that the decreased availability of or access to adult models and the associated complex of societal and cultural elements leads to the absence or diminished presence of viable and available aspirations for many youth (Cohen, 1972). Alternatively, nonusers would be seen as having greater exposure to and availability of traditional adult models. The process of identification with and the acceptance of the values and aspirations of those models would tend, for nonusers, to result in a more traditional orientation and a more well defined set of aspirations. It is, then, this decreased availability of and access to models and the resulting deficit of aspirations which, for many youth, culminate in what might be called the future void. That void is then substituted for with drugs and thus use. At another level, this apparent absence of aspirations may, in fact, more reflect the nature of society than any particular characteristics of users. The case may be that available aspirations within society tend to be limited to those defined
by traditional values and goals. Therefore, youth whose aspirations are not consistent with these traditional models are seen as not having defined aspirations. It has already been argued that members of the youth culture tend to turn away from adults for guidance and direction. The orientation is of youth to youth. This movement away from adult models will be further elaborated in the discussions below in reference to the family, church, and school. At this point, let it suffice to say that the absence or diminished availability of adult models is consistent with the theoretical development. The absence of defined aspirations, however, is a more tenuous position. Alienation and estrangement as discussed earlier, however, would tend to prompt withdrawal and escape as opposed to aspiring and future orientation. It is, therefore, concluded that users tend to have less well defined aspirations and are less future oriented than nonusers. Similarly, it is held that nonusers are more oriented to traditional adult models than are users. The likelihood is that this latter orientation is a function of the availability of and access to such traditional models.

Problem and Solution:

The discussion thus far has seen that use, for users, is a way of coping with a complex of societal, economic, cultural, subcultural, and personal forces. Use is, in short, a way of countering the experience of alienation and estrangement. The conception of use, then, is of a panacea. (Bruyn, 1970). It is a cure or at least a temporary release from a multiplicity of ills and problems both apparent and real. Drugs, then, are for users a means of self medication (Gay,

SOCIAL INFLUENCES AND DRUGS
(PULL FORCES)

Social Influences (General):

The thrust of the social argument comes in terms of seeing use, and especially initial use, as much more of a social as opposed to a psychological phenomenon (Bentel, Grim and Smith, 1971). Lindesmith (1968) has argued that one can tell the discipline of a writer in the area of drug abuse by the way he approaches the problem. Medical people will tend to concentrate on a medical frame of reference; sociologists will tend to focus on a societal and interactional level; psychologists will tend to focus on intrapsychic processes and dynamics. This point is only being made here to emphasize the fact that the current theoretical development would argue that any such perspectives are, by their very nature, partial and to some extent misleading. The same holds for the distinction here raised between social and psychological phenomena. Use is, of course, both social and psychological as well as structural and societal in terms of causality. It is the present responsibility to be aware of the multidimensionality of use and to avoid, as fully as possible, discipline directed bias. It is, however, clear that use is, to some extent, a social phenomenon, and it is to this perspective that the present discussion is focused. From this perspective, use is seen as a complicated process involving
the interaction of a teenager with his or her social world (Scott, 1971). The emphasis, though, is on that social world. Adolescent sociocultural pressures (British Medical Journal, 1967 and Lister, 1967) and the overall teenage environment (Bedworth and D'Elia, 1971) combine to make use appealing and the likelihood of avoiding use diminished. The earlier discussion provides an explanation for this increased likelihood of use and the associated decreased likelihood of nonuse. On the one hand, the sociocultural push forces discussed above press toward use and involvement in the youth culture. On the other hand, the "youth culture" itself offers a strong appeal in terms of values, norms, and the opportunity for identification and identity. This opportunity and appeal represents what is here being described as "pull." The push forces, then, increases the probability of use, while the "pull forces" decrease the probability of nonuse. If the initial concept is accepted, the discussion below will further clarify the idea. In this context, social influences surrounding use (California Medicine, 1967) and the social orientation of youth makes use in contemporary America a social group activity (Dawtry, 1968). As will be documented below, use—and especially initial use—almost never takes place in a context other than that of a social group. When it does take place as a lone activity, the individual user has usually reached the level of chronic, habitual use. The escape and withdrawal have become so severe that use has, itself, become the major purpose and motivation of life. Although no reference is available which defines the phenomena in this particular manner, this type of orientation and use would be seen as severe addiction. Nevertheless use
is, in general, a social group activity as noted. It is a behavioral norm of the youth culture or at least of some youth subcultures, and there is, therefore, a strong likelihood that youth will use as part of their participation in such groups. It is use in that context which is here being discussed.

Social Adjustment:

It has been argued that users are less well adjusted than nonusers (Milman, 1969 and Holloran, 1972). The thesis is that painful adolescent experiences including social rejection, problems of independence and sexuality (Medical Association of Australia, 1968), and a general inability to maintain the difficult social balance leads to an involvement with drugs as an alternative to coping with the socially induced pain. "I suggest that some proportion of drug users, students and others, are fouled up people. The drugs serve them not in an unscrewing fashion, perhaps in a pain reducing function." (Brummit, 1963). In its essence, the argument suggests that users are socially maladjusted (Laughlin, 1967 and Gerard and Kornetsky, 1954). Alternatively, Hogan, Mankin, Conway, and Fox (1973) found users attaining slightly higher grades in school and being "socially skilled, flexible, concerned with the feelings of others, impulsive, nonconforming, and had a broader range of interest than nonusers." Herl (1972) argues that, disregarding use itself, users are no more or less socially well adjusted, or alternatively socially maladjusted, than are nonusers. Resolution of the controversy, of course, is contingent on one's definition of social maladjustment or of satisfactory
social adjustment. If by acceptable social adjustment one means active and positive participation in family, church, school, peer group activities, the community, the neighborhood, society in general, etc., along with behavioral conformance to traditional values, norms, and standards such as sexual abstinence, competitiveness, material success, etc., then the theoretical development would argue that users tend to be less well adjusted socially than do nonusers. The point is that social adjustment can be seen in a more absolute sense as a sense of well-being, social participation, social connectedness, etc.; or in a more relative sense, as conformity to external standards and definitions. From the more absolute position, users would be seen as theoretically no more or less well adjusted than nonusers. This is the position taken here. In a more relative sense, users would be seen as less well adjusted than nonusers. This position is rejected here. Using the position accepted, then, any relationship found between social maladjustment and use would be unacceptable unless a more absolute maladjustment could be demonstrated. So much for one level of theory. At another level, it is clear that personally maladjusted people, those experiencing high levels of alienation and estrangement, are more likely to use than are those experiencing lower levels of alienation and estrangement. To the extent that this holds, personally maladjusted people are also likely to have difficulties in social adjustment. It can, therefore, be seen that the user population would probably tend to include a higher proportion or socially maladjusted people than would the nonusing population. There would, then, be a relationship between social maladjustment and use; but the relation-
ship would be indirect with personal maladjustment being the primary determinate.

Peer Group Acceptance

Here the argument would start by suggesting that some teenagers experience strong feelings of aloneness, unproductiveness, and limited belongingness (Levy, 1968). These feelings are combined with lack of status in traditional social groups (Bender, 1968). The result is that the young person feels alienated (Gay, Smith, and Sheppard, 1972; Barton, 1968; Records, 1971; Lecker and Pigott, 1970; Wurmser, 1970; and Pet, 1968). He feels cut off from all levels of social meaningfulness and interpersonal connectedness. At a peer level, these factors are seen as representing non, or at least limited, integration into the peer group (Cloward and Ohlin, 1969). From this, the need to be accepted by peers (Maloy, 1970) stimulates the search for peer acceptance (Bedworth and D'Elia, 1971). From that point, the desire to be one of the gang (Pet and Ball, 1968) and the accompanying fear of rejection by peers (Tseng, 1970; Maurer and Vogel, 1967; and Daniels, 1970) leads to if not demands use. The argument here is in a fairly extreme form. It should be kept in mind that such alienation and estrangement can exist in degrees from a little to a lot. The "degree" would represent the strength of the push. The opportunity for identification, participation, involvement, and acceptance of the peer group represents, then, the pull. The strength of that pull, given the extent of alienation and estrangement, is intense and will be familiar to even the most casual student of adolescent psychology.
Here, then, alienation becomes the pivotal variable in the argument. It has also been observed that users tend not to feel socially alienated, or at least not any more or less so than nonusers (Herl, 1972). The alienation argument seems to be contradicted by the observation that the users tend not to feel alienated. The apparent contradiction is resolved, however, if one holds in mind the distinction between initial use and continuing use. The earlier argument was that initial use tends to be pushed by alienation and pulled by the opportunity for peer group involvement. Once one has attained peer group involvement and status, however, the feelings of alienation, estrangement, social unconnectedness, etc., diminish if not totally disappear. At that point, continuing use would be seen as a mechanism for avoiding the reoccurrence of alienation and personal estrangement. From this perspective, fear of peer group rejection would become the pivotal variable in continuing use. The contradiction results from a focus on two different populations. It can, in fact, be true that users and nonusers tend to experience similar levels of alienation and personal estrangement, while at the same time movement from nonuse to use is prompted by increased feelings of alienation. To the extent that the argument is valid, a similar mechanism would operate in the transition from use to nonuse. One would hypothesize that those who move from use to nonuse do so as a result of developing status and connectedness outside of the youth culture. To the extent that the argument holds, it is clear that a possible social strategy for dealing with use would be the co-optation of users into traditional, mainstream society.
Delinquency

One position here holds that use is related to a teenager's history of delinquency (Press and Done, 1967; Brill, 1968; and Jones, 1967). On the other hand, it has been argued that, other than the specific activities related to getting and using drugs, use is not related to a teenager's history or pattern of delinquency (Lister, 1967). These two positions are not as easily reconciled theoretically as other apparent contradictions in the drug literature. The apparent contradiction softens, however, if one keeps in mind the fact that there is not a single youth culture or using culture, but rather a multiplicity of subcultures. Also, it is important to keep in mind the definition of delinquency. The argument here is similar to that above for social maladjustment. Delinquency in particular is typically defined by violation of explicit public policy, i.e., specific laws. Using Hollister's argument (1969) that people tend to ignore those laws which they feel are attempting to control things which are a matter of personal choice and morality, it can be seen that drug laws can be conceived of as a different category of phenomena than laws controlling crimes against property and people. From this perspective, use would be seen as a different category of offense than delinquency. (This holds insofar as delinquency is typically seen in terms of crimes against property and people.) For any subgroup, then, it is clear that their values and norms could easily separate use from delinquency. Given this argument, groups who tended to accept "delinquency" as a norm would, then, likely also see use as acceptable.
It is, of course, possible that they might not so see use. Similarly, other groups might see use as acceptable while maintaining the societal prohibitions against "delinquency." Whether or not one would find a relationship between use and one's history of delinquency, then, would be highly contingent on the groups sampled. Also, one's history of delinquency tends to be an official record. It is also the case that such official records tend to be kept more for some groups than for others. This fact would further blur the operation of a relationship between use and delinquency. In general, the possibilities are nonuse–delinquency, use–delinquency, use–nondelinquency, and nonuse–nondelinquency. The relative numbers of people in each group is a matter for empirical investigation and is not demanded theoretically. However, the conclusion is clear that delinquency is a function of particular subgroup norms and values. A relationship between use and delinquency, then, would be indirect with the intervening influence of subculture. In a theoretical explanation of use, then, history of delinquency—although possibly related—would be seen as conceptually irrelevant.

Peer Influence

Discussing their research, Warner and Swisher (1971) report, "Indeed the results of this investigation indicate that the relationship between an individual's use of drugs and the extent to which his friends use drugs is much stronger than the relationship between alienation and drug use. This finding supports the notion that drug use is not confined to the alienated, and that there are certainly
equal other important variables which may account for drug use. The whole concept of peer influence in and of itself may account for young people's use of drugs to a far greater degree than does alienation."

Ruch and Zimbardo (1971) report that, "Recent research has indicated that most young people who begin taking a drug, particularly an illegal drug, do so for the first time not because of mental illness but because of curiosity and peer group pressure." The argument is, of course, that peer influence and pressures stimulate use (Records, 1971; Kraft, 1970; and Laskowitz, 1967). Users are here seen as more susceptible to peer group pressure than nonusers (Scott, 1971). This susceptibility combines with the user's desire to conform to the "in" group (Rossi, 1968). The resulting associations and peer group involvement (Pescor and Surgeon, 1940; Norton, 1968; and Rossi, 1968) leaves use as a requisite to conformity and needed peer involvement.

Diffusion of Use

There are multiple paths for the diffusion of use: from older youth to younger (Grayson, 1971); diffusion through peer group (DeAlarcon, 1969); from users to nonusers (Blum, 1968); and introduction by friends (Fort, 1966). As Blum (1971) asserts, reporting on his college research, "Some aspects of drug diffusion seem fairly consistent from campus to campus and are even consistent over the last few thousand years. For example, young people usually take drugs from people who are older, females tend to take them from males, people of higher status give them to people of lower status, leaders distribute them to followers." It is also suggested that a teenager may be swept up in a
drug abuse epidemic (Bejerot, 1971). In that model, use is then seen as a contagious disease (DeAlarcon, 1969). The "epidemic" model is, of course, reminiscent of the above idea of cultural exchange. From this view, the "exchange" may be seen as having a varying rate from slower to extremely fast. If use, as a value and behavior norm, were seen as the element of exchange, an extremely accelerated rate of exchange would, then, be appropriately described as an epidemic. Also, in the context of this section, the impact of peer influence is reiterated as well as the pull toward increased social status in the peer group through use. Another discussion would undoubtedly be quite interested in a more detailed investigation of the rate and pattern of exchange in reference to behavioral and value patterns among and between subgroups and throughout the "peer group community." It is sufficient here to only note the gross pattern of dissemination.

Social Functions of Use

Of course, the social functions of use have, in a broad sense, been the focus of this section. Here, however, it is the intent to further specify these functions. It has been suggested above as well as elsewhere that use stems, in part, from a need for something to do to fill one's leisure time (Krantz, 1972; Bloomquist, 1967; and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Brotman and Freedman, 1968). From this perspective, use can be seen as a form of social relaxation (American Academy of Pediatrics, Committee on Youth, 1972) or recreation (Cohen, 1972). This position is, of course, very consistent with the above discussion. The point is only reintroduced here to empha-
size the fact that leisure time may be a pivotal variable in understanding use. The earlier argument suggested that there were certain push forces which tended to increase the probability of use. One of these push forces is the need of people to fill their leisure time with some kind of meaningful or interim activities. Given the "pull forces" discussed above, use as a way of filling one's leisure time follows. It can, then, be seen as a form of recreation and/or relaxation which both fills one's leisure time and is, for the individual, associated with social and interpersonal fulfillment of a broad nature.

DRUGS

Agent and Host

Many writers have emphasized the fact that drugs must be available to potential users before use can occur (Lindesmith, 1968; Lister, 1967; British Medical Journal, 1967; Bedworth and D'Elia, 1971; Maloy, 1970; and Krantz, 1972). Further, since teenagers are almost never forced to use they must, in some way, represent a receptive host (Tseng, 1970) before introduction of the agent-drugs-can occur. The foregoing discussion has emphasized many of the push and pull factors related to that receptivity. From that, it may be argued that use is ordinarily preceded by a receptive attitude (Wurmsen, 1970). This receptivity of attitude, of course, relates to the appeal of the youth culture as well as the appeal of the utilization of drugs as a vehicle for escape from the push forces already discussed. Theoretically, it must be admitted that drugs, per se, are not necessarily the object
of such receptivity. Were other vehicles available which were perceived to be equally effective in terms of both escape and peer group involvement, they would also tend to prompt a positive attitude toward them. Given the availability of drugs, though, and their potential for escape and social involvement, they become the object of a receptive attitude. Literally, the receptivity of attitude is toward what drugs are perceived as being able to do for the individual and probably not to the drugs as an object in and of themselves. Given availability and receptivity, however, curiosity becomes a primary determinant of use (Pet and Ball, 1968; Fisher, 1972; Pescor and Surgeon, 1940; Rossi, 1968; Daniels, 1970; Brehm and Back, 1968; and Bruyn, 1970). Reporting on a sample of users, Brown (1972) reports, "All cited curiosity and the influence of others as the primary reason for experimentation." As can be seen, availability combined with receptivity and, in turn, curiosity leads to experimentation and use. "Experimentation" as an operative factor in the etiology of use is a widely acknowledged variable (Bender, 1963; Brill, 1969; Yolles, 1969; Pet, 1968; Todd, 1970; Maloy, 1970; and Pharmaceutical Journal, 1967). In this context, curiosity would be seen as a basic wondering about whether or not drugs have the capacity to achieve, for the individual, an increased state of well-being and a decreased sense of alienation and estrangement. Experimentation, then, would be the consequence of curiosity insofar as experimentation would be the actual "try it and see what happens." The flow of the argument is, therefore, that certain push and pull forces lead to an increased level of receptivity and to a positive attitude toward drugs. This receptivity in terms of attitude is com-
bined with "curiosity" which in turn leads to experimentation. As can be seen, the theoretical development is leading toward a "flow" argument which starts at a broad societal level and conceptually introduces push and pull forces which intermingle to move the individual from nonuse toward use.

Attitudes Toward Drugs

Consistent with and following from the above is the argument that attitudes toward drugs are positively related to use (Kadushin, 1972). It is here only important to further articulate and specify those attitudes. They include the belief that drugs and use are not really harmful (Moore, 1972 and Blumer, Sutter, Smith and Ahmed, 1967), a lack of fear (Geller and Boas, 1969), a belief that drugs can help with bad or unpleasant feelings (Leech and Jordan, 1967), and the sense that drugs are in some way associated with peer acceptance and involvement. Following on this perspective, it has been argued by advocates of drug education that teenagers and, on a more general level, communities have a lot of misinformation and/or lack of information about drugs and use (Cowden and Horan, 1968; Bedworth and D'Elia, 1971). Further, it is suggested that teenagers, especially, have a lack of knowledge of and respect for the negative values and dangerous potentials of drugs and use (Wolfson, 1970; Armed Forces Information Service, 1969; Bruyn, 1970; and Smith, 1970). The call, then, is for widespread and intensive drug education. Alternatively, it is argued that "drug education based on information approaches may not be sufficient and, in fact, may be part of the problem rather than a solution." (Swisher,
Crawford, Goldstein, and Yura, 1971). The problem is, of course, that many advocates of drug education operate under the assumption that use is a rational, objective process which is a result of conscious decisions, understandings, and judgments. The theoretical development thus far overwhelmingly argues against this perception. As one looks here at the further articulation of attitude, it is clear that drugs are seen as a "means to an end." Drug education, typically, has been oriented to increased information about the effects of drugs, the process of using drugs, etc. In some respects, the theoretical posture here would argue that this kind of approach would only serve to increase the teenager's sophistication and selectivity in terms of using as a vehicle for increased opportunity for social need meeting. Considering the prevalence and intensity of drug education programs, it is likely that most teenagers are cognizant of the risk and dangers involved in use. Knowing these risks and dangers helps them to be more selective and rational about use and increases their ability to assess the risk. The drug education proponents have, for the most part, given little emphasis to the "gain" or advantages of use. For the individual teenager, use would be theoretically seen as a decision or judgment which takes place at the intellectual, social, and psychological level. The issue is, for the most part, not one of whether to use or not to use, but is rather in terms of the risk of use weighed against the advantages or potential gain from using. The above suggestion that use represents a lack of fear is probably, in this sense, misleading. The reality is likely to be that whatever "fear" exists is overshadowed by the push and pull to use. Until educators
can demonstrate that use will, in fact, not lead to the desired end or that there is a very low probability of goal attainment or pay off, teenagers will probably continue to take the "risk" despite further articulation and definition of that risk.

MEDIATING INSTITUTIONS

The Family (General):

In the foregoing sections, the theoretical causality of use has been posited through a quasi-mechanical posture. Buckley (1967) has suggested that causality is usually approached from one or more of several perspectives, viz. organismic, process, mechanical, or system. An organismic approach would draw the analogy between an organism's development and the causal sequence. From that perspective, things would be seen as growing, developing, expanding, etc. The "process" perspective tends to see things as an ongoing "process." In this view, it is rather like a chain reaction where one thing causes another, which in turn causes another thing, etc. It is the notion of A leading to B leading to C, etc. In a "systems" approach, all of the relevant elements of the theoretical "system" are seen as interacting with, influencing, and relating to each other. It is, then, the overall operation of and changes in this system, over time, which is held as cause. These brief explanations are, of course, extremely simplistic and oversimplified. They do not deal with issues such as the source of energy, the technique of recognizing sequence or numerous other factors. In the present theoretical approach, the analogy is to a machine insofar as the individual is put in the middle of the theo-
retical flow. From this position, certain "forces" are seen as pushing while others are seen as pulling. Let it here be acknowledged and agreed that any such analogy tends, more or less, to misrepresent the true nature of human life and functioning. The point is only here being brought up so as to alert the reader against getting too pulled into too much of a mechanical set. For purposes of explanation, the theory could have been developed in any of the other terms, i.e., organismic, process, or system. Had the organismic stance been taken, initial focus would have been on the individual as a growing, developing organism. After having developed that foundation, the discussion would have moved on to argue in terms of those factors, situations, and conditions which impede or encourage the organism's development. Complexity of society would, then, have been seen as an impeding factor in terms of development. Had the process approach been taken, the individual would have been seen as "moving" through time with certain factors, conditions, and situations interacting both with each other and with him so as to influence his progress. Had the systems approach been used, the individual would have been presented as a multidimensional being having an intra-personal dimension, an inter-personal dimension, and an extra-personal dimension. The discussion would have then focused on those positive and negative factors, conditions, and situations influencing and interacting with the various dimensions as well as the interdimensional interaction of the human system. It is undoubtedly true that this very cursory and abbreviated discussion of alternative postures may serve more to confuse than to clarify. However, it is felt to be important that the reader remain cognizant of
the fact that the "quasi-mechanical" strategy adopted here to some extent represents an analogy, and that particular characteristic of the theory should be kept in mind. Given the above, the theory has approached the causality of use in terms of pushes on teenagers and pulls on them. It should be clear by now that given these pulls and pushes, the theory is arguing that the "natural course of events" for teenagers would be to move toward use. The issue, then, becomes one of, "Why do not all teenagers use?" The argument here is that something gets in the way of or mediates the flow so as to prevent the transition from nonuse to use. Durkheim (1963) argued that the natural course of society is to increase in complexity, elaborate, differentiate, and specialize. The effect of this societal process on society's members is "anomie." The issue, then, is what within a society prevents severe anomie and thus use for all people? Durkheim argued that, within societies, there develop "secondary groups" whose function it is to prevent and counteract the effects of societal expansion, i.e., to prevent anomie. An analogous argument is here being used. It is argued that certain "institutions" within society mediate between the push forces and pull forces so as to prevent use. From this perspective, the primary mediating institution is the family. Let the point be here left somewhat vague with clarification coming,

1Anomie, for Durkheim, represents normlessness. Such anomie, then, negates the control function of society over insatiable needs of people. Formation of secondary groups serves to re-establish social control or to counteract anomie.
contextually, as the discussion proceeds. Initially it is, in general, argued that family factors are related to the nonuse—use transition (Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Brotman and Freedman, 1968; Louria, 1968; and Morgenstern, 1970). At a broad level, it is argued that the drug problem reflects the contemporary values and conditions of family life in American (Lovinger, 1971). Causally, then, use is a direct result of the deterioration of the American family (Louria, 1968). Further, use stems from the resulting prevalence of relatively weak family units (Louria, 1967). From this perspective, family values and conditions would be seen as intervening in the nonuse—use transition. When things are as they "should" be, these values and conditions are such that they tend to interrupt the transition itself. Given the deterioration of the American family and the prevalence of relatively weak family units, however, family values and conditions no longer serve to effectively interrupt that transition.

From this, one might conclude that users tend to come from families which are less well integrated and weaker, and whose values and conditions are such that the family, as an institution, is effectively unable to meet its structural function. Similarly, it may be concluded that nonusers tend to come from families which are functioning, structurally, as families "should" function. This is true insofar as their families are effectively interrupting the transition.

Relationship to Family

Users tend to experience feelings of rejection toward the home environment (Brummit, 1963). This includes a tendency to hold negative
attitudes about one's family (Streit and Oliver, 1972), an orientation away from family involvement (Brotman, Silverman, and Suffet, 1970; and Freedman, Brotman, 1969), and a general pattern of alienation from home and family (Maloy, 1970). At the level of perception, users perceive their families as being less close than do nonusers (Streit and Oliver, 1972). From this we may conclude that users hold stronger negative feelings toward their families than do nonusers, as well as having a tendency to feel more alienated from their families than do nonusers. Finally, it is clear that nonusers tend to perceive their families as being more close knit than do users.

Family Relationships

Dai (1965) suggests that "disturbed parent-child relationships" may precipitate use. He continues, "The adjustmental difficulties seem to arise not so much in infancy but in middle childhood and pre-adolescence. By the time adolescence is reached, they—children who become users—seem bent on endless pleasure with an elimination of more mature demands and responsibilities." "Disturbance" in terms of family relationships has been seen in many forms. The primary effect is that such relationships are not emotionally supportive (Richards, 1968). They tend to precipitate use when children reach the teenage years. Concomitant with a lack of emotional support are: poor parent-child communication (Herz, 1970) and, in terms of social and emotional insight, what has been described as a parent-child generation gap (Krantz, 1972). The absence of such a gap, then, and higher family rapport intervene in the nonuse—use transition. For example, "Tack-
ling family decisions together may be one way of throwing teenage
drug abuse for a loss. How Mom and Dad and the kids go about select-
ing the color of a new car or choosing a group activity appears to be
related to whether Sis or Junior decide to go out and score some dope."
(Mead and Campbell, 1973). At a more severe level, intense family
strife (Lawton and Malmquist, 1961) directly contributes to teenage use.
This kind of conflict leads to instability between parents (Lawton and
Malmquist, 1961) and contributes to emotional upheaval (Lawton and
Malmquist, 1961), an unstable environmental situation (Seldin, 1972),
and ultimately to disrupted family settings (Lawton and Malmquist,
1961 and Rosenberg, 1969). Finally, the progression is to broken
homes (Bender, 1963). All of these factors significantly affect the
growth of younger children and contribute to use in teenagers. To the
extent that things like reciprocal insight, rapport, family harmony as
opposed to discord, and the like stem from effective communication and
participation within the family, it may be concluded that users tend
to have a lower sense of participation and involvement in their fami-
lies than do nonusers. If "communication" is differentiated from
arguing and hassling, one might speculate that nonusers tend to com-
nunicate more while hassling and arguing less with their parents than
do users. Conversely, users will likely tend to perceive their parti-
cipation and communication with their parents less positively and more
negatively than do nonusers. From the discussion, one could move on
to conclude that: users and their parents have a lower level of reci-
procal insight than do nonusers and their parents; nonusers are more
directly involved in family decisions than are users; families of
users experience more internal strife than do those of nonusers; par-
ents of nonusers get along better with each other than do those of
users; and users are more likely to come from broken homes than are
nonusers. The issue is, of course, why should all of this be true?
The families of nonusers have a greater sense of intrafamily partici-
pation and communication, feel better about each other, have more sta-
ble and lasting relationships, and generally represent a better inte-
grated, more smooth running, more stable functional unit. It is here
argued that the focal variable is "stability." In turn, it is argued
that factors such as better communication, higher rapport, less argu-
ing and hassling, greater participation in decisions, and so on are,
in their essence, indicators of family stability. Using the earlier
theoretical development, it can be seen that the same set of "push
forces" which operate toward anomie in the individual similarly operate
toward instability and deterioration in the family unit. The issue is,
then, one of why some families are better able to negate and mediate
the "push" than are others. The earlier theoretical development offers
some clues although not a definite explanation of the phenomenon.
First, the argument suggests that those families which maintain greater
stability also maintain a greater structural connectedness for their
members. To the extent that society does not offer to them the oppor-
tunity for this connectedness, the family must internally develop and
maintain opportunities for such connectedness. This would argue that
more stable families have more elaborated and differentiated roles for
each of their members than do less stable families. For example, each
member may be expected in terms of their role to participate in family
decisions, both understand and be understood in terms of the problems and needs of each family member, participate in the tasks and responsibilities of the family, and so on. The theoretical development, of course, does not specify what these functional elements might be beyond these gross understandings. However, it is clear that the role definition (Gross, Mason, and McEachern, 1958) for each family member within more stable families would tend to be more complex and differentiated. As the functional involvement of the family and the individual within the society decreases, the functional responsibility and demands of the family itself on the individual probably tends to increase in more stable families. At an initial level, this explanation provides some insight into the mediating function of the family institution in reference to the push and pull factors discussed earlier. The argument here is that each factor or set of factors which push and pull on the individual similarly have a tendency to push and/or pull on the family. Those families which are more adequately meeting their structural function, those families which reflect higher stability are somehow count-eracting, redirecting, modifying, or otherwise mediating the pull and push forces external to the family itself.

Childrearing Practices

It is clear that childrearing practices are related to use (British Medical Journal, 1967, and Bruyn, 1970). At a general level, parental permissiveness is seen as contributing to use by teenagers (Maloy, 1970). This is, of course, consistent with the above discussion insofar as the above argument holds that for nonusers family role
definitions will be more elaborated and defined. If permissiveness is seen as a tendency to allow children to develop and behave in accord with their own wishes and desires, family structure and definition can be seen as contrary to permissiveness. It has further been argued that maternal overprotection (Fort, 1966), including mothers being dominant, critical, and immature (Seldin, 1972) is related to use in a manner similar to that of permissiveness. It is a subtle point, but parents can be permissive on the one hand and dominant and critical on the other hand. The argument is that these patterns are themselves related to use. Similarly, a parental pattern which vacillates between the two approaches would also be related to use. From this argument, it may also be concluded that parental inconsistency and vacillation would be related to use. Also, fathers' being uninvolved and detached (Seldin, 1972) is a contributing factor to use. Reporting on his investigation of users, Robbins (1970) suggests that, "The father, while present, worked such long hours that he saw his children little . . . Parent discord was common. There was a frequent history of the use of alcohol or reliance on medicinal substances by one or both parents."

Further, use is seen as the failure of both parents to develop appropriate social attitudes in their children (Medical Journal of Australia, 1972). Finally, Blum (1969) points out that "users of all classes of drugs consistently recall the advantages of being sick as a child . . . and/or their parents had little concern over their health in childhood."

From the above, it may be concluded that users' parents probably tend to be more permissive with them than do those of nonusers. In addition, parents of nonusers will likely tend to be less overpro-
tective, dominant, and critical than will be the parents of users. Similarly, fathers of users probably tend to spend less time with their family than do fathers of nonusers. Although it was not suggested, the same may hold for mothers of users. Still further, it is suggested that mothers and fathers of users tend to be less close to their children than do the parents of nonusers. Also, the argument would suggest that the social attitudes of nonusers would tend to be more consistent with those of their family than are those of users. Finally, the argument would suggest the likelihood that the parents of users will tend to also be higher users of alcohol and drugs than are the parents of nonusers. The same questions can be asked about those propositions as were raised earlier, viz. why should they be true? For permissiveness on the one hand and criticalness, overprotection, and dominance on the other, the argument has already been posited that elaboration and definition of intrafamily roles and functions is contrary to either permissiveness or overprotection, criticalness, and dominance. In terms of fathers and possibly mothers of nonusers spending more time with their families than do those of users, the earlier arguments in reference to family closeness, integration, etc., suggest that there would be a higher level of family involvement and participation by all family members for those families in which the likelihood of use is lowest. The discussion in terms of parental use of alcohol and drugs is similar. To the extent that drug use in teenagers represents alienation from the family and a sense of estrangement, the use of alcohol and drugs by parents may be seen as similarly related to a sense of family alienation and estrangement. Such feelings are, of course, contrary to feel-
ings of closeness, involvement, participation, etc. In general, the theoretical position is that to the extent that parent-child relationships, relationships between parents, and childrearing practices lead to family stability as elaborated above, the likelihood of use manifesting in teenagers is lowered.

CHURCH AND RELIGION

General

It is acknowledged that "church" and "religion" represent two somewhat different concepts. For the present purpose, however, the two concepts will be taken as representing a single societal institution. As was argued for the family, it is here argued that the institution of church and religion has a mediating function within society, namely to mediate the push and pull forces already elaborated. With this in mind, it is argued that the drug problem represents a spiritual poverty of a prosperous society (Huber, 1970). Over time, changing religious values (Richards, 1968) have weakened the religious foundation; and most of all, the contemporary failure of religion to reach the nation's youth (Krantz, 1972) has culminated in widespread teenage use. There are, of course, two issues raised here: first, changing religious values and second, the failure of religion to reach contemporary youth. Changing religious values may be seen as a manifestation of or as a prime example of changing values discussed in earlier sections in reference to culture. Such changing religious values can be seen as a further example of cultural or value instability. The problems are sev-
eral. First, as a mediating institution, religion serves as a "sta-
ble" reference point in terms of values, acceptable behavioral norms,
and so forth. To the extent that this reference point or etiological
landmark is unstable and changing, its utility or functionality is
diminished. Second, religion has the potential for serving as a focus
for identification and involvement for youth. This is, of course, one
of the institutional functions of the family. Therefore, the arguments
given in reference to alienation from the family also apply to aliena-
tion from religion. Third, religious values and orientation can serve
as a source of aspiration and inspiration for youth. To the extent
that such religious values change over time, such aspirations and in-
spiration become less well defined and more ambiguous. Fourth, reli-
gion and religious values serve as a guide or criterion for acceptable
and unacceptable involvements, e.g., the counterculture. To the extent
that it does not serve this function, its effectiveness in mediating
the "pull forces" is severely diminished. As can be seen from these
brief examples, the church and religion do have a mediating function;
and to the extent that this point is acknowledged it is, for many
youth, not meeting its institutional demands. The fact that religion
tends to be in a state of flux and transition is, by itself, sufficient
to suggest that the contemporary state of religion is contributing to
use. As suggested, however, the problem is compounded when, even in
its fluctuating transitional form, it is not reaching many of America's
youth. For those whom it is reaching, the changing values of the church
and religion represent a diminished ability of religion to fill its
institutional role. To the extent that it is not reaching many youth,
Involvement in Religion

"Church attendance is much higher among non-drug users with 85 percent stating they attend church two or more times per month. A total of 83 percent of the drug using group said religious beliefs were of little importance to them." (Gossett, Lewis, and Phillips, 1973). It is clear from this that use is related to low involvement in church and religion (Freedman and Brotman, 1969). This low involvement, in turn, results in a lack of secure religious beliefs (Richards, 1968 and Brotman, Silverman, and Suffet, 1970). These secure religious beliefs are, in turn, the key to avoiding the nonuse-use transition. From this, it may be concluded that users attend church less frequently than nonusers. Similarly, one may conclude that users tend to be less secure about their religious beliefs than do nonusers. If these points are combined with the above comments in reference to changing religious values and the low involvement of youth in religion, it is clear that religion, as a mediating institution, is in a state of crisis.

Attitudes Toward Religion

One writer has concluded, "... students who are sticking with the 'faith of their fathers' are less likely to be taking drugs than classmates who are shifting affiliations in their search for the divine; and expectedly, drug use was highest among those for whom there was no spiritual search at all." (Human Behavior, 1973). Further, users in general tend to value religion low (Gossett, Lewis, and
Phillips, 1973). At the extreme, users tend, in reference to religion, to hold negative attitudes toward it (Streit and Oliver, 1972). From this, it is suggested that nonusers are more likely than users to have one or both parents involved in church and that their religious beliefs are more likely to be consistent with those of their parents than are users. Finally, nonusers are likely to hold a higher personal value for religion than are users. From the foregoing, it is clear that, for nonusers, the church and religion are more likely to be fulfilling their institutional function of mediating the push and pull forces than for users.

THE SCHOOL

General

At a general level, use is seen as reflecting inadequacies in the educational system (Cohen, 1972). In the present context, Cohen's suggestion of use being related to inadequacies in the educational system would expand to argue that use is related to the failure of schools to fulfill their function of mediating between the push and pull forces leading to use. What is the nature of the school's responsibility in this respect? Here, the legitimacy of including "the school" as a mediating institution similar to the church and the family must be carefully scrutinized. It is here argued that the primary function of a school as a societal institution is to "educate" the youth with whom it deals. The emphasis of the "education" is in terms of conveying certain information and skills necessary for functioning in a variety
of socially defined situations. In addition to this primary function, the school has a less primary function of socialization and acculturation in reference to the values, beliefs, norms, and behavior patterns appropriate to the specific community and to the greater society. Somewhat artificially, then the school's function may be seen as including education, socialization, and acculturation. It is hoped that this gross conceptualization of the functions of the educational system will be generally accepted without further specification here. It must, indeed, be left to more appropriate forums and context since that specification would require far more elaboration and detail than can be handled in the present discussion. At a minimum, it can be seen that the nature of the "education," socialization, and acculturation is not clearcut. From the earlier discussion, it was seen that society represents a multiplicity of subgroups which lack uniformity and consensus. To the extent that the educational system reflects that society, then, a similar lack of uniformity and consensus will be present. (This point would, of course, be minimized were it the case that only one or so subgroups within the society had absolute control over the school system.) The only point here being made is that the schools tend to reflect a compromise in terms of values, beliefs, norms, and the like. This is reflected through varying curricula, varying school policies, and a general lack of uniformity from school to school and, probably, in a particular school. Nevertheless, young people within a school system are under a certain amount of pressure to "conform" to the education, socialization, and acculturation of the particular school system in which they are involved. Etzioni (1972) has argued
that people do not really change much over time. If the point is true for individuals, it is even more true for institutions. The issue here is that institutions change slowly over time. Given this fact, the result is that as culture and society change over time, institutions like the school tend to change at a somewhat slower rate. The result is a lag between the state of culture and the advance of society. The argument is here being narrowed to specific institutions within society. The conclusion is that the school, as an institution, will always tend to reflect a more traditional cultural and societal orientation. (There are, of course, exceptions to any rule. Some schools may be, in fact, moving ahead of society in terms of values, beliefs, etc.)

At any rate, the argument here is fairly simple. If one acknowledges the pressure on students to conform, it can be seen that students with a less traditional orientation would be under more pressure than would students with a more traditional orientation, given the tendency of the school, as an institution, to reflect a more traditional orientation. It was argued earlier that users tend to have a less traditional orientation in terms of values, beliefs, behavior patterns, and the like. It follows, then, that users will tend to be under more pressure at school than will nonusers, when school is seen in terms of educational, socialization, and acculturation functions. Demos (1969) has suggested the relationship between school pressure and use. This "pressure" is, as has been shown, a diverse phenomenon and should not be seen as reflecting academic pressure per se. The pressure may be seen as academic/social/cultural.

To the extent that the above argument holds, the school, as an
institution, represents a further "push" on individuals toward alienation, limited connectedness, and estrangement. This institutional alienation is partially reflected in the tendency of users to have less involvement in school activities than nonusers (Brotman, Silverman, and Suffet, 1970). "Nondrug users are far more active in school organizations than their turned on classmates. While most nondrug users belonged to two or more school clubs and organizations, the majority of the drug users belong to none or only one." (Gossett, Lewis and Phillips, 1973). Alternatively, both users and nonusers in one study reported equal participation in intramural sports, drama, and music organizations with users reporting slightly higher involvement in some activities related to political action, etc. (Walters, Goethals, and Pope, 1972). Considering the tendency of users discussed earlier to be more oriented toward "cultural" activities, one would expect them to show an increased involvement in drama and music over nonusers. The fact that this was not found would tend to suggest that users, as a group, are probably less oriented to school activities. The finding in reference to intramural sports is more curious, perhaps reflecting a particular characteristic of a given school system. Another argument would suggest that students involved in intramural sports are less involved in intermural sports. Particularly in high schools, intermural sports tend to be a more central part of the ongoing program of the school, while intramural sports tend to be a fringe activity oriented more toward recreation. In either case, the findings tend to support the argument that users are less involved in school activities than nonusers. Another point to be noted is that
school clubs and organizations tend to be quite varied and numerous. Also they are, to some extent, a reflection of the interests and motivations of the students. To the extent that this is true, the "user subgroups" are likely themselves to form groups, clubs, and organizations which would be recognized by the school administration. The point is that any study of such involvement and activity must, in some way, account for the intervening factor of the acceptance, support, and encouragement given to the group or activity by the school administration and the community in which the school exists. It is argued that such consideration would lead to seeing involvement in school activities on a continuum from high centrality to very low centrality, using Young's (1966) conception of centrality discussed earlier. With this intervening factor in mind, it is concluded that users will tend to be under more pressure, feel more alienated, and be less involved in school activities than nonusers.

School Policies

The controversy of Theory X and Theory Y (McGregor, 1960) raised earlier is at the heart of the debate over school policies. The divergent views (Hart, 1970) involve the opposing contentions that, on the one hand, rigid school policies precipitate use, and on the other hand, that permissive school policies contribute to use. At a more narrow level the argument is, of course, the same as that in reference to laws and public policies. As argued above, it is here argued that the influence of school policies in reference to behavior, conduct, and so forth has a differing effect on different subgroups
within the student population of any school. Rigid school policies would cause some subgroups to conform while causing others to rebel. Similarly, permissive school policies would tend to result in behavior patterns on the part of some subgroups less in accord with traditional patterns than they would otherwise be, given more rigid school policies. At the same time, such permissive school policies would tend, for some groups, to result in less pressure to conform, less norm violation, and a lowered feeling of alienation. It would be here argued that, on the whole, the relative permissiveness or rigidity of school policies would be empirically unrelated to use unless consideration and control were allowed for the multiplicity of and lack of uniformity between subgroups. Theoretically, there should be some optimum balance of rigidity and permissiveness. The point would be argued in terms of the notion that rigidity could be increased to a point at which almost all of the student body of a given school would consistently be defined as violating school norms or policies. On the other hand, permissiveness could be extended to the point at which there were practically no norms or standards. Extension in that direction would lead to the eventual elimination of all school policies in reference to the given area. The extension of rigidity is toward the absolute definition and control of almost everything. The extension of permissiveness is toward a policy which essentially holds that the schools will have no policy. The thrust of the argument, then, directs schools toward some middle ground wherein school policies can serve to mediate between the need for some conformity and the risk of alien-
ation of students. With this in mind, it is concluded that school policies are, in fact, related to use; but the nature of that relationship is quite complex and reflects a differential effect on various subgroups.

Grades and Attitudes

It has been suggested that users tend to do less well in school than nonusers from an academic point of view (Rosenberg, 1968). The thrust of the theoretical development to this point would support the notion that users would tend to do less well in school than nonusers insofar as academic achievement relates to positive feelings about self, and orientation to success, the approval of others, competitiveness, and so on. The difficult question of a relationship between academic achievement and use tends to take on a somewhat different perspective, however, when one considers the fact that studies in reference to use and academic achievement have, for the most part, not considered factors other than grades received. Factors such as the nature of the student's school program may be relevant. For example, schools offer a variety of programs including college preparatory programs, general programs, technical-vocational programs, and so on. There is a possibility that the effort required, the grading standards, and the overall concomitance to success may vary from program to program. To the extent that this is true, a relationship between use and academic achievement may be disguised or even distorted. Further, the multiple nature of available programs allows students to
select courses and programs which are, to some extent, consistent with their orientation, motivation, interests, ability, etc. To the extent that this is true, users as well as nonusers have the opportunity to select programs in which they are, in fact, interested at some level. This opportunity for self selection of school program would tend to minimize any relationship between use and academic achievement as measured by grades received. One might speculate that, to the extent that science represents a more traditional course of study, nonusers would tend to do better in science courses than users. Similarly, to the extent that art programs would tend to be consistent with the "cultural" orientation of users, one might speculate that users would tend to do better in art programs than nonusers. In any event, the relationship between use and academic achievement is vague because of the possible intervening effect of the factors noted along with possibly others which have not been here considered. In general, it is concluded that no relationship will be noted between academic achievement and use unless particular strategies are developed to account for and control the influence of the factors noted along with others which will undoubtedly be developed.

From the foregoing, it can be seen that the nature of the relationship between use and the functioning of the school as a mediating institution is very complex. In general, it may be concluded that users tend to feel under more pressure from school than do nonusers. Similarly, they-users-tend to feel more alienated from school and are generally less involved in the main stream of school activities. It
follows that users would be expected to have more negative attitudes toward school than nonusers as a result of their increased sense of alienation, nonparticipation, and lower involvement. Similarly, it is likely that nonusers will tend to be more successful in academic programs oriented toward the objective and traditional, while users will tend to be at least as successful if not more so than nonusers in programs more oriented to the subjective and nontraditional. (It is acknowledged that the last conclusion in reference to academic achievement is more suggested by the theoretical development than supported in the drug literature. The literature does not tend to reject the point, but rather tends only not to support it.

THE INDIVIDUAL

The Focus of the System (General):

The argument thus far can be summarized in terms of the existence of certain push forces operating on the individual so as to lead to an increasing sense of alienation and estrangement, which in turn lead to an increasing tendency toward escapism. Concomitant to these push forces are certain pull forces which attract or move the individual toward the youth culture and thus toward use. It was argued that this description reflects the "natural flow" of contemporary society toward use. As mentioned earlier, the question then becomes, "Why is it not the case that all teenagers use drugs?" This issue was considered in terms of "mediating institutions." To make the argument explicit, it is held that these mediating institutions—
family, the church, and the school—operate successfully for some teenagers and not for others. The general reasoning, sometimes explicit and sometimes implicit, is that there is a general deterioration of the functional capacity of the family, the church, and the school to mediate. These incapacities or functional failures were enumerated in some detail. The argument is, then, that these institutions have been successful for only a portion of society's youth. For those youth for whom the mediating institutions have been successful, the argument is that alienation and estrangement have been interrupted through an active process leading to involvement, participation, and connectedness. The discussion below specifically considers the drug literature in terms of the individual and the suggested tendency toward estrangement, alienation, and escapism.

Alienation and Estrangement

The discussion here is premised on a view of the nature of man which holds that a sense of meaningfulness is syntonic to a sense of well-being. In the absence of a sense of well-being, then, men will tend to take remedial or restorative action so as to obtain or achieve an acceptable level of well-being. Meaninglessness is, alternatively, alien to man's nature and thus requires remediation. Use, a remedial or restorative activity, is then held to be related to a relatively meaningless existence (Giordano, 1968 and Wurms, 1970). From this perspective, users are seen as disillusioned, dissatisfied, frustrated, and experiencing despair (Gay, Smith and Shep-
pated, 1972). They are seen as lacking personal commitment (Ramirez, 1968) as a concomitant to meaninglessness, and searching for meaning through drugs (Bruyn, 1970). From this, it may be concluded that users tend to perceive their lives as less meaningful than the non-users.

Green (1969) has concluded that, "Two aspects of self-perception are associated with the desire for self-modification through the use of chemical agents: one is generally dissatisfaction with oneself . . . the other is the absence of any defenses or restraint against taking this route, be it fear of loss of control—males—or defense through denial—primarily in females." Other writers (Levy, 1968) have also seen that users are conflicted over feelings of inadequacy. The argument goes on to assert that users have negative attitudes toward self, a poor self-concept, and low self-esteem (Streit and Oliver, 1972; Ferneau, 1971; and Wurmser, 1970). In general, it may be concluded that users have a more negative self-concept than do nonusers.

The concept of "identity" is well known and recurrent in psychological and sociological literature. In the present context, it is argued that users have greater difficulty than nonusers in negotiating an identity. Drugs, then, are used as an aid or vehicle in negotiating and/or establishing an identity (Wurmser, 1970). Both of these points are, of course, consistent with earlier arguments. The increased difficulty in negotiating an identity is not suggested to be an inherent characteristic of the using individual. Rather,
it is argued that the availability of structural and institutional opportunities for identification are less present and operative for users than for nonusers. This lack of opportunity and availability is seen as the proximate cause of the difficulty for users in negotiating an identity. As discussed earlier, then, use becomes a vehicle for identification in the youth culture. In addition, it becomes a potential alternative to the meaninglessness and personal estrangement discussed above. At any rate, it is fair to conclude that users do, in fact, experience more difficulty negotiating and establishing an identity than do nonusers.

This increased sense of meaninglessness, personal estrangement, and difficulty in negotiating an identity have been seen as an indication of immaturity (Records, 1971 and Seldin, 1972). "Many of these personalities are inadequate and immature . . . This kind of personality reaches adolescence with the motivations of a child. He lacks moral obligating and responsibilities . . . like the child, he is often obsessed with the desire to gain effortless pleasure, to have fun; and like the child, he refuses to face the responsibilities of adulthood which are often painful . . ." (Ansubel, 1958) This "immaturity" has further been seen as a low ability to anticipate the consequences of their behavior (Holloran, 1972). The developing argument would have predicted these findings. Maturity is, in part, defined in terms of a sense of meaningfulness and purposefulness; it is seen in terms of an established identity and connectedness; and it is seen in terms of a positive, well defined self-concept.
What accounts for whether or not children develop these characteristics? The answer is, of course, in terms of the successfulness of the socialization and acculturation processes as well as a sense of belongingness, functional importance, and so on. In short, maturity is a function of the degree to which the family, church, and the school have successfully met their institutional responsibility. To the extent that they have failed to meet their responsibility, it would be expected that youth would fail to progress toward maturity. Such failure on the part of these institutions for users has been elaborated and articulated above. Based on that discussion and reinforced by the findings cited, it is reasonable to conclude that users tend to be more immature than nonusers.

In general, it may be concluded, then, that users have an increased tendency relative to nonusers to experience a sense of meaningless have a poor self-concept and to experience a sense of self-estrangement, have difficulty in negotiating and establishing an identity, and finally, show a greater immaturity and increased difficulty in moving toward maturity.

Escapism

One investigator argues that, "Use is learned from peers and older associates" and "occurs as a group activity imbued with group meaning, and that drug use does not necessarily signify rebellion, escape, or alienation." (Blumer, 1969) It is here agreed that use does, indeed, represent a group activity imbued with group meaning.
Similarly, it has earlier been acknowledged that there is a tendency to experience initial use through older associates. From this perspective, it could be argued that use does not reflect escapism and alienation. Rather, it would then be argued that use reflects a movement toward group involvement and status gain. The theoretical development would suggest that this view does, however, only look at the "pull forces" leading to use. It has been argued that escapism and alienation are a function of the "push forces" and that the movement toward use stems both from that and from the "pull forces" present in the group and personified in older associates. The finding here, then, is not inconsistent with the overall argument but only appears to be so as a result of its partial focus. Incardi and Chambers (1973) suggest that users come in two varieties: escapist users and adaptive users. Here again, the apparent inconsistency is a function of focus. It is here argued that use always has an escapist and adaptive dimension. The escapist dimension is related to escape from reality and estrangement. The escape is, itself, a form of adaptation to that reality. Drugs are, in this view, the adaptive mechanism. Seeing use as a way of avoiding (escaping from) and/or modifying (adapting to) reality is a very common theme in the literature (Pet, 1968; Gay, Smith and Sheppard, 1972; Lindesmith, 1968; Press and Done, 1967; Skousen, 1969; Levy, 1968; Lochaya, 1970; Rabe, 1970; and Yolles, 1968).

It has been further argued that users are attracted to thrills and danger (Tseng, 1970). They are seen as drawn by the excitement of use (Lister, 1967) with the appeal of use being enhanced
by the element of risk (Hawes, 1970). "Despite the known risk of drug taking, many intelligent high school and college students who can be categorized as experience seekers, oblivion seekers, or personality change seekers choose to take this risk. High school students take drugs most frequently in order to prove their courage, defy authority, to increase sexual desire and performance, obtain a thrill, or find the meaning of life." (Blaine, 1970). However, it has alternatively been seen that users are no more or less sensation seeking than nonusers (Herl, 1972). The apparent controversy here again stems from a failure to see the broader picture. As an inherent characteristic there is no reason to suppose that users will be any more sensation seeking than nonusers. The problem comes in terms of the nature of sensation seeking and the opportunity for gratification of needs for sensation. From this perspective, it would be argued that non-users have a wide variety of opportunities and situations available to them for sensation in terms of the physical, emotional, social, intellectual, and so on. This variety, then, leads away from any particular focus for unmet sensation needs. The general suggestion is that use is a vehicle for achieving sensation, thrill, experience, and so on. This is undoubtedly true. The problem comes in terms of the availability of alternative vehicles. When this lack of opportunity is combined with the perceived possibility for oblivion, increased sexual potency, and increased insight into the meaningfulness and meaning of life, drugs represent a powerful "pull" on the individual. This point has been elaborated in much more detail above. Also, it
is noted that users seem, for some reason, to be more willing than nonusers to take the risk assumed to be present in use. The willingness of users to take this "risk" is easily understood if one appreciates the alternatives to the risk, viz. estrangement, meaninglessness, despair, etc. From this, it may be concluded that the strength of the "push" and the tendency toward escape is only emphasized through the extent to which the user perceives there being a "risk" involved in use. It would be argued that users do not use because of the risk, but rather they use in spite of it.

Levine, Lloyd, and Longdon (1973) report that "curiosity, boredom . . . and just a deep need" were frequently reasons given for use. The tendency of users to be bored has been noted by other students as well (Pet and Ball, 1968; Wurmser, 1970). From the perspective of boredom, then, use reflects a desire for a change (Pet and Ball, 1968). Whether it be a function of boredom, meaninglessness, or any other alien feeling or self perception, the argument may be concluded by suggesting that use represents an attempt on the part of the user to escape the impact of alienation and estrangement and to achieve a state of well-being.
CHAPTER THREE
THE DEVELOPMENT OF HYPOTHESES AND
MEASUREMENT OF VARIABLES
A CONCEPTUAL SYNTHESIS

Nonusers

As suggested in Chapter Two, the focus of the research entered into the theory of use at the level of interaction between the teenager and the mediating institutions of family, church, and school. The argument was that the flow in reference to use was from the push forces within society through the individual to the pull forces of the youth culture and its associated social influences, and of drugs. It is, then, the function of the mediating institutions to interrupt this flow. As the model suggests, there is an institutional failure at the point of interruption. It was also noted that, for nonusers, the mediating institutions do, in some way, perform their function in terms of interrupting the flow. The theoretical development, then, argues that the difference between users and nonusers is whether or not the mediating institutions fill their societal function for the teenager. It is the purpose of this conceptual synthesis, then, to look at the operation of mediating institutions for both nonusers and users in order that a clear picture can be developed of their differential operation. The
discussion looks first at the operation of the family, the church, and the school for nonusers. The factors introduced, of course, could be put in a negative form and applied to users. Similarly, the discussion of users has the same property, insofar as the factors could be put in negative form and applied to nonusers. With this in mind, let the discussion move to focus on a conceptual synthesis of nonuse.

Starting at the family level, a nonuser has a positive attitude toward his family, feels close to both of his parents, sees the family as an integrated unit, and perceives the family as being close knit. His parents have a stable relationship and communicate well both with each other and with the teenager. Both he and his parents exhibit good insight into each other's needs and situation; and the teenager is regularly involved in decisions affecting the family. The values and social attitudes of the family are strong; and the teenager comes to hold values and attitudes consistent with those of his family. Both parents spend a lot of time with their family, and he remembers their concern when he would get sick when he was little.

The teenager attends church regularly, as do his parents. He is very secure in his religious belief and places high value on religion, as he follows the faith of his parents.

He has a positive attitude toward school, a positive self-image, and experiences a general feeling of well-being. He sees himself as able to solve his personal and social problems and is thus solution oriented. He has many traditional adult models to whom he turns for personal and moral guidance. He knows who he is and what he be-
lieves, which includes the values of his elders in all important matters, e.g., sexual conduct. He is quite competitive, has well defined aspirations, and is oriented to the future. He is personally and socially responsible, showing good progress toward maturity and adult status. He finds life personally meaningful and always fears any loss of control. He likes sports and watches a lot of T.V. and feels drugs are potentially harmful. The likelihood is, of course, that he is a nonuser.

Users

The user comes from a family fraught with internal strife. His parents, if they are both there, drink a lot or use a lot of drugs themselves. They are quite permissive with him on the one hand and tend to be domineering, overprotective, and quite critical on the other. He recalls a lot of advantages of being sick as a child, and now as he feels alienated from his family and under a lot of pressure at school, he looks at the medication value of drugs. He feels depressed and bored. Maybe drugs can help solve his problem; anyway, most of his associates use drugs. Drugs have a lot of beneficial effect. He hears this in the media coverage of the drug problem, as well as through exposure to popular songs and singers advocating use. On top of that, there are all of those ads for over-the-counter drugs.

He has become quite receptive to use, and there are lots of opportunities even though he has not tried it yet. Drugs are readily available and most of his friends use. He watched a lot of T.V. when
he was younger but is mostly into cultural activities now. He really wants to be one of the gang and is attracted by the values and norms of the counterculture. He has had sexual intercourse, and feels that use is a requisite to membership in the group. If he does not use, his peers may reject him. He has a lot of leisure time and feels also that drugs can be a form of relaxation and recreation. Also, he is quite susceptible to peer influence, and the impact of peer use is great. Along with all of that, he is curious. What will happen if he tries it? The likelihood is, of course, that he will become a user.

Summary Propositions

The above profiles of users and nonusers clearly suggest the following propositions:

A. Nonusers feel accepted by and involved in family, church, and school.

B. Users feel alienated from and uninvolved in family, church, and school.

C. For nonusers, the family, the church, and the school operate so as to increase the teenager's sense of involvement and participation.

D. For users, the family, the church, and the school fail to operate so as to stimulate a sense of involvement and participation for teenagers.

E. There is a significant difference between users and nonusers in terms of their sense of involvement, acceptance, and participation in family, church, and school.

F. For nonusers, the family, the church, and the school have actively encouraged, promoted, and developed feelings of involvement, acceptance, and participation, whereas they have failed to do so for users.
It was the purpose of this research to operationally define and test propositions "F" and "F" above. This chapter discusses the specific hypothesis, operational definitions, and methodology used to test those propositions.

DEVELOPMENT OF HYPOTHESES

A Model of Use

As will be elaborated below, proposition "f" constitutes the major hypothetical consideration derived from the theory of use in Chapter Two. It—proposition "f"—responds to the question, "What accounts for the significant difference posited between users and non-users in proposition "e"?

At this point, the developing argument faces a serious problem, viz. the introduction of prior cause. From the conceptual synthesis above, it can be seen that users develop negative attitudes toward family, church, and school as well as concomitant feelings of alienation from those institutions. These feelings of alienation, as the theory argues, foster an increased receptivity to use; and through the pull forces already specified, this increased receptivity actualizes in an increased probability of use. Similarly, the theory holds that, for nonusers, more positive attitudes toward family, church, and school prompt fewer feelings of alienation, in turn leading to lower receptivity and to a lowered probability of use. For both users and nonusers, then, the critical point of the argument is set at the point of formation of attitudes toward family, church, and
school. Proposition "e" thus proposes a significant difference between users and nonusers at the point of attitude and feeling formation. From this, it can be seen that proposition "e" is demanded theoretically. The serious problem suggested above comes in here. Why is there a significant difference? Below is the hypothesized answer to this question. The problem is that the answer proposes a prior cause for attitude and feeling formation not demanded theoretically. In fact, the theory allows for any number of possible causes at this point. The argument for "institutional activism" presented below represents a new explanatory variable in the conceptual system. Where did it come from? As the argument for its inclusion is considered, its source may be apparent. If not, let it suffice to acknowledge the notion that hypothetical insight involves intuition, judgment, experience, along with a multitude of other factors. The issue is not so much to account for such insight, but rather to explain and test it.

If there is a significant difference between users and nonusers in terms of the formation of attitudes toward and feelings of alienation from the institutions of family, church, and school, that difference must, in part, lie in the operation of those institutions. With that in mind, it is argued that these three institutions-family, church, school—function or act differently, in some way, for nonusers as compared to users. How? They act so as to elicit more positive as opposed to more negative attitudes toward them, as well as to foster less as opposed to more feelings of alienation from them.
This action of those institutions is here held as "institutional activism." Figure One summarizes the argument.

FIGURE ONE

SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIZED VARIABLES AND "DIRECTION" OF VARIABLES FOR USERS AND NONUSERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction For Users</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Direction For Nonusers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Institutional Activism</td>
<td>More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Negative</td>
<td>Attitude Toward Institution</td>
<td>More Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>Alienation From Institution</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Receptivity</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Probability of Use</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Figure One suggests, the theoretical sequence for users is from less institutional activism to a more negative attitude toward the institution to more feelings of alienation from the institution to higher receptivity to a higher probability of use. For nonusers, the theoretical sequence is from more institutional activism to more positive attitudes toward the institution to less feelings of alienation from the institution to lower receptivity to a lower probability of use. This does, of course, represent the conceptual elaboration of proposition "f" introduced earlier. Conceptually, then, the above theoretical sequence for users and nonusers can be seen as a single sequence leading to an increased or decreased probability of use.
depending on the operation—more or less—of institutional activism. It—institutional activism—then stands as the independent variable in the system operating through attitude, alienation, and receptivity on the dependent variable: use. With this in mind, the discussion can now focus on further elaborating and articulating proposition "f".

At the level of abstraction at which Figure One is presented, thirty-one implicit relationships are held from view. First, "institutional activism" includes family activism, church activism, and school activism. Next, "attitude" includes attitude toward family, toward church, and toward school. "Alienation" includes alienation from family, from church, and from school.

When receptivity and use are added, the result is an eleven variable system, the result is three interrelated but conceptually separable sequences. The first moves from family activism through attitude toward family to alienation from family through receptivity to use. The second moves from church activism through attitude toward church to alienation from church through receptivity to use. The third moves from school activism through attitude toward school to alienation from school through receptivity to use. From there then, family activism, church activism, and school activism are hypothesized as related to their respective attitude variables, their respective alienation variables, as well as to receptivity and use. In turn, the three attitude variables—toward family, toward church, toward school—are hypothesized as related to their respective alienation variables as well as to receptivity and use. To further ela-
borate the interrelationships among the eleven variables, the three alienation variables—toward family, toward church, toward school—are hypothesized as related to receptivity and use. Further, receptivity is then hypothesized as related to use. Finally, as mentioned above, family activism, church activism, and school activism are seen as interrelated with each other. Without suggesting any time ordering of those three variables, the argument is that a young person comes into an already established system which includes family, church, and school. At that point, whether or not the teenager moves, over time, toward an increased or a decreased probability of use is held to be contingent on the relative activism of those three institutions. As can be seen, the eleven variables in the system are hypothesized as interacting with each other over time. With the foregoing understanding of the complex interrelationship of the eleven variables, the need now is for the specific articulation of each relationship in hypothetical form. To this task, the discussion next turns.

Hypotheses

As suggested above, the next task is to specify in hypothetical form, the thirty-one interrelationships among the eleven variables in the theoretical sequence. They are here presented in related groups for purposes of increased clarity as the reader considers them individually.
Family

H₁: Family activism is negatively related to use.
H₂: Family activism is negatively related to receptivity.
H₃: Family activism is negatively related to perceived alienation from family.
H₄: Family activism is positively related to attitude toward family.
H₅: Attitude toward family is negatively related to use.
H₆: Attitude toward family is negatively related to receptivity.
H₇: Attitude toward family is negatively related to perceived alienation from family.
H₈: Perceived alienation from family is positively related to receptivity.

Church

H₁₀: Church activism is negatively related to use.
H₁¹: Church activism is negatively related to receptivity.
H₁²: Church activism is negatively related to perceived alienation from church.
H₁₃: Church activism is positively related to attitude toward church.
H₁₄: Attitude toward church is negatively related to use.
H₁₅: Attitude toward church is negatively related to receptivity.
H₁₆: Attitude toward church is negatively related to perceived alienation from church.
H₁₇: Perceived alienation from church is positively related to use.
H₁₈: Perceived alienation from church is positively related to receptivity.

School

H₁₉: School activism is negatively related to use.
H₂₀: School activism is negatively related to receptivity.
H₂₁: School activism is negatively related to perceived alienation from school.
H₂₂: School activism is positively related to attitude toward school.
H₂₃: Attitude toward school is negatively related to use.
H₂₄: Attitude toward school is negatively related to receptivity.
H₂₅: Attitude toward school is negatively related to perceived alienation from school.
H₂₆: Perceived alienation from school is positively related to use.
H₂₇: Perceived alienation from school is positively related to receptivity.

General

H₂₈: Receptivity is positively related to use.
H₂₉: Family activism is related to church activism.
H₃₀: Church activism is related to school activism.
H₃₁: School activism is related to family activism.

The hypotheses above—H₁ through H₃₁—represent the major hypotheses of the study. As the reader will recall, the theoretical development in Chapter Two considered many more than the eleven variables included in these thirty-one hypotheses. Since some of these
additional variables are easily measured and could be readily included in the instruments measuring the eleven major variables, some of these additional variables were considered in the field research. They are discussed in later sections of this chapter and were held as minor hypotheses in the study. At this point, the discussion next focuses on operationalizing and measuring the eleven major variables.

MEASUREMENT OF MAJOR VARIABLES

In general, the task is to measure activism, attitude, and alienation for family, church, and school. In addition, testing the model requires the measurement of receptivity and use. In the discussion below, the strategy is to operationally define the variable in question, and then to present a reliable scale for the measurement of that variable.

Institutional Activism

As one examines the study's major hypotheses, the first step in measurement becomes the operationalizing and measuring of institutional activism in reference to family, church, and school. As the reader will recall, institutional activism was defined earlier as the action of an institution which promotes more positive as opposed to more negative attitudes toward that institution, as well as prompting fewer feelings of alienation from that institution. The key here is in the word "action." The notion is that institutions "act" so as to promote more positive feelings toward them and fewer feelings of
alienation from them. Since attitude and perceived alienation are a function of the individual's cognitive and feeling system, and since institutional activism requires the action of an institution, it is argued that institutional activism can be and is perceived by the individual. At a general level, then, institutional activism is operationally defined as the actions of an institution which are perceived by the individual teenager as fostering more positive attitudes on his part toward that institution, as well as contrary to alienating actions insofar as they tend to increase his sense of belonging to, participation in, and acceptance by that institution including actions perceived by the individual teenager as related to his personal needs. Looking more closely at this fairly complex definition, institutional activism is seen as having several properties. First, it is perceived by the individual teenager. Next, it is perceived as actions of the given institution. Actions of an institution, of course, include both acts of individuals within that institution and acts which are generalized, by the teenager, as a function of the institution as a whole. Further, those acts are seen as both developing a positive attitude toward that institution and preventing or countering feelings of alienation from that institution. To clarify the argument, consider first attitude toward family, church, or school. As will be elaborated later, "attitude" represents the perceived "goodness" or "value" of an institution. Attitude deals fundamentally with the question, "How do you feel about family, church, or school?" If the reader will accept this gross formulation here with the understanding that it will be further articulated later, attitude is, then, a per-
ception of the individual about the institution. Activism, then, refers to the extent to which the individual perceives that institution as actively trying or making an effort to positively influence his attitude. For example, a teenager might say, "I really feel good about my school." This would reflect a positive attitude. In addition, he might say, "I think my school makes a real effort to get me to feel good about it." This, then, would represent institutional activism. Following the same line of thought, alienation represents the individual's perceived involvement in, participation in, and belongingness to an institution as well as the capacity of that institution to meet his needs. Activism then includes actions on the part of the institution oriented to minimizing feelings of alienation. For example, a teenager might say, "I really feel like I am a part of my family; and it meets many of my personal needs." Considering alienation as a variable, this would represent extremely low alienation. In addition, the teenager might say, "My family really tries to make me feel a part of things; and the people in my family go out of their way to be sure that my personal needs are met." This, then, would represent institutional activism. Taking the above operational considerations as given, the key to measuring activism lies in being able to measure attitude and alienation. First considering alienation, the first step was to find a highly reliable scale measuring alienation. With the operational definition here used, an instrument measuring alienation from any social system is appropriate. Even though the study focused specifically on activism in reference to family, church, and school, the concept is applicable to activism in
reference to any social system or institution. Napier's (1972) community alienation scale was thus selected as a highly reliable instrument—split-half 0.9—for measuring alienation. The original scale—see Appendix Two—includes twenty items of the Likert type.

The first step in converting the scale for the present research involved systematically subdividing it into three six item alienation scales. This was accomplished by systematically removing every third item for the first scale, removing every third remaining item for the second scale, and so on. Once the three shorter community alienation scales had been extracted, each item in each scale was considered individually. This individual consideration involved being careful to retain the concept implicit in the item while converting the item itself to apply to family, church, or school. The original scale in Appendix Two can be compared with the items used in the research instrument—see Appendix One—when considering the adequacy of this conversion process. Specifically, one of the six item scales was converted to apply to alienation from family; one was converted to apply to alienation from church; and the third was converted to apply to alienation from school. The next step was to further convert each item from a measure of alienation to a measure of activism. This was accomplished by considering the concept implicit in the item and carefully restating it as an action of the family, church, or school. For example, start with the individual's perception of his community's resources in terms of meeting his needs. The first step in the conversion process would be to restate the concept in terms of, for example, the church's capacity to meet an
individual's needs. The second step, then, would be converting the concept into action or effort on the part of the church to meet the individual's needs. Without repetitively reiterating the reasoning process, the same steps were used in converting the attitude scale (Crow, 1973), split-half 0.9,—see Appendix Three— from attitude toward a service delivery agency to family, church, and school activism. For example, one of the original attitudinal concepts involved holding positive feelings toward a service delivery agency. This was converted to holding positive attitudes toward, for example, school. In turn, attitude toward school was finally converted to action or effort on the part of the school to promote or elicit a positive attitude toward it by the teenager. This process of converting the original alienation and attitude scales resulted in the three activism scales presented below.

School Activism (Items 1-9 in Appendix One)

A. Most of the teachers at my school really try to get to know their students.

B. In some way, most of the adults at my school really act like they care about what happens to me.

C. If I were sick for a few days most of my teachers would try to help me catch up on my work.

D. When I do well at something, most of my teachers let me know they are proud of me.

E. Most of my teachers find some way to let me know they are happy to have me in their class.
F. My school does not try very hard to see to it that I get the kind of education I need.

G. My teachers try hard to do a good job.

H. A lot of things happen at school to make me feel good about school.

I. No one at school would try to help if I had a special problem of some kind.

Family Activism (Items 20-28 in Appendix One)

A. In my home everyone really tries to make me feel a part of things.

B. Everyone in my home makes an effort to be friendly toward me most of the time.

C. People in my family don't do much to make me feel like I belong.

D. If I need some help, someone at home would go out of their way to help me.

E. I can tell for sure that my family would miss me if I weren't there.

F. My family tries hard to see that I have what I need.

G. My family would try to help a friend of mine if they needed help.

H. No one at my home would care much if I were upset about things at home.

I. My family gives me about everything I need.

Church Activism (Items 51-59 in Appendix One)

A. Most people at church try hard to be honest and trustworthy.

B. People at church are willing to listen to me and try to understand my ideas.
C. People at church are not very friendly to me.

D. If I really need something, there are people at church who would gladly loan it to me if they had it.

E. There are lots of people at church who really try to help me.

F. People at church really try to let me know they care about me.

G. No one at church would go out of their way to make me feel welcome.

H. Most people at church try hard to set a good example.

I. My friends would be welcomed at my church.

Expressed Attitude:

"Expressed attitude" is seen in terms of the teenager's attitude toward family, church, and school. As suggested above, "attitude" is held to be an expression of the relative "goodness" or "value" of an institution or social system. As the reader will recall, attitude is seen as representing a gross evaluation by a teenager of an institution. In the developing conceptual framework, attitude has been set as sequentially prior to alienation. As will be argued below, alienation is held to be a perceived relationship between the individual and the institution. It is here argued that prior to the development of feelings about the relationship between an individual and an institution there develops gross judgment about whether or not any relationship between the individual and the institution is good and desirable. Simply stated, the argument is that one must feel that he should be or wants to be part of an institution before he can experience a sense of alienation from that institution. It is a subtle but acknowledged point that the "should" or
"want to" may be both a function of the individual himself and of external coercion. For example, a teenager may not feel that he wants to be a part of church while at the same time being coerced by his parents, for example, to relate himself to church. At another level, it is argued that one can hold an attitude toward an institution without being related to that institution in a way which allows for the possibility of alienation. Contrary to this, it would be argued that one could not be related to an institution in a way that would allow for the possibility of alienation without having an attitude toward that institution. In reality, one's attitude toward an institution, for example, the family, and one's relative sense of alienation from it may develop more or less simultaneously. This comes, in part, from being born into that particular institution. School is a different case, however. Anyone familiar with the psychology of preschoolers knows well the phenomenon of "school phobia." At the level here being considered, a negative attitude toward school develops prior to any opportunity for alienation from school. Similarly, unless a child was reared from a very young age in a church, as a teenager his attitude toward church would tend to precede his becoming involved in church; thus attitude would precede the possibility of alienation. For the present purpose, then, "attitude" is operationally defined as the gross evaluation of the relative goodness or value of an institution including the desirability of being involved in that institution.

With the above understanding of "attitude" as given, the attitude scale in Appendix Three cited above was used as the initial
foundation for measuring attitude toward family, church, and school. In the discussion of institutional activism, the process of converting the original attitude scale to a measurement of attitude toward family, church, and school was discussed. It does not, therefore, need to be reiterated here. At this point, let it suffice to note that the three attitude scales below were developed from the scale in Appendix Three and constituted the measurement of expressed attitude in the study.

Attitude Toward School (Items 10-13 in Appendix One)

A. I think most kids would like my school.
B. School is very important to me.
C. I have good teachers at my school.
D. I feel good about my school.

Attitude Toward Family (Items 29-32 in Appendix One)

A. Most kids would like living with my family.
B. My home is a good place to grow up in.
C. I really like my family.
D. My family helps me a lot.

Attitude Toward Church (Items 60-63 in Appendix One)

A. Church helps me to get along better.
B. I think all teenagers should go to church.
C. I have good feelings about church.
D. Church has helped me to know God.
Perceived Alienation

From the two sections above dealing with the measurement of institutional activism and expressed attitude, the reader will already have a general awareness of the operationalization and measurement of perceived alienation. As suggested earlier, "alienation" is seen as a variable. In this sense, it varies from severe alienation to minimal or no alienation. In terms of defining alienation, then, it is important to keep in mind the variable nature of the concept. Here it—alienation—is seen as a sense of belongingness to, involvement in, and participation in an institution as well as the perceived capacity of that institution to meet one’s needs. In general, these are seen as characteristics of the perceived relationship between the individual and the institution. First, the individual has a sense of either belonging to or not belonging to the institution. The construct here relates to the extent to which the individual identifies with and sees himself as belonging to a given institution or group such as family, church, or school. Does he see himself as in the institution or as outside of the institution? Further, alienation includes the construct of involvement. Along with "belongingness" alienation includes the idea of whether or not the individual perceives himself as being part of the on-going processes of the institution. As a simplistic example, one might belong to an organization—be a member—but not be involved in the actions and operation of that organization. This is the sense in which "involvement" is here being suggested. Still further, alienation includes the con-
struct here referred to as participation. In addition to belongingness and involvement, participation adds an additional dimension to one's relatedness to a group or institution. The differentiation between involvement and participation is perhaps more one of degree than of kind. Nevertheless, it is argued that one can be involved in the ongoing processes and actions of an institution without having a sense of participation in that institution. For example, a teenager may belong to or be a member of a school, i.e., he is a student. Similarly, he may be involved in the ongoing processes and actions of the school insofar as he is influenced and affected by those actions and processes. In addition to this belongingness and involvement, he may also be a participant insofar as he actively and intentionally behaves so as to maintain or increase his involvement as well as to influence and affect the institution and its actions and operations.

In addition to belongingness, involvement, and participation, alienation is seen as including a perception of the institution's capacity to meet one's needs, whatever those needs may be perceived to be. For example, one might belong to a church, be involved in and participate in that church, while at the same time not perceiving the church as meeting one's perceived needs in reference to, for example, religion. To the extent that the institution is perceived as failing to meet one's needs, one feels alienated from that institution. Implicit here is a definition of institutions which sees them as a social mechanism for patterned need meeting. The church, for example, may meet many of one's social, emotional, and interpersonal needs but fail to meet one's religious needs. To the extent that the
church, as a social institution, involves the meeting of religious needs, then, the individual is left with unmet needs which "should" be met by that institution. In this sense, one would feel alienated from the institution. Alienation, then, is seen as a concept involving belongingness, involvement, participation, and need meeting. It—alienation—is then operationally defined as one's perception of belongingness to, involvement in, and participation in an institution as well as the perceived capacity of that institution to meet one's needs.

With the above operational understanding of perceived alienation as given, the task turns to measuring alienation from family, church, and school. As elaborated earlier, the measurement of alienation was based on the community alienation scale in Appendix Two. The process of converting the scale items in Appendix Two to a measure of alienation from family, church, and school has also been discussed. Below, then, are the three six item alienation scales used in the study.

Alienation From School (Items 14–19 in Appendix One)

A. I trust most people at my school
B. No one can agree about anything at my school
C. Many people at my school are unfriendly.
D. I often share things of mine with other kids at school.
E. Most kids at my school will get the kind of education they need.
F. Basically, the education a kid gets at my school is pretty poor.
Alienation From Family (Items 33-38 in Appendix One)

A. In my family, we all pretty well know how everyone thinks and feels.
B. I care about what happens to my family.
C. I would go out of my way to help a member of my family if they were sick.
D. I am proud when someone in my family does well at something.
E. I don't feel like I am wanted in my family.
F. I usually can not count on my family to be there when I need them.

Alienation From Church (Items 64-69 in Appendix One)

A. People at church really care about each other.
B. People at church are friendly.
C. I feel that I have never been a part of a church.
D. If they had a project at church, I would be happy to help.
E. When someone at church moves away, almost everyone misses them.
F. Church helps meet a lot of my needs.

Receptivity to Use

"Receptivity" is here seen as a teenager's openness to and willingness to orient himself to drugs, use, and users. In the theoretical development in Chapter Two, receptivity was generally seen as a function of alienation and estrangement. This alienation and estrangement was held to lead to an increased receptivity to an orientation to drugs and the youth culture. Along with a behavioral mani-
festation involving an increased inclination to use and to participate in the counterculture, the theoretical development argued that receptivity is also manifested in a more positive attitude toward drugs, use, and users. It is, then, this attitudinal dimension of receptivity which is here being considered. It is here argued that teenagers who are receptive to use will reflect that receptivity in positive attitudes toward drugs, use, and users. Therefore, receptivity is operationally defined as a teenager's expressed attitude toward drugs, use and users. In considering this operational definition, it should be kept in mind that attitude toward use and users implicitly involves a teenager's attitude toward behavior-use-associated with the counterculture, as well as with people-users-actually involved in the counterculture. The definition thus gets at attitudes toward drugs as well as toward the counterculture itself.

With the above operational definition of receptivity in mind, the task is to measure attitude toward drugs, use, and users. The twelve item scale below was taken, with some slight modification, from a longer seventy-two item scale measuring teenagers' attitudes toward drugs, use, and users. The longer scale (Crow, 1973) is presented in Appendix Four and has a split-half of 0.9. It is, therefore, operationally seen as a highly reliable measure of receptivity as defined. The twelve items included in the scale below are the "strongest" items from the original scale.
Receptivity (Items 39-50 in Appendix One)

A. Some street drugs are good.
B. Feeling lonely is a good reason for using some street drugs.
C. Marijuana is a waste of money.
D. To feel better is a good reason for using marijuana.
E. Marijuana is wonderful.
F. Feeling overwhelmed is a good reason for using some drugs.
G. Street drugs are bad.
H. To feel wanted is a good reason for using marijuana.
I. Marijuana can help a person understand things better.
J. People who use street drugs are losers.
K. Street drugs are terrible.
L. People who use marijuana are reckless.

Use:

Chapter Two goes into great detail about the sense in which "use" was used in the present research. It is thus not necessary to repeat that detailed discussion here. In general, "use" refers to the injection, ingestion, or inhalation of substances which are held by traditional society to be illegal, injurious to the health and well-being of the individual or society, and so on. For further definition, the reader is referred to the beginning of Chapter Two. In addition to these substances, it was also acknowledged that caffeine, nicotine, and alcohol are drugs not easily separated from street drugs and deleterious inhalants when considering use as a generalized
concept. For operational purposes, then, use was seen as referring to the use of: caffeine, nicotine, alcohol, marijuana, "pills" including uppers and downers, glue and other like substances the fumes of which are inhaled, LSD and other hallucinogenics, and Speed and heroin in injectible form. This list is not held to be inclusive of all possible substances meeting the criteria for drugs and use. Rather, it is held to represent a gross continuum from less deleterious to more deleterious substances. The exact ordering of the substances for continuum purposes is open to discussion. It is, however, argued that caffeine and injectible heroin and Speed respectively represent polar categories in terms of their harmful potential.

As elaborated in Chapter Two, use has traditionally been measured along two dimensions, viz. substance used and extent of use. With the list above representing the range of substances used, extent of use was measured in two ways. First, the teenager was asked to indicate how many times he had used each of the included substances during the last two years. This was held to represent his history of use. In addition, he was asked to indicate the number of times he had used each of the substances during the thirty days prior to the collection of the data. The two year measurement, then, was seen as reflecting his history of use bidimensionally in terms of type and extent. The thirty day measure was seen as a bidimensional strategy for determining the extent to which he is a current user. This allowed for the classification of users into: nonusers, past users, and present users. Further, it allowed for the additional classification of past users and present users in terms of type and extent of use. It is
here argued that this strategy represents a multidimensional measure of use.

As the reader will note when reviewing the instruments in Appendix One, the strategy for measuring use also represented a convenient way of measuring other behavioral variables. As suggested earlier, other "minor variables" were included in the study when their inclusion was convenient, their measurement was relatively easy, and where their relationship to each other and to the major variables was of interest to the researcher. Thus, the measures of "use" do not appear as consecutive items in Appendix One. The two year measure of history of use falls in items 70-88 in Appendix One. Specifically, the items measuring use are: 70, 71, 73, 76, 78, 79, 80, 82, and 84. Similarly, the items measuring present use fall within items 89-107. As the reader will note, both sets of items—history of use and present use—are presented in the same order. Therefore, the items measuring use fall in the same order for present use as discussed above for history of use. Present use starts with items 89 in Appendix One.

In concluding the discussion of the measurement of the major variables, it is noted that instruments were developed to measure each of those variables. For each of the major variables except use, Likert-type scales were used, with use being measured by a two-dimensional strategy which directly asks the teenager to report specific behavior. From this point, the discussion can turn to focus on the inclusion of, operational definition of, and measurement of the minor variables included in the research.
MINOR HYPOTHESES AND MEASUREMENT OF MINOR VARIABLES

School

As discussed earlier, several additional minor variables were considered using the criteria of ease of inclusion, simplicity of measurement, and research interest. Primarily, these additional minor variables attempted to get at further dimensions of family, church, and school in relation to teenagers. The first two such variables considered were school truancy and participation in school activities. Although the literature reviewed on drugs did not specifically deal with school truancy, it is here argued that, on the face of it, one would suspect that teenagers who hold more negative attitudes toward school and who feel more alienated from school would be more likely to truant—skip school—than would teenagers with more positive attitudes and less feelings of alienation. Using the logic developed above, then, it would also follow that the level of school activism perceived by a teenager would be positively related to both his history of and current pattern of school truancy. Following the same line of thought, truancy would then theoretically be positively related to both receptivity and use. To the extent that truancy tends to be an escapist or avoidance behavior, the theoretical development in Chapter Two could, it would seem, also focus on the probability of school truancy along with its established focus on use. Conversely, participation in school activities would—as argued in Chapter Two—appear to be contrary to feelings of alienation from school. As argued in the above section measuring alienation, participation is seen as a construct under the gen-
eral concept: alienation. To the extent that this holds, it would be theoretically concluded that students with higher perceived school activism, more positive attitudes toward school, and lower feelings of alienation from school would be more likely to participate in school activities than would students with opposite feelings and perceptions. It would then finally be concluded that participation in school activities is inversely related to school truancy. The statistical manipulation of the data involved correlating each of the minor variables with each other and with each of the major variables. These manipulations are reported in Chapter Four. For the present purpose, however, the strategy will be to hypothesize relationships between apparently related minor variables and between minor variables and one of the major variables. The major variables selected for purposes of hypothesize development will be somewhat arbitrary and based on the intention to develop a clear example. From this follow the hypotheses below.

\[ \text{MH}_1: \] School truancy is positively related to perceived alienation from school.

\[ \text{MH}_2: \] Participation in school activities is inversely related to perceived alienation from school.

\[ \text{MH}_3: \] School truancy is inversely related to participation in school activities.

School truancy was measured by asking the teenager to report the number of times he "skipped school" during the last two years and during the past thirty days. Participation in school activities was
measured in two ways. First, the teenager was asked to report the num-
ber of times he has been in "extraschool activities" during the past
two years and during the past thirty days. Second, he was asked to
report the number of times he has gone "to school plays, ball games,
etc.," during the past two years and during the past thirty days. It
is held that the frequency of participation in "extraschool activities"
gets at the participation construct of alienation, while attending
plays, ball games, etc., more gets at "involvement." Whether the dis­
tinction is accepted or not, it is clear that both strategies get at
the notion of alienation.

In addition to the above, two further factors related to school
were considered, viz. the amount of time a teenager spends "studying,"
and the number of different schools which he has attended. The first
factor—time studying—would, it seems, be related to both a student's
attitude toward school and his sense of involvement in school. It is
acknowledged that the amount of time a student spends studying may be a
function of the academic demands placed on him and of his relative abil­
ity to meet those demands. Nevertheless, it would seem that a student
who was "enthusiastic" about school in the sense of having a very posi­
tive attitude and who identified with the educational function of school
would tend to study more than a student who is not so oriented. Also,
it would seem that a student who has spent most of his school years in
one school would tend to feel more involved in and part of that school
than would a student who has attended many different schools. With this
somewhat superficial justification for inclusion of these minor varia-
bles, the hypotheses below follow.
The amount of time a student spends studying is positively related to his attitude toward school.

The number of different schools a student has attended is positively related to perceived alienation from school.

"Studying" was measured by asking the student to report the number of hours spent "studying" during the past week. "Schools attended" was measured by simply asking the student to report the number of "different schools" he had ever attended.

Church

Three minor variables were considered in reference to church-related behavior, viz. church attendance, participation in church activities, and praying. The minor variable in reference to church attendance was considered for two reasons. First, one would think that frequency of church attendance would be related to attitude toward church and to feelings of alienation from church. Basically, the suggestion is that church attendance, over time, promotes more positive attitudes toward the institution and promotes an increased sense of belongingness, involvement, participation, and so on. In essence, then, the argument is that church attendance tends to promote more positive attitudes and to operate against feelings of alienation from church. Second, in some families and in some churches, attendance is required in a coercive sense. It might be suggested that such "coercion" would psychologically tend to work against positive attitudes and operate so as to promote a sense of alienation. In either event,
the relationship between church attendance and the major variables is of interest. A similar rationale is posited for the inclusion of "participation in church activities" as a variable of interest. "Praying" is seen as a manifest indication of an orientation to God and religion. To the extent that this is true, praying should be positively associated with one's attitude toward church and negatively related to one's sense of alienation from church. This, of course, assumes that a central function of church is to promote an increased orientation to God and religion. From this discussion, it would follow that church attendance, participation in church activities, and praying are interrelated behaviors. With this in mind, the following hypotheses were tested.

MH₆: Church attendance is negatively related to perceived alienation from church.

MH₇: Participation in church activities is negatively related to perceived alienation from church.

MH₈: Frequency of praying is positively related to attitude toward church.

MH₉: Frequency of praying is positively related to church attendance.

Church attendance, participation in church activities, and praying were measured by asking the teenager to report the frequency with which he exhibited each of the specific behaviors both within the past thirty days and within the past two years.
Several minor hypotheses were considered in reference to family. In Chapter Two, it was argued that nonusers and their parents communicate more than users and their parents. This point was elaborated to suggest that parents and their nonusing children show higher levels of reciprocal insight than do parents and their using children. In addition, other portions of the theory development in Chapter Two suggested that users are less oriented to traditional models, e.g., parents, than are nonusers. The notion of alienation from home would additionally tend to suggest that nonusers turn to and communicate with their parents more than do users. With these points in mind, it is suggested that nonusers will show a higher frequency of talking to their mother or father about personal problems than will users. In addition, it is suggested that teenagers who communicate more with their parents about personal problems and who feel less alienated from home will be less likely to run away from or leave home. For the present purpose, it was convenient to differentiate between communication with mother and communication with father. This discussion, then, leads to the consideration of communication with mother about personal problems, communication with father about personal problems, and history of running away from or leaving home. From that, the following hypotheses were developed.

\( \text{MH}_{10} \): There is a negative relationship between use and the frequency of communication between a teenager and his mother about personal problems.
There is a negative relationship between frequency or running away from or leaving home and frequency of communication between a teenager and his parents about personal problems.

Frequency of communication about personal problems with mother, frequency of communication about personal problems with father, and frequency of running away from or leaving home were each measured by asking the teenager to report the frequency of such behavior during the past two years and during the past thirty days.

The next family variable considered deals with family mobility. Historically, the view of the family was in terms of settling down in one place, rearing one's children in one house, and entertaining the grandchildren in that same house. It seems not a debatable point that contemporary American society tends to be much more mobile than suggested by the historical view. It is of interest to know to what extent this mobility may relate to attitudes toward school, patterns of use, and feelings of alienation from the family. Mobility was measured simply by asking the teenager how many different places he remembers having lived. The hypothesis tested is as follows.

**MH_{13}:** Use is related to family mobility.

Size of family and birth order are intuitively suggested as possible correlates of use. This dimension of family was measured by asking the teenager to report how many brothers and sisters he has, how many older brothers and sisters he has, and how many younger brothers and sisters he has. The possible relationship between family size and birth order was tested through the hypotheses below.
MH$_{14}$: Use is related to the number of siblings which a teenager has.

MH$_{15}$: Use is related to the birth order—within his family—of a teenager.

Other

The following group of minor hypotheses were, individually, either directly considered in or suggested by the theoretical development in Chapter Two. The minor variables involved were measured by either asking the teenager to report a specific fact or to estimate the number of hours spent in a given activity during the past week. Recalling the criteria for the inclusion of minor variables, the rationale for the inclusion of each of the minor variables involved in the hypotheses below will probably be apparent to the reader. If not, he is referred to the discussions in Chapter Two.

MH$_{16}$: Age is positively related to use.

MH$_{17}$: Males are more likely to use than females.

MH$_{18}$: The amount of time a teenager spends watching television is related to use.

MH$_{19}$: The amount of time a teenager spends talking with adults other than his parents is negatively related to use.

MH$_{20}$: The amount of time a teenager spends listening to records and music is positively related to use.

MH$_{21}$: The amount of time a teenager spends "out with his friends" is positively related to use.
MH22: The amount of time a teenager spends working (other than related to school) is negatively related to use.

MH23: The amount of time a teenager spends working on hobbies is related to use.

MH24: The amount of time a teenager spends "doing drugs" is positively related to use.

MH25: The amount of time a teenager spends "trying to think up something to do" is positively related to use.

(Note) The final two minor hypotheses were included as a function of research interest. One hears a lot of talk about the amount of time a teenager spends on the telephone. Just for fun, this activity was measured and correlated with the other variables in the study. In addition, there is a special interest in teenage suicide and suicide attempts. The notions of alienation and estrangement discussed in this and the second chapter play directly into this interest. It could be inferred from the theoretical development in Chapter Two that users have a greater history of suicide attempts than nonusers. In addition, it is of special interest to look at the relationship between suicide attempts and the major family variables.

MH26: There is a relationship between use and the amount of time a teenager spends talking on the telephone.

MH27: There is a positive relationship between perceived alienation from the family and a teenager's history of suicide attempts.
CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS

Sampling; Data Analysis; and Findings

THE SAMPLE

In order to test the hypotheses developed in Chapter Three, and thus to evaluate the predictive power of the theory of use developed in Chapter Two, the sample or data base had to meet several requirements. First, it will be recalled that the "theory of use" focuses on teenage use. It was, therefore, necessary to develop or find a fairly large teenage population which is, as nearly as possible, free from biasing and/or contaminating factors. Such possible biasing factors as unusual socio-economic concentration in one or more segments of the socio-economic continuum, particularly high concentration of specific religious affiliation, disproportionate numbers of males or females, unusually high percentage representation of specific ethnic or racial groups, as well as other abnormally high or low concentrations of specific demographic factors were, as nearly as possible, to be avoided.

(Note) The reader's attention is directed to Appendix Five--"In Retrospect"--to complete his consideration of this report.
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Similarly, possible contaminating factors such as the occurrence of some recent disaster or catastrophe affecting the population, the disruptive effect of recent and significantly atypical social and political events, as well as other like factors which might substantially affect the social, economic, and family structure of the population were, as nearly as possible, to be avoided. It was important that the population selected be accessible for research purposes, and that this accessibility allow for the possibility of "group administration" of the research instrument. Group administration was held as a criterion since it would allow for greater anonymity of the respondents than would individual administration, and since individual administration was impractical given the limited resources available to the researcher. Finally, adequately testing the hypotheses and evaluating the theory combined with the necessity for group administration to a teenage population led to the conclusion that a public school system would be ideally suited to and consistent with the overall sample requirements.

The criteria of minimal demographic bias and freedom from contamination as defined above were held central when selecting the particular school system used in the study.

In describing the characteristics of the school system selected, specific facts are presented as approximations so as to minimize the possibility of immediate recognition of the specific school system used. The geographic area served by the school system covers approximately ninety square miles in western Ohio. The school district was formed several years ago through the consolidation of
smaller, contiguous school districts. Within the present school district, the average family income is approximately $10,000 per year, the average educational level of the adult population of the district is about twelve years, and the median age within the district is approximately thirty years. The non-white population of the area represents about two percent of the total; and there are no particular concentrations of specific nationality or religious groups. There are several small towns in the area with the largest having a population of approximately 1,200. For the most part, the remainder of the land area is devoted to production agriculture. Even with this, the population is fairly stable over time reflecting no unusual patterns of in or out migration. Within the area, there are several small businesses in addition to the numerous farming operations. However, there is no large industry; and a high percentage of the working population is involved in industrial employment in surrounding, more urbanized areas.

The school system has approximately 2,400 students enrolled in kindergarten through the twelfth grade. As a result of the consolidation, the school buildings are scattered throughout the district. There are several elementary school buildings. The junior high students (seventh and eighth grades) attend school in an older building located in one of the small towns. The relatively new consolidated high school (ninth through twelfth grades) is located in an open, rural area a few miles from the junior high school. The combined enrollment of the junior high and high school is approximately 1,100 students. It was this combined group from which the sample was drawn.
Since the junior high and high school students attend different buildings, their school records are contained in separate files. This fact made it necessary to draw the junior high school and high school samples separately. At each building, the student "schedule cards" were placed in a stack with the required number of cards being randomly drawn from the stack. At this point in the sampling process, the names of sixty students from the junior high school and 120 students from the high school were randomly selected. The students' names were then typed on lists and distributed to classroom teachers on the day that the data was collected. At the appointed time, then, the students on the list were told that they had been selected to participate in a research project and were asked to report to the room where the research instrument was administered. Due to normal absenteeism as a result of illness and other sundry causes, 37 of the original 180 students were not present at the time the data were collected. This resulted in a total sample of 143 students actually completing the research instrument. A second administration date was not set for the remaining 37 students due to the possible contaminating effect of pretest interaction with the 143 students who had already completed the instrument. The actual data collection was conducted personally by this researcher and an assistant with no school personnel present at the time of administration. The final sample, then, consisted of an approximately twelve percent (n=143) random sample of the teenage population of the school system.
Before the data could be analyzed, it was necessary to quantitatively operationalize the use variable. As discussed in Chapter Three, the research instrument obtained two kinds of data relative to use. First, data was obtained in terms of the "type" of use involving a range from the ingestion of coffee to the injection of Speed or heroin. Second, the research instrument obtained data relative to the "frequency" of use involving a range from no use to using 51 or more times during a given time period. The need was, then, to integrate type and frequency of use into one continuous variable. This would yield a quantitative index of use which takes into account both the type and frequency of use. As will be seen later, such a quantitative index is crucial to the correlation analysis utilized in testing the study's hypotheses.

A "panel of experts" approach was used in developing the use index. Somewhat surprisingly, the drug literature search yielded no single index which takes into account both the type and the frequency of use. In the absence of such an available instrument, it was necessary to ask the panel of experts to participate in this first effort at developing this kind of use measure. Even though it is held that the index of use developed here is quite adequate for the present purpose, it is emphasized that future research into drug use must carefully attend to the difficult task of increased refinement of the index presented including attention to further assurances of validity, reliability, and overall utility. These comments do not suggest that
the present index suffers from problems of utility, reliability, and validity in the present context, but rather that its present primitive form and its value in future drug research both warrant careful attention.

The panel of experts was composed of: a psychiatrist and a general practice physician, three psychologists involved in work with teenagers, two rehabilitation counselors, two young adults with a history of drug use, two social workers involved with work with teenagers, one professional public school educator, and two nonprofessional workers from a mental health center dealing with teenage drug use. Each of the fourteen panel members was asked to respond individually to the index problem without consultation with each other. They were each asked to list the nine types of use with the nine types being presented, not always in the same order, verbally to the panel members. Each panel member was then asked to assign a value of "one" to one of the nine types of use. He assigned that value of "one" to that type of use which he perceived the least negatively or held the least negative attitude toward. With one exception, all of the panel members assigned a value of one to "drinking coffee." (The other eight use types are included in Figure Two.) Having established a value of "one" for that type of use perceived the least negatively or toward which the least negative attitude was held, the panel member was then asked to assign a relative value to each of the other eight use types, using the criteria of negative perception or negative attitude.
## FIGURE TWO

**USE INDEX, INCLUDING LOADINGS FOR TYPE AND AMOUNT OF USE FOR EITHER TWO YEAR OR THIRTY DAY HISTORY OF USE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Use</th>
<th>Extent or amount of use: Number of times either in the past two years or in the past thirty days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>0 1 2-5 6-10 11-25 26-50 51 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer or wine</td>
<td>0 4 8 12 16 20 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarettes</td>
<td>0 5 10 15 20 25 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard liquor</td>
<td>0 9 18 27 36 45 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>0 10 20 30 40 50 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popping pills</td>
<td>0 15 30 45 60 75 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sniffing glue</td>
<td>0 15 30 45 60 75 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acid: LSD, etc.</td>
<td>0 20 40 60 80 100 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting up Speed</td>
<td>0 25 50 75 100 125 150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use index from nonuse to maximum combined use for one respondent: \( \xi = 0 \rightarrow \xi = 624 \)
He was told that he could use whatever range of values he felt to be necessary and told that he may or may not want to assign the same value to two or more types of use. Finally, it was emphasized that he was not being asked to rank the types of use from one to nine, but rather was being asked to assign relative values to the other eight types of use given the value of "one" initially assigned to one of the use types. After the panel member had completed the task of assigning values to the nine use types, he was asked to verbally report to the researcher the frequency or quantity of use which he had in mind while assigning each of the values. Although the quantity of use varied from panel member to panel member, the quantity of use used by each panel member did not vary from one type of use to another, i.e., if a panel member was thinking in terms of minimal use while assigning a value to one type of use, he was also thinking in terms of minimal use while assigning values to the other types of use; and similarly, if he were thinking in terms of a high frequency of use while assigning a value to one type of use, he was also thinking in terms of a high frequency of use while assigning values to the other use types. The point is that even though the frequency of use used varied among panel members, the frequency was consistent for each panel member over all nine types of use. Having established this consistency, the panel member was asked if the relative values assigned to each type of use would change were he to consistently apply a different frequency of use, i.e., if he were using "minimal use" as his criteria, would his relative assigned values change were he to shift his perspective to a high frequency of use? Without exception, the response of the panel was that,
so long as the frequency of use used was consistent, changes in the
frequency would not affect the relative values assigned to the nine
types of use. This led to the conclusion that the proportional dis-
tance between coffee (the lowest valued type) and Speed and heroin
(the highest valued type) would remain constant between a use rate of
one time and a use rate of 51 times or more.

The next step in developing the index was to determine the
"average value" assigned to each type of use by the panel of experts.
Since no maximum value was set, the panel members varied a lot among
themselves in terms of the highest value assigned to one of the use
types. One panel member used a range from one to 100 while another
panel member used a range from one to twelve. The majority of the
panel members used a range from one to about 25. When the responses
of all 14 panel members are charted for each use type, the distribution
is quite skewed. Due to this characteristic of the distribution, the
median was judged to be the best single measure of central tendency for
each use type. Taking the median value for each use type, then, yield-
ed a range from one to 25, with "popping pills—uppers and downers"
and "sniffing glue and stuff like that" both receiving a value of 15.

The next step in developing the index involved generating the
average value for each use type over the range of use frequencies
measured. This was accomplished by assigning a value of "zero" to the
"never tried it" frequency for each use type. The average value of
one through 25 was then assigned to "I've tried it one time" for each
use type. Excluding the "I've never tried it" frequency, there are
six possible response categories for each type of use; I've tried it
once, I’ve tried it two to five times, six to ten times, eleven to twenty-five times, twenty-six to fifty times, and fifty-one or more times. Using “drinking coffee” as an example, then, a value of one was assigned to “I’ve tried it one time.” A value of two was then assigned to “I’ve tried it two to five times” with a value of three being assigned to six to ten times, a value of four being assigned to eleven to twenty-five times, a value of five being assigned to twenty-six to fifty times, and a value of six being assigned to fifty-one or more times. Each of the other eight use types was similarly generated across the frequency range by assigning the "average value" given by the panel of experts to a frequency of “I’ve tried it one time,” twice that value being assigned to “I’ve tried it two to five times,” three times the value to six to ten times, four times the value to eleven to twenty-five times, five times the value to twenty-six to fifty times, and six times the value to fifty-one or more times. The result is that "drinking coffee" has a range from one to six while shooting up Speed or heroin has a range from twenty-five to one hundred fifty, excluding the "I've never tried it" frequency. The actual values assigned to a given type and frequency of use are included in Figure Two. The careful reader will note the fact that the process of generating the "average values" across the frequency range includes an arbitrary component. This is reflected in the fact that the mathematical expansion of the original value over the six frequency categories imposes a "value" range in the sense of better to worse on the index. During the time period of the present research, careful thought failed to yield a more satisfactory procedure. Perhaps future research will reflect sharpened
insight into this problem. Also, the frequency categories are the same in terms of "number of times used" for each type of use. Frequent use (fifty-one times or more) is, then, measured in terms of the number of times used for each type of use. The difficulty here involves the possibility that using one type of drug fifty-one or more times may, in a valuing sense, represent heavy use, while using another type of drug fifty-one or more times during an equivalent time period may represent something less than heavy use. This property of the index, then, should also be given careful thought in future application of the index to research problems. Even with these difficulties in mind, however, it is reiterated that the index, in its present form, is quite adequate in the context of this research.

Given the type-frequency values shown in Figure Two, the use index represents a continuous variable with a range from zero to 624 as shown at the bottom of Figure Two. As discussed in Chapter Three, use was measured both in terms of the individual types of use and in terms of the use index. An individual respondent's position on the use index was computed by assigning a use score for each of the nine types of use using the values shown in Figure Two. For each respondent, then, his score or value received for "drinking coffee" was added to his score for "drinking beer or wine," which was in turn added to his score for "smoking cigarettes," and so on. For example, if an individual respondent had never used any of the nine types of drugs, his index score would be zero. Had he used each type of drug fifty-one or more times, his index score would be 624. Assuming that he had used some of the drugs but not others and some drugs with a greater frequency than
others, his index score would fall some place between zero and 624. Using this procedure, then, an index score was computed for each respondent both in terms of the thirty day and the two year history of use. The reader may want to note the fact that an individual respondent's thirty day index score should never be higher than his two year index score. Similarly, his score in reference to any given type of drug should never be higher for the thirty day period than it is for the two year period. The raw data was carefully examined for deviation from this necessary pattern. No gross variation from the expected pattern was noted and only slight and very occasional minimal variation from the pattern was found. This characteristic of the raw data lends strong support to the reliability of the type-frequency reports of the respondents.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF LIKERT-TYPE SCALES
AND SCALE ITEMS

As developed in Chapter Three, the first 69 items in the research instrument compose ten Likert-type scales measuring: school, family, and church activism; attitudes toward school, family, and church; perceived alienation from school, family, and church; and receptivity to use. Tables 1 through 13 present the statistical data related to the internal reliability of each scale, the analysis of the effectiveness of each item within the scales, as well as the data from which some of the observations discussed below were derived. When considering Tables 1 through 13 it should be kept in mind that "r split" is the coefficient resulting from a technique which essentially correlates the odd numbered items in the scale against the even numbered items;
"r corr" is the corrected $r$ coefficient which would result had the items not been split. The "high mean" for each item and the "low mean" for each item were computed by splitting the responses to that item at the median and then computing the mean for the top and bottom groups of responses, respectively. The total mean and standard deviation, of course, refer to those statistics in reference to all of the responses to a given item. The scale value difference ratio (SVDR) is a measure of a given item's fit with the other items in the given scale. The critical ratio (CR) is a measure of an item's "loading" with the other items in the given scale. Higher values for SVDR and CR represent greater statistical significance, while lower values represent lesser statistical significance. A cutoff of 0.5 and 5.0, respectively, are usually used as the criteria for an item's appropriateness and utility in a given scale. Even though, as the reader will note, not all items reported in Tables 1 through 13 meet these minimal criteria, all items were retained for purposes of the present research. The rationale for retaining these items is twofold: first, even those items which fail to meet the minimum criteria, do so only by a very small margin; and second, the relative homogeneity of the respondents in reference to the variables studied tended to somewhat negatively influence the statistical procedures. This relative homogeneity will be discussed in various sections below. Also, it is noted that the preponderance of items in every scale do meet all of the stated criteria; thus, each scale, as a whole, can stand as an adequate measure of the variable in question without revision. With these points in mind and with the data in Tables 1 through 13 as supporting documentation, it is thus concluded.
that each of the ten scales mentioned above as well as the additional three scales developed below represent highly reliable measures of the variables in question. The scale value difference (SVD) has been included for each item presented in Tables 1 through 13. This statistic gets at the "difference between means" in respect to the high and low mean for each item. It then represents on items power to differentiate between people holding positive and people holding negative attitudes in reference to the concept being measured.

**TABLE 1**

**SCHOOL ACTIVISM**

**SCALE AND ITEM ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Low Mean</th>
<th>High Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total SD</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SVDR</th>
<th>SVD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r split = .6340  
r corr. = .7760
For purposes of interpreting Tables 1 through 13, it is noted that the Likert-type items were loaded one through five, with one representing a strongly positive attitude and five representing a strongly negative attitude. As a convenient frame of reference when reviewing the data, a mean of from one to 1.5 may be thought of as extremely positive, very high, etc. 1.5 to 2.5 may be thought of as positive, high, etc. 2.5 to 3.5 may be thought of as neutral or indecisive. 3.5 to 4.5 may be thought of as negative or low. 4.5 to 5.0 may be thought of as extremely negative or very low. With this frame of reference in mind, it is clear that the student group is quite homogeneous in the direction of high school activism. If one recalls that the high and low means are computed based on the median response, it is clear that at least half of the students in the school system evaluate school activism in the high to very high range. Even the students evaluating school activism less positively strongly tend to see school activism in their school system in the neutral to positive range. These findings very strongly support the conclusion that the students as a group see the adults at their school actively making an effort to increase the student's sense of belonging, involvement, and participation in the school system; actively reaching out to meet the needs of the students; making an effort to elicit a positive attitude toward school from the students; and generally working toward minimizing a sense of alienation on the part of the students. The fact that all of the total means fall on the positive side of complete neutrality (3.0) and the relatively low total standard deviation lend further support to these observations and the general conclusion that the student group is
relatively homogenous in the direction of high school activism.

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Low Mean</th>
<th>High Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total SD</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SVDR</th>
<th>SVD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r split = .6780  
r corr. = .8081

An examination of the CR and SVDR columns in Table 2 clearly shows that the four items measuring attitude toward school represent a strong scale. As is the case for school activism, the students generally hold a positive attitude toward school. All of the high means are in the strong to very strong range with all of the low means falling below the 3.0 mid-point. Also, it is noted that the relatively low total standard deviations reflect a high degree of homogeneity among the student population. Another way of thinking about these findings would be in terms of a graph or chart which developed a visual image of the phenomena. If one were to graph the distribution of responses placing attitude across the bottom and frequency on the vertical axis, and if very positive were on the left and very negative were on the right, the graph would be significantly skewed to the left or in the positive direction. The conclusion is clear that the students within the school
system studied have a strong tendency toward a positive to very positive attitude toward school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Low Mean</th>
<th>High Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total SD</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SVDR</th>
<th>SVD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r split = .3971  
r corr. = .5685

Were one to consider the data in Table 3 in isolation from the other data and the theoretical development of the scales used in this research, the conclusion might follow that the school alienation scale is inadequate to the task at hand. However, it should be kept in mind that the school, family, and church alienation scales were converted from the original community alienation scale in precisely the same manner. As will be seen later, the data in reference to the family and church alienation scales is quite strong. This leads strongly to the suspicion that the relatively low split half found for the school alienation scale is more indicative of factors more profound than a simple
inadequacy in the scale itself. First, it is noted that the student population tends not to feel alienated from school. If one compares the difference between the high means and low means, it is also noted that for some of the items, the difference between those two means is fairly low. Recalling that the split half is a technique which essentially correlates the odd items with the even items, it can be seen that very slight variations in responses to the odd and/or even items would tend to lower the r split. Similarly, the relatively low total standard deviations support the impression that the student group is quite homogeneous in the direction of low school alienation. Relatively high homogeneity, relatively low school alienation, and some increased variation in responses between items are probably combining to lower the r split. On the other hand, if one examines the CR and SVDR columns and keeps in mind the significance of that data, it is clear that the overall scale is actually operating quite nicely. Second, if one considers the operation of alienation in reference to family and church (Tables 7 and 12), a more important point is suggested. Alienation involves a sense of belongingness, involvement, participation, and the perception that the institution adequately meets one's needs. Since these factors operate quite clearly for family and church and have been seen as operating in a similar manner for community, one is led to consider the possibility that "school" as an institution operates or has a function for the individual somewhat different than the other institutions. It, perhaps, operates more as a resource than as a source of identification, belonging, and so on. The idea is that family, church, and community represent an extension of or an integral part of the
"whole person." From this perspective, school would then be seen as representing a service institution from which the individual obtains or extracts certain knowledge, information, and other tools and increased capacities which he takes back to the family, church, and community. Putting the same idea in different terms, he lives in and belongs to the family, church, and community but does not see himself as holding the same relationship in reference to school. If future thought and research support this impression, the implications for the role of the public school system are quite profound. Increasingly, public schools are assuming more and more responsibility for the socialization and acculturation of young people. This expansion of the school's role has as an implicit assumption the notion that "school" as a social institution operates and should operate in concert with the family, the church, and the community in reference to the whole person. The findings here, at least from the point of view of the students, suggest that the school's function for the student, may be much more narrow and limited than one might have suspected. Of course, the school alienation data does not itself press such a conclusion; but rather, the comments are stimulated speculatively in response to the operation of the school alienation scale relative to the operation of the other scales considered. In the same vein, the schools social and cultural impact relative to that of the family, the church and the community may actually be much less than one might have supposed. These impressions and speculations should, of course, only be the weight of possibility. Nevertheless, such possibilities demand serious thought and attention.
### TABLE 4

**INSTITUTIONAL RAPPORT WITH SCHOOL: SCALE AND ITEM ANALYSIS**

(School activism, school attitude, and school alienation scales are here combined—items appear in the same consecutive order as presented in 1, 2, and 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SVDR</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SVDR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_{split} = 0.7932 \quad r_{corr.} = 0.8847 \]

The nineteen item scale presented in Table 4 appears as items one through nineteen on the research instrument. The theoretical development in Chapters Two and Three argued that school activism, school alienation, and attitude toward school are positively interrelated. A restatement of that argument posits that, for an individual teenager, orientation to school is a complex phenomenon involving a cluster of subphenomena. These subphenomena are, in turn, positively interrelated with each other. In Tables 1 through 3, the scales dealing with these
subphenomena are presented. As is seen in those tables and in the related discussion, school activism, attitude toward school, and perceived alienation from school all operate as part of a teenager's orientation to school. The positive interrelation of these factors with each other, as theoretically developed, is empirically supported by the fact that the individual scales for activism, alienation, and attitude can be combined and demonstrated to operate as one single measure. The results of this combination are reported in Table 4. The result is a new and more complex variable—which is here being called "institutional rapport with school." The idea of "rapport" suggests a sympathetic and mutually responsive relationship which involves the interaction of the teenager with the given institution. The "rapport" is, then, between the teenager and the institution. If institutional rapport is thought of as a concept, then it can be seen as involving the constructs of activism, attitude, and perceived alienation. High rapport involves high activism, a positive attitude, and low alienation. Low rapport involves low activism on the part of the institution, a more negative attitude on the part of the teenager, and an increased sense of alienation of the teenager from the institution. In reference to school, and from the teenager's point of view, the notion is supported that the institution is not static but rather participates in the relationship with the teenager; it is an interacting, two-way street. As can be seen from the data in Table 4, the students tend to express high institutional rapport with the school. Since this research was focused on the students, data was not collected from the teachers and other adults.
at the school. In order for full verification of the operation of institutional rapport, however, empirical verification would have to demonstrate that the adults in the school studied would reflect a positive attitude toward their students, would see their students as actively pursuing involvement, participation, and so on with the faculty, and would generally express a positive attitude toward the school and a low sense of alienation from the school. The idea is that the data supports the conclusion that the students experience high institutional rapport with the school.

### TABLE 5

**FAMILY ACTIVISM: SCALE AND ITEM ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Low Mean</th>
<th>High Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total SD</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SVDR</th>
<th>SVD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r split = .8280  
r corr. = .9059
As can be seen from the data in Table 5, the family activism scale represents a very strong measure of the variable. The students, as a whole, strongly tend to view their families as reflecting high to very high activism. It is noted that all of the means fall below the 3.0 point suggesting a very strong tendency toward activism within the families of the students. To elaborate, the students in general see their families as actively encouraging a positive attitude toward the family on the part of the students, making an observable effort to provide the students with a sense of family belonging, involvement, and participation, making an effort to meet the needs of the students, and generally working toward a positive attitude and low alienation on the part of the students in reference to their families.

**TABLE 6**

ATTITUDE TOWARD FAMILY: SCALE AND ITEM ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Low Mean</th>
<th>High Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total SD</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SVDR</th>
<th>SVD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r split = .7448  
r corr. = .8537

As can be seen from the data in Table 6, the students tend to have a very positive attitude toward their families. An examination of the low means reveals the fact that the most positive half of the
group have a very strong tendency toward a positive to very positive attitude toward their families. Even the less positive half of the group strongly tends to fall within the positive attitudinal range. From the data, it is also clear that the student group tends to be highly homogeneous in the direction of positive attitudes toward their families.

**TABLE 7**

**PERCEIVED ALIENATION FROM FAMILY: SCALE AND ITEM ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Low Mean</th>
<th>High Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total SD</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SVDR</th>
<th>SVD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r \text{ split} = .5940 \quad r \text{ corr.} = .7453 \]

The data in Table 7 strongly supports the observation that the students, as a group, have a strong tendency not to feel alienated from home. An examination of the high and low means shows that the group tends to experience low to very low perceived alienation from home. This points out the tendency of the group to experience a sense of belongingness, involvement, and participation within their families along with feeling that their families do meet their needs. Inspection of
the CR and SVDR columns in Table 7 further suggests that the six items constituting the Family Alienation Scale represent a highly reliable measure of the phenomenon.

**TABLE 8**

**INSTITUTIONAL RAPPORT WITH FAMILY: SCALE AND ITEM ANALYSIS**

(A combination of family activism, family attitude, and family alienation scales--items presented consecutively as in Tables 5, 6, and 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SVDR</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SVDR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_{split} = .8982 \quad \quad r_{corr.} = .9464 \]

Items one through nineteen in Table 8 appear as items 20 through 38 in the research instrument. This scale measuring institutional rapport with family represents a combination of the activism, alienation, and attitude scales in reference to family. As was the
case for the school variables, the activism, alienation, and attitude variables for the family represent constructs under an incorporating variable which is here being called institutional rapport with family. As can be noted from an examination of Table 8, the 19 item scale measuring institutional rapport represents a very strong and highly reliable measure of the phenomenon. Conceptually, institutional rapport would involve the constructs of a gross positive attitude or perception on the part of the individual in reference to the family as well as a sense of belongingness, involvement, participation, and the feeling that the family does meet the individual's needs. In addition to these constructs, institutional rapport with the family would involve a perception that the family, itself, actively makes an effort to maximize the positiveness of the individual's attitude toward it as well as actively working toward minimizing the individual's sense of alienation from the family. Again, the earlier theoretical development is supported to the extent that it argued that activism, attitude, and alienation are positively interrelated and interacting variables. As was the case for school, the notion is partially empirically supported that institutional rapport with family involves a dynamic, interacting process between the individual and the family. The argument would suggest that if the individual holds a negative attitude toward his family, perceives family activism low, and feels alienated from the family, that family would, in turn, hold similar attitudes toward and perceptions of the individual. If future thought and research continues to support this conceptual position, increased emphasis can be placed on the significance of the family for the individual
as well as a somewhat new and increased focus on the responsibility of the individual in reference to the level of rapport which he experiences with the family. Nonetheless, it may be concluded that the students within the school system studied generally tend to experience high to very high institutional rapport with their families.

**TABLE 9**

**RECEPTIVITY: SCALE AND ITEM ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Low Mean</th>
<th>High Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total SD</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SVDR</th>
<th>SVD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r split = .8094  
r corr. = .8947
The 12 item scale, the data for which appears in Table 9, appears as items 39 through 50 in the research instrument. This scale measures "receptivity" which is operationally defined in Chapter Three as in individual's attitudes toward drugs, drug use, and drug users. As can be seen from an examination of the data in Table 9, the students in the school system studied strongly tend to express low to very low receptivity. If one examines the high means and keeps in mind that the higher the mean, the more negative the attitude, it can be seen that some of the items resulted in an almost totally negative attitude on the part of the most negative half of the student group. It is similarly clear that the group, as a whole, shows a high degree of homogeneity in a negative direction in reference to drugs, drug users, and drug use. This point is further supported by the fact that all of the means are higher than the 3.0 mid-point. The unusually high CR and SVDR data in Table 9 as well as the high split half for the scale as a whole support the contention that the scale represents a highly reliable instrument for the measurement of receptivity. Given this reliability and the relatively high means, it is concluded that the student body, as a whole, shows a strong tendency toward low to very low receptivity and thus toward a negative to very negative attitude toward drugs and drug use.

When looking at the students as a group it can be seen that the data as presented to this point shows strong support for the earlier theoretical development. If one thinks in terms of institutional rapport as developed above, it can be seen that the theory of use argues that high institutional rapport is inversely related to receptivity.
As can be seen from the data to this point, the students in the school system studied reflect high institutional rapport with the school and with the family. As predicted, this high institutional rapport is concurrently operating with low to very low receptivity. This summary finding is, of course, consistent with the theory of use and strongly tends to support the theory when the students are viewed as a group. The discussion next turns to the scales in reference to church activism, attitude toward church, and perceived alienation from church. As was the case for school and family, the church variables will be seen as positively interacting so as to allow for the introduction of institutional rapport with the church. As the reader examines that data, it should be kept in mind that the theory of use predicts high institutional rapport with the church given the findings already presented in reference to high institutional rapport with the school and family. The only caution here in examining the data in reference to its support for the theory of use is to emphasize the fact that the scale data represents "group data." The theory of use argues that high institutional rapport is inversely related to receptivity for the individual. Later sections of this chapter deal with the operation of the theory in reference to the individual. Its operation for the students as a group has only become clear as a result of the examination of the actual data.
As was anticipated above, the students in the school system studied strongly tend to evaluate church activism high. As was the case for family activism and school activism, the student group shows a strong tendency toward homogeneity in reference to church activism. It is noted that all of the low and total means are clearly below the 3.0 mid-point while most of the high means are also below that point. An examination of the CR and SVDR columns as well as of the split half for the scale as a whole clearly shows that the instrument is a highly reliable measure of church activism. From this, it may be concluded that the students, as a group, show a strong tendency to perceive the

**TABLE 10**

**CHURCH ACTIVISM: SCALE AND ITEM ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Low Mean</th>
<th>High Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total SD</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SVDR</th>
<th>SYD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r split = .8193  
r corr. = .9007
church as actively encouraging a positive attitude toward it on their part, as making an active effort to involve the young people and to give them a sense of belongingness and participation, and as an effective institution in reference to their needs.

**TABLE 11**

**ATTITUDE TOWARD CHURCH: SCALE AND ITEM ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Low Mean</th>
<th>High Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total SD</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SVDR</th>
<th>SVD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r \text{ split} = .86 \]
\[ r \text{ corr.} = .9294 \]

The data in Table 11 clearly supports the conclusion that the students, as a group, tend to hold positive attitudes toward church. An examination of the CR and SVDR data in Table 11 as well as of the split half for the scale as a whole very clearly shows that the scale represents a highly reliable instrument for measuring attitude toward church. An inspection of the high and low means suggests that the group, in reference to their attitude toward church, shows somewhat less homogeneity than was seen in reference to attitudes toward family and school. Nevertheless, all of the low means and total means are below the 3.0 mid-point. Those high means which are above the 3.0 mid-point are still well within the neutral or undecided range. In general,
the data in Table 11 clearly supports the conclusion that the students, as a group, have a positive attitude toward church.

**TABLE 12**

**PERCEIVED ALIENATION FROM CHURCH: SCALE AND ITEM ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Low Mean</th>
<th>High Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total SD</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SVDR</th>
<th>SVD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_{split} = .7731 \]
\[ r_{corr.} = .8720 \]

The data in Table 12 supports the conclusion that the students, as a group, tend to experience relatively low feelings of alienation from church. On the whole, they tend to experience a sense of belongingness, involvement, and participation in reference to church as well as perceiving the church as meeting their needs. Again, low alienation is not quite as strong as that seen for family and school. Nevertheless, an examination of the means reveals that none of them falls above the 3.5 boundary between neutral and higher feelings of alienation. The group presents somewhat less homogeneity than they did in reference to perceived alienation from school and family but reflects
a strong tendency away from alienation and toward feelings of belongingness, involvement, and participation in reference to church.

TABLE 13

INSTITUTIONAL RAPPORT WITH CHURCH: SCALE AND ITEM ANALYSIS

(Combination of church activism, church attitude, and church alienation scales—items appear consecutively as presented in Tables 10, 11, and 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SVDR</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SVDR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r split = .9212  
r corr. = .9590

The data in Table 13 is for the 19 items comprising the institutional rapport with church scale. The original 19 items appear as items 51 through 69 in the research instrument. As was the case for institutional rapport with school and family, institutional rapport with church represents a combining of the scales measuring attitude
toward church, church activism, and perceived alienation from church. An examination of the CR and SVDR data for the scale as well as the split half reveals that the 19 item scale is a highly reliable measure of institutional rapport with church. The students, as a group, reflect high rapport with church although it is a somewhat less homogeneous phenomenon than observed for family and school. It can be concluded from these findings that the students tend to perceive positively or hold a positive attitude toward church, see themselves as experiencing belongingness, involvement, and participation in church, as well as seeing the church as meeting their needs. In addition, they perceive the church and the people at church as actively making an effort to elicit a positive attitude on their part as well as actively trying to encourage the teenagers' sense of belongingness, involvement, and participation. Further, the teenagers see the people at church as actively trying to meet their needs. In general, it may be concluded that the students, as a whole, tend to experience relatively high institutional rapport with the church.

In view of the findings reported in this section, it may be concluded that, when the data is considered on a group basis, the findings clearly support the theory of use developed in Chapter Two. The theory would suggest that high institutional rapport with family, church, and school would be associated with relatively low receptivity. This is, in fact, the pattern which is seen as a result of the scale and item analyses above. Within the school system studied, the students tend to experience high institutional rapport with school, with family, and with church. Concurrently, they do, as a group, express low to very
low receptivity to drugs and drug use. The conclusion is, then, clear that the findings provide substantial support for the descriptive and predictive power of the theory of use.

Correlation Analysis of Variables

Evaluation of Hypotheses: Analysis of the Theory of Use

The first thirty-one hypotheses developed in Chapter Four represent the relationships posited in the theoretical model of use. In this section, the statistical analyses of those hypotheses as well as a more general consideration of the theory of use are presented. The first step in this presentation is to simply enumerate the hypotheses, report whether the data supports or fails to support the hypotheses, note the Pearson coefficient $r$ for each relationship, and report the level at which the $r$ value found is significant.

As the reader considers the $r$ values presented below, it will be necessary to keep in mind the procedures used when loading the variables for coding purposes. The possible difficulty involves the fact that a negative coefficient occasionally denotes a positive relationship, while a positive coefficient occasionally denotes a negative relationship. Below are the directional loading procedures used for the variables. It will be extremely important to keep them in mind when considering the following material.

A: All "activism" variables were loaded so that "the lower the score on the scale, the higher the perceived activism."

B: All "attitude" scales were loaded so that, "the lower the score on the scale, the more positive the attitude."
C: All "alienation" scales were loaded so that, "the higher the score on the scale, the greater the degree of perceived alienation."

D: "Receptivity" was loaded so that, "the higher the score on the scale, the lower the receptivity."

E: Both the two year and thirty day index of use are such that "the higher the score, the greater the degree of use."

(All probabilities presented for "r" values represent a one tailed test of significance for zero order correlations. The figures were taken from a probability table using the probabilities for an "n" of 120--actual "n" for the data: "n" = 143)

Family

1. Family activism is negatively related to use.

   Two year measure of use
   \[ r = .21 \]
   significant at .01

   Thirty day measure of use
   \[ r = .17 \]
   significant at .025

   The hypothesis is accepted.

2. Family activism is negatively related to receptivity.

   \[ r = -.22 \]
   significant at .01

   The hypothesis is accepted.

3. Family activism is negatively related to perceived alienation from family.

   \[ r = .69 \]
   significant at .001

   The hypothesis is accepted.
4. Family activism is positively related to attitude toward family.
   \[ r = .73 \]
   significant at .001
   The hypothesis is accepted.

5. Attitude toward family is negatively related to use.
   Two year measure of use
   \[ r = .26 \]
   significant at .005
   Thirty day measure of use
   \[ r = .21 \]
   significant at .01
   The hypothesis is accepted.

6. Attitude toward family is negatively related to receptivity.
   \[ r = -.22 \]
   significant at .01
   The hypothesis is accepted.

7. Attitude toward family is negatively related to perceived alienation from family.
   \[ r = .61 \]
   significant at .001
   The hypothesis is accepted.

8. Perceived alienation from family is positively related to use.
   Two year measure of use
   \[ r = .32 \]
   significant at .001
   Thirty day measure of use
   \[ r = .32 \]
   significant at .001
   The hypothesis is accepted.

9. Perceived alienation from family is positively related to receptivity.
   \[ r = -.38 \]
   significant at .001
   The hypothesis is accepted.
10. Church activism is negatively related to use.
   Two year measure of use  Thirty day measure of use
   \[ r = .26 \]  \[ r = .24 \]
   significant at .005  significant at .005

   The hypothesis is accepted.

11. Church activism is negatively related to receptivity.
     \[ r = -.20 \]
     significant at .025
     The hypothesis is accepted.

12. Church activism is negatively related to perceived alienation from church.
     \[ r = .79 \]
     significant at .001
     The hypothesis is accepted.

13. Church activism is positively related to attitude toward church.
     \[ r = .62 \]
     significant at .001
     The hypothesis is accepted.

14. Attitude toward church is negatively related to use.
   Two year measure of use  Thirty day measure of use
   \[ r = .38 \]  \[ r = .33 \]
   significant at .001  significant at .001

   The hypothesis is accepted.
15. Attitude toward church is negatively related to receptivity.

\[ r = -0.38 \]

significant at .001

The hypothesis is accepted.

16. Attitude toward church is negatively related to perceived alienation from church.

\[ r = 0.81 \]

significant at .001

The hypothesis is accepted.

17. Perceived alienation from church is positively related to use.

Two year measure of use

\[ r = 0.35 \]

significant at .001

Thirty day measure of use

\[ r = 0.30 \]

significant at .005

The hypothesis is accepted.

18. Perceived alienation from church is positively related to receptivity.

\[ r = -0.33 \]

significant at .001

The hypothesis is accepted.

School

19. School activism is negatively related to use.

Two year measure of use

\[ r = 0.29 \]

significant at .005

Thirty day measure of use

\[ r = 0.24 \]

significant at .005

The hypothesis is accepted.
20. School activism is negatively related to receptivity.
   \[ r = -0.24 \]
   significant at .005
   The hypothesis is accepted.

21. School activism is negatively related to perceived alienation from school.
   \[ r = 0.45 \]
   significant at .001
   The hypothesis is accepted.

22. School activism is positively related to attitude toward school.
   \[ r = 0.71 \]
   significant at .001
   The hypothesis is accepted.

23. Attitude toward school is negatively related to use.
   Two year measure of use
   \[ r = 0.38 \]
   significant at .001
   Thirty day measure of use
   \[ r = 0.37 \]
   significant at .001
   The hypothesis is accepted.

24. Attitude toward school is negatively related to receptivity.
   \[ r = -0.31 \]
   significant at .001
   The hypothesis is accepted.

25. Attitude toward school is negatively related to perceived alienation from school.
   \[ r = 0.52 \]
   significant at .001
   The hypothesis is accepted.
26. Perceived alienation from school is positively related to use.
   Two year measure of use       Thirty day measure of use
   \( r = .28 \)                \( r = .27 \)
   significant at .005         significant at .005
   The hypothesis is accepted.

27. Perceived alienation from school is positively related to receptivity.
   \( r = -.25 \)
   significant at .005
   The hypothesis is accepted.

General

28. Receptivity is positively related to use.
   Two year measure of use       Thirty day measure of use
   \( r = -.67 \)                \( r = -.68 \)
   significant at .001         significant at .001
   The hypothesis is accepted.

29. Family activism is related to church activism.
   \( r = .24 \)
   significant at .005
   The hypothesis is accepted.

30. Church activism is related to school activism.
   \( r = .25 \)
   significant at .005
   The hypothesis is accepted.
31. School activism is related to family activism.

\[ r = .38 \]

significant at .001

The hypothesis is accepted.

Several interesting points are noted by virtue of the fact that all thirty-one of the above hypotheses were, without exception, accepted. First, the reader will recall that these thirty-one hypotheses represent the network of relationships posited in the theory of use. Further, the theoretical model was directly deduced from the theory of use developed in Chapter Two. It can, with emphasis, be concluded that the data clearly supports the theory of use and attests to its predictive power. Second, the preceding data can be combined with the new concept "institutional rapport" developed in the preceding section. When institutional rapport was first introduced, it was done so on the basis of "group data." The concept can now be reaffirmed based on the correlation analysis of the data from the individual respondents. As will be seen below, considering institutional rapport in the light of the individual data both gives further credence to the concept itself and provides additional evaluative procedures in reference to the theory of use and the theoretical model of use.

Focus first turns to institutional rapport with school. As developed above, the concept involves the prediction that school activism, attitude toward school, and perceived alienation from school are intercorrelated. Table 14 represents a regression matrix showing the intercorrelation of these three variables.
### Table 14

**Correlation Matrix for Institutional Rapport with School: Activism to Attitude to Alienation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>School Activism</th>
<th>Attitude Toward School</th>
<th>Alienation From School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School activism</td>
<td>$r = 1.00$</td>
<td>$r = .71$</td>
<td>$r = .45$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward school</td>
<td>$r = .71$</td>
<td>$r = 1.00$</td>
<td>$r = .52$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation from school</td>
<td>$r = .45$</td>
<td>$r = .52$</td>
<td>$r = .100$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 14, if institutional rapport with school is thought of as a concept and activism, attitude and alienation are thought of as constructs under that concept, each construct is intercorrelated with the other two. However, it is also clear that they are not equivalent phenomena. This is seen by virtue of the fact that each construct only accounts for part of the variance in either of the other two. Nonetheless, as was elaborated in the section on scale and item analysis, the three constructs do load together nicely as a single concept. Tables 15 and 16 duplicate this process in reference to institutional rapport with family and institutional rapport with church. As is the case for "school," activism, attitude and alienation represent highly intercorrelated constructs both in reference to institutional rapport with family and with church. Following the same rationale, then, the constructs related to institutional rapport with church and institutional rapport with family can, respectively, be loaded to-
gather to develop a single measure of the concept as was done for institutional rapport with school.

TABLE 15

INSTITUTIONAL RAPPORT WITH FAMILY: ACTIVISM, ATTITUDE AND PERCEIVED ALIENATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Family Activism</th>
<th>Attitude Toward Family</th>
<th>Perceived alienation from Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family activism</td>
<td>$r = 1.00$</td>
<td>$r = .73$</td>
<td>$r = .69$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward family</td>
<td>$r = .73$</td>
<td>$r = 1.00$</td>
<td>$r = .61$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived alienation from family</td>
<td>$r = .69$</td>
<td>$r = .61$</td>
<td>$r = 1.00$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 16

INSTITUTIONAL RAPPORT WITH CHURCH: ACTIVISM, ATTITUDE AND PERCEIVED ALIENATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Church Activism</th>
<th>Attitude Toward Church</th>
<th>Perceived alienation from Church</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church activism</td>
<td>$r = 1.00$</td>
<td>$r = .63$</td>
<td>$r = .79$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward church</td>
<td>$r = .63$</td>
<td>$r = 1.00$</td>
<td>$r = .81$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived alienation from church</td>
<td>$r = .79$</td>
<td>$r = .81$</td>
<td>$r = 1.00$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given the developed concept of institutional rapport, the theoretical model of use can be restated. Before doing so, it is here noted that the two year measure of use and the thirty day measure of use are highly interrelated (r = .90). Since the relationship is so strong, the measures may be used interchangeably for the present purpose i.e., the "r" values for the correlates the two year and thirty day measures of use are nearly equivalent. With this in mind, the revised interactive path model of use will be evaluated only in terms of the two year history of use.

With the above in mind, the following propositions with their accompanying statistical data represent the revised theoretical model of use developed from the foregoing analyses.

A. Institutional rapport with family is negatively related to use.

\[ r = .25 \]

significant at .005

The proposition is accepted.

B. Institutional rapport with family is negatively related to receptivity.

\[ r = -.33 \]

significant at .001

The proposition is accepted.

C. Institutional rapport with church is negatively related to use.

\[ r = .31 \]

significant at .001

The proposition is accepted.
D. Institutional rapport with church is negatively related to receptivity.

\[ r = -0.31 \]

significant at .001

The proposition is accepted.

E. Institutional rapport with school is negatively related to use.

\[ r = -0.34 \]

significant at .001

The proposition is accepted.

F. Institutional rapport with school is negatively related to receptivity.

\[ r = -0.31 \]

significant at .001

The proposition is accepted.

G. Receptivity is positively related to use.

\[ r = 0.68 \]

significant at .001

The proposition is accepted.

H. Institutional rapport with family is positively related to institutional rapport with church.

\[ r = 0.29 \]

significant at .005

The proposition is accepted.

I. Institutional rapport with church is positively related to institutional rapport with school.

\[ r = 0.30 \]

significant at .001

The proposition is accepted.
J. Institutional rapport with family is positively related to institutional rapport with school.

\[ r = .41 \]

significant at .001

The proposition is accepted.

As can be seen, each of the ten propositions in the revised theoretical model of use is statistically significant and is, therefore, accepted. By virtue of the acceptability of all ten of its propositions, the revised conceptual model of use is likewise accepted. To the extent that it was developed from the original theoretical model of use which was in turn developed from the theory of use, it may be concluded that the revised model flows directly from and gives further support to the predictive power of the theory of use.\(^2\) Further, the revised model demonstrates the value and utility of institutional rapport when considering future research and further understanding of the behavior of teenagers. Although the original model and the revised model both leave much unexplained variance in reference to receptivity and use, they both account for a small portion of that variance and are thus recommended to researchers and students of adolescence. Due to its relative simplicity and compactness, and since it accounts for approximately the same estimated variance as does the original model, the

\(^2\)It should be kept in mind that the original and revised theoretical model of use accounts for only a small portion of the variance in use. Had the data been statistically manipulated so as to determine the total variance in use accounted for by the models, it is felt that the effect of the variables would not be strongly additive; and it is estimated that the total models account for probably no more than 20 percent or so in the total variance in use.
revised model should be given preferential consideration in future re-
search and study. Of course, the utility of the revised model is not
particularly surprising since it uses the same variable as in the ori-
ginal model organized and compacted so as to result in the revised mod-
els having fewer variables. The property of having "fewer variables"
is then, the chief value of the revised theoretical model.

Although a more complete elaboration of the point is here re-
served for the next chapter, the reader is here cautioned against an
overinterpretation of the data. The theory of use in Chapter Two argues
that the institutions of the family, the church, and the school, to some
extent, interrupt the flow from nonuse to use or mediate between the
push forces of society and the pull forces of drugs and the youth cul-
ture. The data here presented are consistent of that argument. How-
ever, the revised model of use accounts for only a portion of the var-
iance in use. The remainder and major portion of that variance is not
accounted for by the revised model. When the question is drawn in terms
of, "What accounts for nonuse among teenagers?", the conclusion is
pressed that powerful influences other than family, church, and school
are operative. This point does not detract from the utility and power
of the revised model. It does, rather, only point out the reality that
the present research gets at only a portion of the drug problem.

Evaluation of Minor Hypotheses

As the hypotheses were developed in Chapter Three, they were
somewhat arbitrarily divided into major and minor categories. This
distinction is not to suggest that some hypotheses are more important
than others or that some findings are necessarily more significant than others. Rather, the distinction was made for reference purposes only. The "major hypotheses" represent that group of hypotheses involved in the original theory of use. "Minor hypotheses" refer to that group of hypotheses which either flow from the theory of use or were presented from the perspective of research interest, but are not directly involved in the theory. If these comments serve to emphasize the point that the findings presented below are important and worthy of serious consideration, the presentation can move to present the minor hypotheses and associated statistical data using the same format as was used in the preceding section.

It should also be noted that the data presented are in terms of the two year measures of the behavior or activities considered. As will be recalled, the two year and thirty day distinctions were developed for consideration of use variables. The distinction is not felt to be important in reference to the other variables. In addition, two other factors would raise some question about the reliability of the thirty day measure of some variables. First, the data was collected in the winter. Behavior such as skipping school and running away from home would possibly be influenced by the below-freezing weather. Second, during the early part of the thirty day period prior to data collection, there had been a "flu epidemic" in the area. This factor would similarly tend to affect certain behavior such as going to church, going to school activities, etc. Due to the high correlation between the thirty day and two year measures, and due to the above noted factors, this researcher opted to use only the two year measure.
With the above comments and considerations in mind, the discussion next moves to present the minor hypotheses. The reader will recall that the operationalization and measurement of the minor variables was presented in Chapter Three and may want to note that an "r" value of 0.14 is significant at the .05 level and that an "r" value of 0.31 is significant at the .001 level.

1. School truancy is positively related to perceived alienation from school.
   \[ r = .17 \]
   significant at .05
   The hypothesis is accepted.

2. Participation in school activities is inversely related to perceived alienation from school.
   \[ r = -.12 \]
   not significant
   The hypothesis is rejected.

3. School truancy is inversely related to participation in school activities.
   \[ r = -.08 \]
   not significant
   The hypothesis is rejected.

4. The amount of time a student spends studying is positively related to his attitude toward school.
   \[ r = -.28 \]
   significant at .005
   (It is important to refer to the "loading procedures" discussed in the preceding section.)
   The hypothesis is accepted.
5. The number of schools a student has attended is positively related to perceived alienation from school.

\[ r = -0.05 \]

not significant

The hypothesis is rejected.

6. Church attendance is negatively related to perceived alienation from church.

\[ r = -0.52 \]

significant at .001

The hypothesis is accepted.

7. Participation in church activities is negatively related to perceived alienation from church.

\[ r = -0.55 \]

significant at .001

The hypothesis is accepted.

8. Frequency of praying is positively related to attitude toward church.

\[ r = -0.54 \]

significant at .001

The hypothesis is accepted.

9. Frequency of praying is positively related to church attendance.

\[ r = 0.59 \]

significant at .001

The hypothesis is accepted.

10. There is a negative relationship between use and the frequency of communication between a teenager and his mother about personal problems.

\[ r = -0.16 \]
significant at .05

The hypothesis is accepted.

11. There is a negative relationship between use and communication between a teenager and his father about personal problems.

\[ r = -.08 \]

not significant

The hypothesis is rejected.

12. There is a negative relationship between frequency of running away from or leaving home and frequency of communication between a teenager and his parents about a personal problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication with father</th>
<th>Communication with mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ r = -.09 ]</td>
<td>[ r = -.19 ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

not significant  
significant at .025

The hypothesis is accepted for communication with mother, but rejected for communication with father.

13. Use is related to family mobility.

\[ r = .18 \]

significant at .025

The hypothesis is accepted.

14. Use is related to the number of siblings which a teenager has.

\[ r = .02 \]

not significant

The hypothesis is rejected.

15. Use is related to the birth order within his family of a teenager.

\[ r = .08 \]

not significant

The hypothesis is rejected.
16. Age is positively related to use.
   \[ r = .20 \]
   significant at .025
   The hypothesis is accepted.

17. Males are more likely to use than females.
   (Males were loaded as "1" and females as "2").
   \[ r = -.25 \]
   significant at .005
   The hypothesis is accepted.

18. The amount of time a teenager spends watching television is related to use.
   \[ r = -.06 \]
   not significant
   The hypothesis is rejected.

19. The amount of time a teenager spends talking with adults other than his parents is negatively related to use.
   \[ r = -.11 \]
   not significant
   The hypothesis is rejected.

20. The amount of time a teenager spends listening to records and music is positively related to use.
   \[ r = .39 \]
   significant at .001
   The hypothesis is accepted.

21. The amount of time a teenager spends out with his friends is positively related to use.
   \[ r = .36 \]
significant at .001

The hypothesis is accepted.

22. The amount of time a teenager spends working other than related to school is negatively related to use.

\[ r = .26 \]

significant at .005

(The relationship is significant but not in the hypothesized direction.)

The hypothesis is rejected.

23. The amount of time a teenager spends working on hobbies is related to use.

\[ r = .00 \]

not significant

The hypothesis is rejected.

24. The amount of time a teenager spends doing drugs is positively related to use.

\[ r = .41 \]

significant at .001

The hypothesis is accepted.

25. The amount of time a teenager spends trying to think up something to do is positively related to use.

\[ r = .08 \]

not significant

The hypothesis is rejected.

26. There is a relationship between use and the amount of time a teenager spends talking on the telephone.

\[ r = .21 \]

significant at .025

The hypothesis is accepted.
27. There is a positive relationship between perceived alienation from the family and a teenager's history of suicide attempts.

\[ r = 0.15 \]

significant at .05

The hypothesis is accepted.

Special Evaluation of Use

In the preceding sections, analytic focus has been on the two year and thirty day indices of use. The development of those indices, as presented earlier, involved the combining of the various types of use as well as the various frequencies of use. As should be clear by now, both indices represent useful tools in drug related research. However, the indices fail to disclose the interrelationships between various types of use. It is the purpose of this section, then, to look more microscopically at the nine types of use. As was suggested earlier, since the two year and thirty day indices of use are highly correlated \((r = 0.90)\) this special analysis of use will be in terms of the two year measure only. Table 17 presents the "\(r\)" coefficients between each of the nine types of use. In reviewing that table, "\(r=\)" has been omitted, and the coefficient for a given relationship is only presented once; an "\(x\)" in a given cell means that the actual coefficient appears elsewhere in the table.
TABLE 17

SPECIAL ANALYSIS OF USE: INTERRELATIONSHIPS (r=) OF THE NINE TYPES OF USE - TWO YEAR MEASURE ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Use Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Drinking Coffee</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Popping Pills</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Smoking Cigarettes</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Smoking Marijuana</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Shooting Up Speed or Heroin</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Drinking Beer or Wine</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sniffing Glue, etc.</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Drinking Hard Liquor, Whiskey, etc.</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dropping Acid, LSD, etc.</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the reader's convenience, it is noted that any coefficient in Table 17 greater than "0.20" is significant at the .01 level. For purposes of the present analysis, however, focus is on those relationships which have a coefficient of "0.50" or higher. With a coefficient at that level, each of the variables can be seen as accounting for one-fourth or more of the variance in the other variable. Using this criterion, it is argued that any two types of use having a coefficient of "0.50" or greater are sufficiently related so as to strongly suggest that one of the two types of use tends to be accompanied by the other. For example, if A and B have a coefficient of "0.50" or more, it is argued that type A use has a strong tendency to be accompanied by type B use, or vice-versa.

With these comments in mind and using the criterion presented, the following propositions are held to be supported by the data.

1. Drinking coffee tends not to be associated with other types of drug use although non-coffee drinkers are slightly less likely to drink beer or wine, or whiskey or hard liquor than are heavy coffee drinkers.

2. Teenagers who "pop pills" also tend to be marijuana smokers as well as tending score higher on the overall use index than do teenagers who do not pop pills.

3. Teenagers who smoke cigarettes also tend to smoke marijuana, drink beer or wine, drink hard liquor, and to the overall use index than non-cigarette smokers.

4. Teenagers who smoke marijuana tend to drink beer or wine, drink hard liquor, drop acid, LSD, etc., score higher on the overall use index than non-marijuana smokers.

5. Teenagers who shoot up Speed or heroin tend to sniff glue, etc., as well as tending to score higher on the overall use index than teenagers who do not shoot up Speed or heroin.
6. Teenagers who drink beer or wine also tend to drink hard liquor, as well as tending to score higher on the overall use index than do teenagers who do not drink beer or wine.

7. Teenagers who sniff glue, etc., tend to score higher on the overall use index than teenagers who do not sniff glue and stuff.

8. Teenagers who drink hard liquor tend to score higher on the overall use index than do teenagers who do not drink hard liquor.

9. Teenagers who drop acid, LSD, etc., tend to score higher on the overall use index than do teenagers who do not drop acid, LSD, etc.

Of course, the above nine statements result from systematically observing Table 17, using the criteria presented earlier, and reporting the data moving to the right and down on the table. Even though this process does result in presenting all of the relationships with a coefficient of "50" or higher, it does not necessarily elaborate all of the relational networks in which the reader may be interested. Since such elaborations relate to the interests of the individual reader, that task will be left to the reader and his individual consideration of Table 17.

At this point, let the section be concluded by observing that the nine types of drug use are interrelated phenomena and that "the drug problem" appears to represent an involved complex of frequencies of types of use. Although the point will be further elaborated in the next chapter, it would appear that any remedial approach to the drug problem must have a wide enough scope to incorporate all types of use with the exception of coffee. Also, it is noted that shooting up Speed and heroin appears to be a less interrelated element than do the other seven types, with coffee also being excluded. The tentative impression developed here is that coffee may be excluded in further
investigation into the drug problem. Similarly, shooting up Speed or heroin may represent a problem somewhat unrelated to the remaining seven types of use.

It is also here noted that the interrelatedness of the various use types supports well the validity and reliability of the use indices developed in this research. Further, the data developed above also encourages the further use and refinement of those indices.

Analysis of Categorical Findings: Family, Church, School, and the Individual

Family

In the preceding sections, findings and associated data are presented in response to the study's specific hypotheses as well as in reference to specific consideration of the several types of use. The process of collecting and analyzing the data relevant to those hypotheses and to the types of use yielded many other interesting findings. In the interest of professional curiosity and future research, this and the following section of this chapter present many of the findings resulting from the analysis of the data but not directly related to the hypotheses. Some material already presented is reintroduced for the sake of contextual continuity. For the most part, however, the findings in this and in the following section represent material not dealt with elsewhere in this report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Institutional Rapport With School</th>
<th>Institutional Rapport With Family</th>
<th>Institutional Rapport With Church</th>
<th>Receptivity</th>
<th>Two Year History Of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Talking to mother about a personal problem</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talking to father about a personal problem</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Running away or leaving home</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family mobility</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Family stability</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of siblings</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Birth order in family</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(It should be remembered that "institutional rapport" was loaded so that the lower the score, the higher the institutional rapport.)
The reader can, of course, interpret the data in Table 18 in accord with his own interest and perspective. Several of the relationships warrant note, however, due to the presence of a significant relationship and, in some cases, due to the absence of a significant relationship. The following discussion is, then, intended to serve only as a perspective from which the data may be considered and as a stimulus to further attention to Table 18.

It is interesting to note that the frequency with which a teenager talks with his mother about personal problems is significantly related to institutional rapport with school, accounts for fully one-fourth of the variance in institutional rapport with family, is significantly related to a teenager's level of institutional rapport with church, is inversely related with receptivity and accounts for only about two percent of the variance in use. The amount of time a teenager spends talking with his father about personal problems is positively related to institutional rapport with school, accounts for over twenty percent of the variance in institutional rapport with family, is positively associated with institutional rapport with church, and is unrelated to both receptivity and use. The number of times a teenager has run away from or left home is unrelated to institutional rapport with school, is clearly negatively related to institutional rapport with family, is negatively related to institutional rapport with church, and accounts for over twenty percent of the variance in both receptivity and use. Family mobility is clearly unrelated to institutional rapport with school, family, and church; but has a slight positive association with both receptivity and use. At any rate, re-
turning to the discussion of Table 18, it can be seen that the number
of siblings which a teenager has is negatively related to institutional
rapport with school and family. The point is that there is a slight
tendency for children from larger families to experience lower insti­
tutional rapport with school and family than do teenagers from smaller
families. Number of siblings, however, is unrelated to institutional
rapport with church, and use; although it does have a slight negative
relationship to receptivity. Finally, a teenager's birth order in his
family accounts for about six percent of the variance in institutional
rapport with school and institutional rapport with family. This ten­
dency is in the direction of lower institutional rapport with family
and school for those teenagers who have the greatest number of older
brothers and sisters. At the same time, birth order is seen to be un­
related to institutional rapport with church, receptivity, and use.
TABLE 19
SUPPLEMENTARY FINDINGS FOR CHURCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Institutional Rapport With School</th>
<th>Institutional Rapport With Family</th>
<th>Institutional Rapport With Church</th>
<th>Receptivity</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Church Attendance</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Frequency of Praying</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participation in Church Activities</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Recall that "institutional rapport" and "receptivity" were loaded so that the lower the score, the higher the institutional rapport or receptivity, respectively.)
Church attendance presents a slight positive relationship with institutional rapport with school as well as with institutional rapport with family, while accounting for over twenty-five percent of the variance in institutional rapport with church. In addition, church attendance is clearly negatively related to both receptivity and use. The frequency with which a teenager prays accounts for about seven percent of the variance in institutional rapport with school and about ten percent of the variance in institutional rapport with family. Both of these relationships are in a positive direction. Similarly, frequency of praying accounts for about twenty percent of the variance in institutional rapport with church as well as approximately twenty percent of the variance in both receptivity and use. Participation in church activities is clearly positively related to institutional rapport with both family and school. It accounts for over twenty-five percent of the variance in institutional rapport with church, and is significantly negatively related to both receptivity and use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Institutional Rapport With School</th>
<th>Institutional Rapport With Family</th>
<th>Institutional Rapport With Church</th>
<th>Receptivity</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. School truancy</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Participation in extra-school activities</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attending school plays, ball games, etc.</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of different schools attended</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Time spent studying</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School

The findings in reference to school are interesting especially in view of the apparent tendency of educators to encourage participation in school activities as a way of involving youth in more traditional behavior and discouraging less traditional behavior, such as use. With this thought in mind, it is noted that school truancy is significantly negatively related to institutional rapport both with school and family, and somewhat less significantly to institutional rapport with church. Similarly, school truancy is positively related to receptivity and accounts for over twenty percent of the variance in use. Participation in extra-school activities is only slightly positively related to institutional rapport with school and shows only slightly more significance in reference to its positive relationship with institutional rapport with family. Institutional rapport with church is unrelated to participation in school activities, while use and receptivity show a slight negative relationship with such participation. Frequency of attendance at school plays, ball games, etc., presents no relationship to institutional rapport with school, family, or church, as well as presenting no relationship with either receptivity or use. Similarly, the number of schools a student has attended is unrelated to institutional rapport with family, church, or school, although it is slightly positively related to both receptivity and use. Finally, the amount of time a student spends studying is positively related to institutional rapport with family and school, and somewhat less positively related to institutional rapport with
church. Similarly, the amount of time spent studying is negatively related to both receptivity and use.
TABLE 21
SUPPLEMENTARY FINDINGS FOR THE INDIVIDUAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Institutional Rapport With School</th>
<th>Institutional Rapport With Family</th>
<th>Institutional Rapport With Church</th>
<th>Receptivity</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. History of suicide attempts</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sex</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Amount of time spent watching television</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Amount of time spent talking to adults</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Amount of time spent listening to records and music</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Amount of time spent out with friends</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Institutional Rapport With School</td>
<td>Institutional Rapport With Family</td>
<td>Institutional Rapport With Church</td>
<td>Receptivity</td>
<td>Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Amount of time spent talking on the telephone</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Amount of time spent working other than for school</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Amount of time spent doing drugs</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Amount of time spent trying to think up something to do</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Amount of time spent on hobbies</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the data in Table 21, it is interesting to observe that there is a significant positive relationship between a teenager's history of suicide attempts and his level of institutional rapport with both family and school, as well as a somewhat less significant positive relationship with his level of institutional rapport with church. History of suicide attempts is, however, unrelated to receptivity but somewhat positively related to use. Younger teenagers are somewhat more likely to experience higher institutional rapport with school than are older teenagers, although age is unrelated to institutional rapport with family and church. There is a slight tendency for older teenagers to show some increased receptivity as well as some increased tendency to use. Similarly, there is a very slight tendency for females to show higher institutional rapport with school than males, although sex is unrelated to institutional rapport with family or church. Males are somewhat more likely than females to use as well as showing a slight tendency to have increased receptivity. The amount of time a teenager spends watching television appears to be a relatively unimportant variable, although there is a slight positive relationship between the amount of time spent watching television and institutional rapport both with school and with family. The amount of time a teenager spends talking to adults other than his parents shows a slight positive relationship between institutional rapport with school and with church, while accounting for about ten percent of the variance in institutional rapport with family. It is significantly
negatively related to receptivity but unrelated to use. The amount of
time a teenager spends listening to records and music is unrelated to
institutional rapport with school and church although slightly posi­
tively related to institutional rapport with family. Similarly, lis­
tening to records and music is positively related to receptivity and
accounts for about fifteen percent of the variance in use. The amount
of time a teenager spends out with his friends is slightly negatively
related to institutional rapport with school and church, although un­
related to institutional rapport with family. On the other hand, it
accounts for nearly ten percent of the variance in receptivity and over
ten percent of the variance in use. The amount of time a teenager
spends talking on the telephone is unrelated to institutional rapport
with family, church, or school, as well as unrelated to receptivity.
However, it is slightly positively related to use. Receptivity as
well as institutional rapport with family, church, and school are un­
related to the amount of time a teenager spends working other than for
school. Such work is, however, slightly positively related to use.
The amount of time a teenager spends doing drugs is slightly negatively
related to institutional rapport with church and school; although it
is unrelated to institutional rapport with family. As might be ex­
pected, it is positively related to both receptivity and use, account­
ing for over twenty percent of the variance in those two variables.
A teenager's frequency of boredom, or the amount of time he usually
spends trying to think up something to do, is only slightly negatively
related to institutional rapport with church and slightly positively
related to receptivity. It is unrelated to institutional rapport with
family and school as well as unrelated to use. Perhaps the thought might be interjected that being bored, on a continuum from a little to a lot, is part of being a teenager, if not in fact a real part of life for everyone. Finally, the amount of time teenagers spend on hobbies was not found to be related to any of the variables here considered.

Miscellaneous Findings

To conclude the presentation of the findings resulting from the research discussed in this report, this section will present miscellaneous findings developed from the data but not presented elsewhere in the chapter. Generally, these findings deal with the particular behaviors and activities of teenagers which were earlier considered in relation to use, receptivity, institutional rapport, alienation, attitude, and activism. It is the focus of this section to consider these behaviors and activities in relation to each other. The correlation analysis reveals that these behaviors and activities are, for the most part, unrelated to each other. A correlation matrix for them would, then, consist, to a large extent, of insignificant r coefficients. Considering this point, the strategy here will be to present the significant relationships in enumerated, form. As the reader considers the "r" values presented with these findings, he may want to keep in mind that an "r" value of 0.14 is significant at the .05 level and that an "r" value of 0.31 is significant at the .001 level.
1. Church attendance is slightly negatively related to school truancy. $r = -.18$

2. Church attendance is positively related to the frequency of praying. $r = .59$

3. Church attendance is slightly positively related to participation in extra-school activities. $r = .24$

4. Church attendance is slightly negatively related to a teenager's history of suicide attempts. $r = -.18$

5. Church attendance is slightly positively related to the frequency with which a teenager talks to his mother about personal problems. $r = .28$

6. Church attendance is slightly positively related to the frequency with which a teenager talks to his father about personal problems. $r = .29$

7. Females show a slight tendency to attend church more than males. $r = .14$

8. Church attendance is slightly positively related to the amount of time a teenager spends talking with adults other than his parents. $r = .28$

9. Church attendance is positively related to the amount of time a teenager spends studying. $r = .30$

10. School truancy is slightly negatively related to the frequency with which a teenager prays. $r = -.16$

11. School truancy is slightly positively related to a teenager's history of suicide attempts. $r = .17$

12. School truancy is positively related to a teenager's history of running away from or leaving home. $r = .40$

13. School truancy is slightly positively related to age. $r = .18$

14. Males are slightly more likely to truant from school than are females. $r = -.14$

15. School truancy is slightly negatively related to the amount of time a teenager spends studying. $r = -.23$

16. The frequency with which a teenager prays is positively related to participation in school activities. $r = .37$
17. The frequency with which a teenager prays is positively related to the frequency with which he talks to his mother about personal problems. $r = .43$

18. The frequency with which a teenager prays is positively related to the frequency with which he talks to his father about personal problems. $r = .31$

19. The frequency with which a teenager prays is slightly negatively related to his history of running away from or leaving home. $r = -.19$

20. There is a tendency for girls to pray more than boys. $r = .42$

21. The frequency with which a teenager prays is slightly positively related to the amount of time he spends talking with adults other than his parents. $r = .26$

22. The frequency with which a teenager prays is slightly positively related to the amount of time he spends studying. $r = .28$

23. The frequency with which a teenager participates in school activities is slightly positively related to the frequency with which he talks to his mother or his father about personal problems. to mother $-- r = .28$ to father $-- r = .29$

24. Participation in school activities is slightly negatively related to a teenager's history of running away from or leaving home. $r = -.24$

25. The frequency with which a teenager participates in school activities is slightly positively related to the frequency with which he talks with adults other than his parents. $r = .22$

26. The frequency with which a teenager participates in school activities is slightly positively related to the amount of time he spends studying. $r = .26$

27. A teenager's history of suicide attempts is slightly negatively related to the frequency with which he talks with his father about personal problems.

28. A teenager's history of suicide attempts is slightly positively related to his history of running away from or leaving home.

29. The amount of time a teenager spends talking with his mother about personal problems is positively related to the amount of time he spends talking to his father about personal problems. $r = .54$
30. The amount of time a teenager spends talking with his mother about personal problems is slightly negatively related to his history of running away from or leaving home. \( r = .19 \)

31. Girls are slightly more likely to talk with their mothers about personal problems than are boys. \( r = .26 \)

32. The amount of time a teenager spends talking to his mother about personal problems is positively related to the amount of time he spends talking with adults other than his parents. \( r = .30 \)

33. The amount of time a teenager spends talking with his mother about personal problems is slightly positively related to the amount of time he spends studying. \( r = .24 \)

34. The amount of time a teenager spends talking with his mother about personal problems is slightly positively related to the amount of time he spends listening to records and music. \( r = .14 \)

35. The amount of time a teenager spends talking with his mother about personal problems is slightly positively related to the amount of time he spends talking on the telephone. \( r = .16 \)

36. The frequency with which a teenager talks with his father about personal problems is slightly positively related to the amount of time he spends talking with adults other than his parents. \( r = .25 \)

37. The frequency with which a teenager talks with his father about personal problems is slightly positively related to the amount of time he spends studying. \( r = .20 \)

38. The frequency with which a teenager talks with his father about personal problems is slightly positively related to the amount of time he spends listening to records and music. \( r = .14 \)

39. A teenager's history of running away from or leaving home is slightly positively related to the amount of time he spends listening to records and music. \( r = .17 \)

40. A teenager's history of running away from or leaving home is slightly positively related to the amount of time he spends out with his friends. \( r = .14 \)

41. Younger teenagers show a slight tendency to watch more television than do older teenagers. \( r = -.14 \)

42. Older teenagers show a slight tendency to spend more time listening to records and music than do younger teenagers.
43. Older teenagers show a slight tendency to spend more time out with their friends than do younger teenagers.

44. Girls show a slight tendency to spend more time talking with adults other than their parents than do boys.

45. Girls tend to spend more time studying than do boys.

46. Girls show a slight tendency to spend more time talking on the telephone than do boys.

47. The amount of time a teenager spends watching television is positively related to the amount of time he spends talking with adults other than his parents.

48. The amount of time a teenager spends watching television is slightly positively related to the amount of time he spends studying.

49. The amount of time a teenager spends watching television is slightly positively related to the amount of time he spends listening to records and music.

50. The amount of time a teenager spends watching television is slightly positively related to the amount of time he spends out with his friends.

51. The amount of time a teenager spends talking with adults other than his parents is positively related to the amount of time he spends studying.

52. The amount of time a teenager spends talking with adults other than his parents is positively related to the amount of time he spends listening to records and music.

53. The amount of time a teenager spends talking with adults other than his parents is slightly positively related to the amount of time he spends talking on the telephone.

54. The amount of time a teenager spends studying is positively related to the amount of time he spends listening to records and music.

55. The amount of time a teenager spends studying is slightly positively related to the amount of time he spends talking on the telephone.

56. The amount of time a teenager spends listening to records and music is positively related to the amount of time he spends out with his friends. $r = .41$
57. The amount of time a teenager spends listening to records and music is positively related to the amount of time he spends talking on the telephone. \( r = .50 \)

58. The amount of time a teenager spends out with his friends is slightly positively related to the amount of time he spends talking on the telephone. \( r = .21 \)

As the reader considers the correlation findings presented above, two points should be kept in mind. First, these propositions represent miscellaneous findings resulting from the general research effort. The process of statistical analysis involved a seventy variable system involved correlating each variable against the other sixty-nine. The result was a seventy by seventy correlation matrix. The above propositions, then, result from systematically looking at the \( r \) values developed between the variables included in those propositions. Second, each relationship has only been posed once. Therefore, a relationship in the form "A is related to B" could also have been presented in the form "B is related to A." This fact allows the reader to review the list, select one variable for consideration, and then consider all of the findings involving that variable as a group.

As a concluding comment to this chapter, it is noted that the attempt has been made to present both the findings and the supporting data. The findings here presented, of course, involve this researcher's interpretation of and judgments about the data. By presenting the data itself in combination with the findings, it is intended that the reader will be able to develop his own interpretations of and judgments about that data. Having done this, then, he may use his interpretation and judgments as a criterion when considering the findings.
as presented. It is hoped that this process allows for maximum freedom and understanding for both the researcher and the reader.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY; CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Summary

The Problem

This report begins with an overview of the research problem. Briefly stated, the argument rests on the promise that, for all teenagers, there was a point in their life at which they were nondrug users. Why is it, then, that some teenagers become drug users while others do not? With this question in mind, the scope of the drug problem is examined. It is clearly seen that drug use and abuse, and especially teenage drug use and abuse, is an international problem. Along with its impact in the United States, teenage use is seen as a serious concern in Europe, Asia, and Australia.

Having established the international proportions of the problem, focus turns to an examination of drug abuse and concern about teenage drug use in the United States. It is documented that the detrimental impact of drug use affects people of all social and economic categories, both young people and older Americans, and people and families from urban, suburban, and rural areas. It is documented that concern about drug use has been present in the United States since before 1920. During the 1940's, widespread concern and alarm about the drug
problem began to develop serious momentum. By 1967, destructive and deleterious drug use, especially among teenagers, had reached what is described as epidemic proportions. From that point, teenage experimentation and abuse is seen as substantially increasing on a yearly basis. The projection is clear that the problem will continue to expand on into the 1970's. While the number of teenagers involved in the drug problem has been increasing and is continuing to increase, it is similarly clear that many, if not most, teenagers have not and will not become involved directly in drug use. Why? The research question focuses on, "What accounts for nonuse among teenagers?"

Societal and Cultural Push Forces

Given the nature of the drug problem and the focus of the research question, the discussion next moves toward a causal theory of use. It is posited that contemporary society and culture are such that structural forces push the teenager toward alienation, escapism, and estrangement. Introductory to a specific consideration of these push forces is a specific consideration of the definitional strategy involved in understanding "use." A very broad, two dimensional definition is used which allows for any "type" of use from the ingestion of coffee to the injection of heroin. Similarly, the manner by which the drug is introduced into the body may include ingestion, inhalation, injection, or any other means. Given this inclusive consideration of the type of use and of the manner of introduction into the body, "use" is also held to be inclusive of any amount of use from no use to a little use to extensive use. With this very broad definition of use
established, focus turns to the drug literature and to a detailed con-
sideration of the push forces mentioned above.

It is argued that contemporary society is extremely complex and
that the negative impact of this complexity on the individual is pro-
nounced. That complexity is a central issue in terms of the individ-
ual's relationship to the economic system. It is seen that the upper
classes, the middle classes, and the lower classes all experience real
and significant difficulty as a result of their relationship to the
economic system. In general, although the nature of that impact varies
from economic group to economic group, its effect is in the direction
of alienation and estrangement for the individual. The impetus toward
alienation and estrangement is first considered on a societal basis
and then more microscopically viewed in terms of the disintegration,
disorganization, and decreasing cohesiveness of present day communities
and neighborhoods.

It is argued that, in addition to or coexistent with these
structural and societal forces, an increasing disintegration of culture
over time is impacting on the individual so as to press toward aliena-
tion and estrangement. The argument fundamentally suggests that the
values, beliefs, and mores of contemporary people may be seen as moving
away from the culture of the past. This movement is dynamic and accel-
erating. The result is that traditional orientations, traditional
sources of truth and guidance, and so on are being replaced by new and
less stable mechanisms. Over time, then, culture is becoming gradually
less unified and may be more adequately seen as a proliferation of
subcultures. Inherent to this process is a gradual orientation of
teenagers away from adults and traditional role models and toward their peers and the youth culture as a source of values, beliefs, and mores. Accompanying this trend are several significant shifts in morality and value orientation. In addition, adolescents' perception of and orientation to culture and politics is changing. This is seen through the development of a generalized youth culture characterized by what might be thought of as numerous subcultures. These youth subcultures, although having much in common, reflect high variability in terms of life style, orientation to drugs and drug use, orientation to the norms and policies of the greater society, conformity to traditional patterns of behavior, and so on.

As a product of the above evolution, or perhaps more accurately—revolution—the printed and electronic media as well as popular music are seen as significantly impacting on the individual, pressing him away from more traditional values, beliefs, behavior patterns, and so on in the direction of rebellion, youth orientation, drug use, and so on. As contemporary youth move away from the more established patterns, public laws and action in response to the change are examined. These laws and actions coalesce to press for social control and social change simultaneously. Control is encouraged as a response to teenagers' moving away from the traditional perspective.

---

The discussion here is focusing on the theoretical development in Chapter Two. The study's findings do not support the theory's position in reference to the impact of the electronic media and popular music.

The data gives almost no support to the notion that increased teenage drug use is associated with teenagers moving away from traditional orientations to adult models either in terms of talking to parents about personal problems or in terms of talking with adults other than parents.
encouraged as a sign of the times and as a necessary and important response to a changing sociocultural orientation.

Use and nonuse among teenagers is examined in terms of models and aspirations. The argument is offered that the structural and cultural push discussed above has tended to split teenagers in terms of those with more traditional aspirations and oriented to more traditional models, and those whose aspirations are less future oriented and less consistent with the work ethic and who turn to contemporaries and the youth culture for role models. The suggestion is that the former group is less likely to be involved in drug use, while the latter group is more likely to be involved in drug use. Basically, then, the argument is that for most teenagers, the increasing structural complexity, the pronounced cultural disintegration, and the overall impact of a multiplicity of macrolevel forces is to push the individual toward alienation, estrangement, and an increasing dependency of youth on youth. As a response to this condition, drugs serve as an effective vehicle for escape and as a counterresponse to the push.

The data gives almost no support to the notion that increased teenage drug use is associated with teenagers moving away from traditional orientations to adult models either in terms of talking to parents about personal problems or in terms of talking with adults other than parents.

The data does not support this theoretical position.

The data does not support this theoretical contention insofar as the teenagers studied, as a group, strongly tended not to feel alienated from family, church, or school.
The Pull of Peers and Drugs

The theory of use is established in quasimechanical terms when the push forces toward alienation, estrangement, and escapism are conceptually set in relation to the pull forces inherent in the peer group, the youth culture, and the attraction of drug use. It is clearly seen that the social influences on youth are pronounced. The increasing alienation and personal estrangement of youth press toward social opportunities for belongingness, involvement, and participation. As suggested above, the present day teenager is more than ever put in the position of having to achieve belongingness, involvement, and participation within the social context of the peer group and the youth culture. Given a state of alienation and estrangement, the attraction or pull of the peer group or youth culture on the individual teenager is, then, immense. From this premise, the discussion moves to carefully consider the argument that teenage use is a function of the relative level of social adjustment of the teenager. The suggestion is that teenagers who are better adjusted socially are more oriented to adult society and traditional institutions. Alternatively, then, teenagers who are primarily oriented to the youth culture and the peer group, and thus more oriented to drug

The theory implies that teenagers feel alienated from traditional institutions, and therefore are pressed toward involvement, etc., in the peer group. As already noted, the teenagers studied strongly tended not to feel alienated from family, etc. Therefore, the argument for an increased press toward the youth culture is not supported by the data.
use, are seen as socially less well adjusted. Serious reservation is raised in terms of this argument and the position is elaborated that social adjustment is a relative concept. Given this relativity, it is not reasonable to conclude that teenagers involved in the youth culture are more or less well adjusted than teenagers more oriented to traditional society. The problem of teenage drug use is substantially more complex than is seen through the relatively weak social adjustment argument. The pull of the youth culture and associated peer influences are substantial and appealing for all teenagers. In a society which pushes toward alienation and estrangement, the pull of involvement, participation, and belongingness within the peer community is a force not to be underestimated.

Given the pull of the peer group and of the youth culture, the argument is examined that use is a function of delinquency. It is clearly seen that, although delinquent subgroups are perhaps more likely to use than nondelinquent subgroups, delinquency and the correlates of delinquency do not represent an adequate causal explanation of teenage use. It is documented that use is prevalent in both delinquent and nondelinquent youth subgroups. Teenage use is very widespread and simple explanations in terms of deviant behavior patterns are inadequate. Use is seen in Chapter Two as, in part, a function of social diffusion. It diffuses from older youth to younger

---

9Only a minimal and relatively unimpressive relationship was found between use and a teenager's orientation to parents and adults.
youth, from males to females, from leaders to followers, and so on. In general, use has for many youth, become a requisite to membership in the peer group; and indoctrination to use follows a pattern similar to that for indoctrination to other values, beliefs, and behavior patterns of the group. The point is that use has become a normative behavior dictated by the peer community for many youth. The pull of peer and youth culture involvement, then, has, as an integral element, conformity to the norm of drug use.

With the above sociocultural pull toward use established, the discussion moves to consider the social functions of use. Within the using subculture, use serves as a vehicle for involvement, participation, and belongingness, as well as a means of recreation, escape, and comradery. The push-pull argument is concluded by emphasizing that drugs are a specific manifestation of that push-pull. As such, drug use is contingent on the availability of drugs. The argument is posited that, were drugs not available, alternative vehicles and behavioral norms would appear. Given the availability of drugs, however, 

---

\(^{10}\text{As already noted, the data fails to support several aspects of the "push-pull argument" especially in terms of some of the theoretically developed correlates involved in the "push."}
use is contingent on the receptivity\textsuperscript{11} of the host: the teenager. As the argument suggests, the teenager experiences increased levels of alienation and personal estrangement. As an alternative to that alienation and estrangement, he is strongly attracted to or pulled by the peer group and youth culture. Since involvement in the youth culture holds use as a requisite, he is coincidentally receptive to use; and the level of receptivity is pronounced. The argument concludes by emphasizing a simple reality: highly receptive teenagers combined with ample availability of drugs leads to a very high probability of teenage use, and to a growing drug problem.\textsuperscript{12}

Mediating Institutions

If the foregoing is taken as a whole, it basically represents the causal theory of use developed in this report. The question still

\textsuperscript{11}"Receptivity" accounted for something less than half of the measured use within the teenage group studied. This, perhaps, reflects the inclusion of coffee and beer, wine, and hard liquor, as well as cigarettes in the use index. These are possibly use types which are not strongly involved in a teenager's attitude toward the use of street drugs, drug users, and drug use. On the other hand, the possibility is offered that "use," is not solely contingent on "receptivity." It may also have to do with factors such as impulsive behavior, peer pressure sufficient to over-ride low receptivity, etc. In this study, at least, receptivity accounts for only a portion of the variance in use. Further research attention should be directed to this area; and the receptivity-use relationship posited in the theory of use, although partially supported, should receive careful critical attention.

\textsuperscript{12}Even though the data supports the general operation of the theory as presented, it does, itself, serve as a basis for questioning the theories implicit, and at times explicit, conditions that the theoretical sequence operates universally, very powerfully, and in a nearly equivalent manner in reference to all teenagers.
remains, "Why is it not the case that all teenagers use?" The discus-
sion moves to present the argument that the push and pull forces can be
understood as a flow or path from nonuse to use. From there, it is
posited that, for nonusers, the transition or flow from nonuse to use
is effectively interrupted. It is suggested that the institutions of
the family, the church, and the school, for some teenagers, effectively
interrupt the flow from nonuse to use or mediate between the push and
pull forces. The discussion then moves to consider each of these in-
stitutions in terms of use and nonuse.

Focusing on the family, it is seen that family relationships are
an important influence on child development and more specifically on
teenagers. The argument is posited that nonusing teenagers have a more
positive attitude toward their family and feel less alienated from
their family than do using teenagers. These positive attitudes and
relatively low perceived alienation are a function of increased family
stability, higher rapport and better communication among family members,
and so on. In addition, child rearing practices are seen as important
influences in terms of whether or not a teenager becomes a user. From
there, the discussion moves to focus on church and religion. Consider-
ation is of the institution of the church; and it is seen that partici-
pation in church and church activities is higher among nonusing than
among using teenagers. Similarly, a detailed discussion is presented
which suggests that nonusing teenagers hold more positive attitudes
toward church and religion and are more positively oriented to religion
than are using teenagers. The school is then considered as a third
institution effectively mediating between the push and pull forces.
The general argument is presented that nonusing teenagers hold more positive attitudes toward school and feel less alienated from school than do using teenagers. Similarly, nonusing teenagers are more oriented to education and traditional values related to education than are using teenagers. The discussion in reference to the school's function in reference to use-nonuse is continued in terms of a consideration of school policies and their effect in terms of increasing or decreasing teenage use. It is concluded that school policies, per se, probably have little general influence on the problem. Similarly, it is argued that academic achievement, although possibly related to use, is a highly variable and involved area which can only be understood through very complex investigations. In general, however, it is concluded that nonusing teenagers tend to have a more positive orientation to school than do using teenagers.

The overall theory can, then, be succinctly summarized by arguing that there are highly complex networks of push and pull forces which move the individual teenager toward use. For some teenagers, however, the institutions of the family, the church, and school effectively interrupt the flow from nonuse to use.¹³ From here, the discussion

---

¹³The data supports the mediating functions of the family, church, and school as theoretical developed. However, the mediating effect of those institutions in terms of increased activism, or positive attitudes, and decreased alienation, was seen to account for only a small percentage of the variance in use among the teenagers studied.
moves to consider the individual in terms of a complex of characteristics associated with use and nonuse. Focus is turned first to alienation and estrangement and their operation in reference to use. Escapism is then considered as a correlate of use; and the argument is posited that nonusing teenagers have access to and are oriented to alternatives to escapism and use.

Reformulation of Research Focus

At this point, the conceptual process moves to develop a conceptual strategy through which the general theory of use can be empirically tested. The first step is to summarize the general theory of use in terms of what is referred to as "a conceptual synthesis." That synthesis is developed from two perspectives: users and nonusers. For both users and nonusers, emphasis is on the functions and characteristics of the family, church, and school and the relationship between the individual and those institutions. From there, the discussion moves to present several summary propositions which attempt to capture the essence of the differential operation of family, church,

14 Using "attitude" as a measure of orientation to family, church, and school, nonusers were found to be somewhat more oriented to family, church, and school than were users. Using communication with parents and other adults was seen, in the group studied, as a minimally differentiating factor in reference to use and nonuse.

15 The conceptual synthesis in Chapter Three draws very sharp distinctions between users and nonusers in reference to family, church, and school. The data gives support to that synthesis, but does not tend to support, in degree the extreme, clear-cut differences posited between users and nonusers.
and school for users and nonusers. The focal proposition is that these three institutions operate differently for users and nonusers; and that users and nonusers relate differently to those institutions. From there, a theoretical model of use is developed. It is argued that nonusing teenagers hold more positive attitudes toward and feel less alienated from the family, the church, and the school. Further, the argument is introduced that the difference in attitudes and perceived alienation for nonusers and users is a function of institutional activism. "Activism" is defined in terms of the family, church, or school making an active effort or actually doing things to encourage a positive attitude on the part of the teenager and to minimize perceived alienation. The argument is then expanded to suggest that institutional activism leads to a more positive attitude toward that institution which in turn leads to lowered perceived alienation from that institution. From there the argument is expanded to posit that increased institutional activism leads to more positive attitudes toward that institution, which in turn leads to decreased perceived alienation from that institution, in turn leading to decreased receptivity to use and to a decreased probability of use. This general form of the argument is developed and presented in terms of family activism, church activism, and school activism. The result is a theoretical model of use leading from family, church, and school activism through attitudes toward family, church, and school to the level of perceived alienation from family, church, and school, and on to level of receptivity and probability of use.
Hypotheses and Instrumentation

The theoretical model discussed above contains eleven variables and represents an interactive system positing thirty-one relationships. Each of the individual relationships is then presented in hypothesis form resulting in a set of hypotheses relative to family, one relative to church, one relative to school, and a final set which represents the remainder of the relationships involved in the theoretical sequence. These thirty-one hypotheses are, for the sake of convenient reference, referred to as the study's major hypotheses. The eleven variables in the system are, in turn, similarly referred to as major variables.

Given the development of the variables and hypotheses above, focus next turns to the operationalization and measurement of those variables. Measurement of the attitude and alienation variables was managed by converting existing scales measuring community alienation and attitude toward service delivery systems from their original form to a form responsive to the variables at issue. This conversion process is described in detail. Since "activism" is defined as the active effort of an institution to elicit positive attitudes and to minimize perceived alienation, the converted alienation and attitude scales were combined and, in turn, converted to measures of activism. This process is similarly discussed in detail. Receptivity is operationally defined as attitude toward drugs, drug use, and drug users. Given this definition, receptivity is, then, measured with a previously existing scale dealing with attitudes toward drugs, drug use, and drug users. Use is operationalized in terms of type and frequency of use with "type" varying
from coffee to heroin and "frequency" varying from none to extensive.
The teenagers were, then, asked to report the frequency of their use
of each type of drug in reference to a two year and a thirty day time
period. The result of all of this is a set of eleven instruments
especially developed for the measurement of the eleven major variables.

In addition to the eleven variables and associated instruments
discussed above, an extensive set of additional variables was intro-
duced. These variables relate to additional factors operating between
the individual and the school, the individual and his family, and the
individual and the church. In addition, they relate to other demogra-
phic and behavioral characteristics of the individual. These additional
variables were selected based on their relevance to the theory of use,
the overall research effort, and the particular interest of the re-
searcher. Further, they were included based on the ease and feasibil-
ity of measurement within the context of the overall research design.
Once the variables were selected, they were carefully operationalized;
and detailed discussion of their measurement is included. From there,
these variables are presented in hypothetical form. That group of
hypotheses is, for convenient reference, referred to as the study's
minor hypotheses.

Sampling and Data Collection

Once the complete set of hypotheses was developed, each variable
operationalized, and appropriate instrumentation developed, the project
moved to empirically test the hypotheses. The setting for data col-
lection was a large, rural school district in Ohio. An approximately
twelve percent random sample was drawn from the students in the seventh through the twelfth grades. The research instruments were administered on a group basis; and the resulting data is held to be quite good and highly representative of the teenagers within that school system.

Data Analysis and Findings

The first step in analyzing the data involved a scale and item analysis of the scales measuring "activism," "attitude," "alienation," and "receptivity." All of these nine scales were demonstrated to be highly reliable measures of the variable in question. In addition, the item analysis of those scales yielded findings supporting the predictive power of the theoretical model of use. Clearly, the students, as a group, expressed high perceived activism in reference to family, church, and school; positive attitudes toward those institutions, low perceived alienation from those institutions, and low receptivity to use.

An intermediate step was involved as a vehicle for more adequately analyzing and understanding the data. Before the data relative to use could be adequately analyzed, it was necessary to develop a single index of use which takes into account both the type and extent of use in cumulative terms. More specifically, it was necessary to develop an index which could effectively differentiate between non-drug users, teenagers who used only one type of drug, teenagers who used several types of drugs, as well as accounting for high frequencies for some types of use combined with low frequencies for other types of use. Through a fourteen member panel of experts, such an index was developed
which represents a continuous variable from zero to 624 and which takes into account both frequency and type of use. It is felt that this index represents one of the major contributions of the overall research effort. The development and use of this index is, of course, discussed in detail.

When the major and minor variables are considered collectively, the result is a seventy variable system. These were set in a seventy by seventy correlation matrix with r values being computed for each possible relationship. Each hypothesis was then analyzed based on this correlation data.

All thirty-one of the study's major hypotheses were supported by the data. From that, the conclusion is that the theoretical model of use is supported. The correlation analysis combined with the scale analysis discussed above additionally led to the development of an integrating concept: institutional rapport. It was found that activism, attitude, and perceived alienation for family, church, and school, respectively, are highly intercorrelated and, in fact, scale together. The result is that activism, attitude, and alienation can be seen as standing as constructs under the integrating concept "institutional rapport." By combining the activism, attitude, and alienation scales for each institution, a new, highly reliable scale was developed for institutional rapport with family, institutional rapport with church, and institutional rapport with school. This made possible the revision of the original theoretical model. The revised theoretical model then posits that institutional rapport with family, church, and school leads to decreased receptivity, and in turn to a lower probability of use.
The revised theoretical model contains ten relationships. These ten relationships were then set in proposition form and evaluated against the correlation data. That data supports each of those ten propositions. From that, it was concluded that the data confirms the predictive power of the revised theoretical model of use.

In general, the findings include, then, three tests of the predictive power of the theory of use and of the resulting model of use developed in Chapter Two: the scale analysis, the evaluation of the original theoretical model of use, and the evaluation of the revised theoretical model of use. All three tests positively support the conclusion that the theory of use and the derived model of use represent useful tools for research in the area of teenage drug use, and that both the theory and derived models have predictive power. The report concludes by presenting two additional sets of findings. First, the variables dealing with particular characteristics of the teenagers involved in the study as well as specific behaviors and activities of those teenagers are correlated with institutional rapport with family, institutional rapport with church, institutional rapport with school, receptivity, and use. The results of that analysis are presented both in terms of the actual correlation data and in terms of a series of propositions supported by that data. Finally, the report concludes by presenting a series of miscellaneous propositions supported by the data but not considered elsewhere in the report. This final set of propositions involves the relationships between different kinds of activities, behavior, and characteristics of the respondents.
Conclusions and Implications for Further Research

Throughout the body of this report, emphasis has been placed on both the conclusions which may appropriately be drawn from the research and on the implications of various aspects of this study for future research. In this final section, the intent is to enumerate a few of the major conclusions and implications of this research for purposes of emphasis and specific focus.

1. The overall development and design of the project and especially the process leading to that design is strongly recommended to other researchers. The first step in that process is to very carefully define the nature and scope of the problem being studied. Next, development of a well formulated question which, at a fairly abstract level, gets to the essence of the problem is crucial. With the question having been stated in the form, "What accounts for . . . ?", careful development of a theory accounting for the phenomena in question is essential. That theory ideally starts at a general, macroscopic level and gradually moves down to causality in reference to the question at issue. This conceptual process, then, allows for the development of appropriate models of causality which predict the phenomena in question from a well defined set of antecedent events or conditions. From there, careful definition and operationalization of the variables in the model can follow. Once this step has taken place, careful development of adequate instrumentation and selection of an appropriate population for empirical investigation is important. If the overall process has been carefully followed to this point and through data collection, the researcher is "home free." Careful analysis of the data and reporting of the findings concludes an undoubtedly valuable step in the process of knowledge building.

2. The study supports the predictive power of the theory of use here developed and of both the original and revised models of use derived

---

When considering the conclusions and implications of this research, the reader will want to give special attention to the several footnotes in the preceding section—"summary"—of this chapter.
from that theory. Both the theory and the revised theoretical model of use are recommended to other researchers for further refinement and continuing articulation. When using the theory and model, however, researchers are cautioned to understand that the revised model of use accounts for only part of the variance in use. It is clear that new models must be developed which explore additional causal systems in reference to use. From the theory, peer group and youth culture involvement and influences have clear potential for fruitful investigations. If such additional models are developed and supported, they should, in turn, be incorporated with the present model, resulting in an expanded rather than new model of use.

3. The index of use developed in this study is a clearly useful tool for measuring the complex phenomena of teenage drug use. Hopefully, future research will give specific focus to further use and refinement of that index.

4. Carefully following the research process discussed above led to the development of a new and valuable concept: "institutional rapport." Initially, activism, attitude, and alienation were seen as linked but essentially separate concepts. Careful attention to the overall analytic process and to the scale analysis process in particular proved to be an especially fruitful effort. The result raises the suggestion that other researchers carefully consider the possibility of combining potentially interrelated scales during the process of scale analysis if for no other reason than that they may, through that effort, develop new integrating concepts such as "institutional rapport." This would, of course, be quite significant especially in terms of increased understanding of the resulting conceptual system including the new integrating concept and the network of constructs falling under it.

5. The twelve item receptivity scale proved to be an especially valuable tool for measuring attitude toward drugs, drug users, and drug use. In addition, the use index and the scales measuring institutional rapport with family, church, and school proved to be highly reliable and convenient measures of those phenomena. Each of these instruments is, then, recommended to other researchers.

6. In his addendum to the first edition of The New Industrial State, Galbraith makes the point that written communication is a bilateral process. It is the writer’s responsibility to convey his material as clearly and completely as his abilities allow. It is, then, the reader’s responsibility to more than casually consider what is written. He—the reader—holds an equal responsibility with the writer to actively work at trying to understand what is being said. After carefully reconsidering this report, it is concluded that the writer’s responsibility has been met; and the reader is enjoined to meet his responsibility in the compact between writer and reader.
(Note) The reader's attention is directed to Appendix Five—
"In Retrospect"—to complete his consideration of this report.
APPENDIX ONE

THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT
SURVEY OF TEENAGERS AND THEIR ATTITUDES

These days lots of people have ideas about what teenagers think, do, and feel. The problem is that too often no one bothers to stop and ask teenagers like you about these things. That's why we want to take this time to ask you. We are going to ask about several different kinds of things like church, school, drugs, family, things you do and feel, and so on. We think that these kinds of things may have something to do with each other. Answering the questions probably won't benefit you directly, but it may really help us help other kids who want and need help.

After you have finished, we will put everyone's answers together to see what you and the other kids think. There is no way we can tell which answers are yours. - NO WAY - So please be honest about your answers, and be sure to answer every question. This usually takes kids about forty minutes.

Thank you for helping!
ABOUT SCHOOL

The statements in this part have to do with school. Under each statement are several possible answers. Put a check mark (✓) beside the answer which best fits how you feel about the particular statement. If you aren't sure how to do it, ask the person who handed out the papers.

1. Most of the teachers at my school really try to get to know their students.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

2. In some way, most of the adults at my school really act like they care about what happens to me.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

3. If I were sick for a few days, most of the teachers at my school would try to help me catch up on my work.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

4. When I do well at something most of my teachers let me know that they are proud of me.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

5. Most of my teachers find some way to let me know they are happy to have me in their class.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree
6. My school does not try very hard to see to it that I get the kind of education I need.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

7. My teachers try hard to do a good job.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

8. A lot of things happen at school to make me feel good about school.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

9. No one at school would try to help if I had a special problem of some kind.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

10. I think most kids would like my school.
    (A) - Strongly agree
     (B) - Agree
     (C) - Undecided
     (D) - Disagree
     (E) - Strongly disagree

11. School is very important to me.
    (A) - Strongly agree
     (B) - Agree
     (C) - Undecided
     (D) - Disagree
     (E) - Strongly disagree

12. I have good teachers at my school.
    (A) - Strongly agree
     (B) - Agree
     (C) - Undecided
     (D) - Disagree
     (E) - Strongly disagree
13. I feel good about my school.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

14. I trust most people at my school.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

15. No one can agree about anything at my school.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

16. Many people at my school are unfriendly.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

17. I often share things of mine with other kids at school.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

18. Most kids at my school will get the kind of education they need.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

19. Basically, the education a kid gets at my school is pretty poor.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree
ABOUT FAMILY

So far, so good. We are about to switch topics. The next bunch of statements are about family. Do these the same way. Check the answer which best fits how you feel about it.

20. In my home, everyone really tries to make me feel a part of things.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

21. Everyone at my home makes an effort to be friendly toward me most of the time.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

22. People in my family don't do much to make me feel like I belong.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

23. If I need some help, someone at my home would go out of their way to help me.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

24. I can tell for sure that my family would miss me if I weren't there.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

25. My family tries hard to see that I have what I need.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree
26. My family would try to help a friend of mine if they needed help.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

27. No one at my home would care much if I were upset about things at home.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

28. My family gives me about everything I need.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

29. Most kids would like living with my family.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

30. My home is a good place to grow up in.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

31. I really like my family.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

32. My family helps me a lot.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree
33. In my family we all pretty well know how everyone thinks and feels.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

34. I care about what happens to my family.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

35. I would go out of my way to help a member of my family if they were sick.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

36. I am proud when someone in my family does well at something.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

37. I don't feel like I'm wanted in my family.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

38. I usually can not count on my family to be there when I need them.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree
ABOUT DRUGS

Check your answers like you did for the ones you have already done.

39. Some street drugs are good.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

40. Feeling lonely is a good reason for using some street drugs.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

41. Marijuana is a waste of money.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

42. To feel better is a good reason for using marijuana.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Strongly disagree

43. Marijuana is wonderful.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

44. Feeling overwhelmed is a good reason for using some drugs.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree
45. Street drugs are bad.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

46. To feel wanted is a good reason for using marijuana.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

47. Marijuana can help a person understand things better.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

48. People who use street drugs are losers.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

49. Street drugs are terrible.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

50. People who use marijuana are reckless.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree
ABOUT CHURCH

These statements are about church. Check what you think.

51. Most people at church try hard to be honest and trustworthy.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

52. People at church are willing to listen to me and try to understand my ideas.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

53. People at church are not very friendly to me.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

54. If I really need something, there are people at church who would gladly loan it to me if they had it.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

55. There are lots of people at church who really try to help me.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

56. People at church try to let me know they care about me.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree
57. No one at church would go out of their way to make me feel welcome.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

58. Most people at church try hard to set a good example.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

59. My friends would be welcomed at my church.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

60. Church helps me get along better.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

61. I think all teenagers should go to church.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

62. I have good feelings about church.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

63. Church has helped me to know God.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree
64. People at church really care about each other.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

65. People at church are friendly.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

66. I feel like I have never been a part of a church.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

67. If they had a project at church I would be happy to help
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

68. When someone at church moves away almost everyone misses them.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree

69. Church helps meet a lot of my needs.
   (A) - Strongly agree
   (B) - Agree
   (C) - Undecided
   (D) - Disagree
   (E) - Strongly disagree
ABOUT YOU

The important thing to remember is that there is no way anyone can tell which answers are yours. Your honest help may help some other kids. Just check the box which best fits you.

How many times have you tried each of the following things in the last two years?

70. Drinking coffee
   (A) – I've never tried it
   (B) – One time
   (C) – Two to five times
   (D) – Six to ten times
   (E) – Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) – Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) – Fifty-one or more times

71. Popping pills: uppers or downers
   (A) – I've never tried it
   (B) – One time
   (C) – Two to five times
   (D) – Six to ten times
   (E) – Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) – Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) – Fifty-one or more times

72. Going to church
   (A) – I've never tried it
   (B) – One time
   (C) – Two to five times
   (D) – Six to ten times
   (E) – Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) – Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) – Fifty-one or more times

73. Smoking cigarettes
   (A) – I've never tried it
   (B) – One time
   (C) – Two to five times
   (D) – Six to ten times
   (E) – Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) – Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) – Fifty-one or more times
74. Skipping school
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

75. Praying
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

76. Smoking marijuana
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

77. Being in extraschool activities
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

78. Shooting up Speed or heroin
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times
79. Drinking beer or wine
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

80. Sniffing glue or stuff like that
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

81. Going to school plays, ball games, etc.
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

82. Drinking hard liquor: whiskey, etc.
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

83. Being in a church activity
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times
84. Dropping acids: LSD, etc.
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

85. Trying to kill yourself
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

86. Talking to your mother about a personal problem
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

87. Talking to your father about a personal problem
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

88. Running away or leaving home
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times
Now, then think about the last month. How many times have you tried each of the following things during the last month?

89. Drinking coffee
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

90. Popping pills: uppers or downers
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

91. Going to church
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

92. Smoking cigarettes
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

93. Skipping school
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times
21. Praying
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

22. Smoking marijuana
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

23. Being in extraschool activities
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

24. Shooting up Speed or heroin
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

25. Drinking beer or wine
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times
99. Sniffing glue or stuff like that
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

100. Going to school plays, ball games, etc.
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

101. Drinking hard liquor: whiskey, etc.
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

102. Being in a church activity
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

103. Dropping acid: LSD, etc.
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times
104. Trying to kill yourself
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

105. Talking to your mother about a personal problem
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

106. Talking to your father about a personal problem
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

107. Running away or leaving home
   (A) - I've never tried it
   (B) - One time
   (C) - Two to five times
   (D) - Six to ten times
   (E) - Eleven to twenty-five times
   (F) - Twenty-six to fifty times
   (G) - Fifty-one or more times

108. How old are you?  
     ____ years

109. Are you male or female?  
     ____ Male
     ____ Female

110. How many different places do you recall having lived?  
     ____ places

111. How many different school have you attended?  
     ____ schools
112. Who do you live with? (Check only one.)
   (A) - My natural mother and natural father
   (B) - Adoptive parents
   (C) - Stepmother and natural father
   (D) - Natural mother and stepfather
   (E) - With just one parent
   (F) - With a relative other than my parents
   (G) - In a foster home or children's home
   (H) - None of these fits my situation

113. How many brothers and sisters do you have?

114. How many of your brothers and sisters are older than you?

We are just about finished. There are just a few more questions about your activities during the last week. During the last week, about how many hours have you spent doing each of these things?

115. Watching T.V.
   (A) - Less than one hour
   (B) - One or two hours
   (C) - Three to five hours
   (D) - Six to ten hours
   (E) - Eleven to fifteen hours
   (F) - Sixteen to twenty hours
   (G) - Twenty-one or more hours

116. Talking with adults
   (A) - Less than one hour
   (B) - One or two hours
   (C) - Three to five hours
   (D) - Six to ten hours
   (E) - Eleven to fifteen hours
   (F) - Sixteen to twenty hours
   (G) - Twenty-one or more hours

117. Studying
   (A) - Less than one hour
   (B) - One or two hours
   (C) - Three to five hours
   (D) - Six to ten hours
   (E) - Eleven to fifteen hours
   (F) - Sixteen to twenty hours
   (G) - Twenty-one or more hours
118. Listening to records and music
   (A) - Less than one hour
   (B) - One or two hours
   (C) - Three to five hours
   (D) - Six to ten hours
   (E) - Eleven to fifteen hours
   (F) - Sixteen to twenty hours
   (G) - Twenty-one or more hours

119. Out with my friends
   (A) - Less than one hour
   (B) - One or two hours
   (C) - Three to five hours
   (D) - Six to ten hours
   (E) - Eleven to fifteen hours
   (F) - Sixteen to twenty hours
   (G) - Twenty-one or more hours

120. Talking on the telephone
   (A) - Less than one hour
   (B) - One or two hours
   (C) - Three to five hours
   (D) - Six to ten hours
   (E) - Eleven to fifteen hours
   (F) - Sixteen to twenty hours
   (G) - Twenty-one or more hours

121. Working other than for school
   (A) - Less than one hour
   (B) - One or two hours
   (C) - Three to five hours
   (D) - Six to ten hours
   (E) - Eleven to fifteen hours
   (F) - Sixteen to twenty hours
   (G) - Twenty-one or more hours

122. Doing drugs
   (A) - Less than one hour
   (B) - One or two hours
   (C) - Three to five hours
   (D) - Six to ten hours
   (E) - Eleven to fifteen hours
   (F) - Sixteen to twenty hours
   (G) - Twenty-one or more hours
123. Trying to think up something to do
   (A) - Less than one hour
   (B) - One or two hours
   (C) - Three to five hours
   (D) - Six to ten hours
   (E) - Eleven to fifteen hours
   (F) - Sixteen to twenty hours
   (G) - Twenty-one or more hours

124. Working on hobbies
   (A) - Less than one hour
   (B) - One or two hours
   (C) - Three to five hours
   (D) - Six to ten hours
   (E) - Eleven to fifteen hours
   (F) - Sixteen to twenty hours
   (G) - Twenty-one or more hours
APPENDIX TWO

COMMUNITY ALIENATION SCALE
INSTRUCTIONS

Please circle the letter or letters which show what you think about each of the following statements.

SA = Strongly agree   A = Agree   U = Undecided
D = Disagree          SD = Strongly disagree
COMMUNITY ALIENATION SCALE

Likert Items: Strongly agree to strongly disagree

1. I know most people in this community quite well.
2. The people in this community are like one big, happy family.
3. I trust most people in this community.
4. I am concerned about what happens to this community.
5. Most people in this community are friendly to my family.
6. No one can agree on anything in this community.
7. When someone in the community is sick, I will stop what I am doing to help him.
8. I feel that I have never been a part of this community.
9. Many people in this community are unfriendly.
10. I take pride in the success of a neighbor.
11. When a neighbor needs help in a job, I am happy to lend him a hand.
12. I often share tools with my neighbors.
13. I do not feel that I am wanted in this community.
14. When someone leaves this neighborhood, nearly everyone feels a loss.
15. Most people are not able to buy the things they need in the stores in this community.
16. We often have to go to surrounding towns to get the things we need.
17. The services of this community basically satisfy my needs.
18. Basically, the services in this community are pretty poor.
19. Most people have to do without many services in this community.
20. I can get most of the things I need in this community or in the stores close by.
EVALUATION SCALE - SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEMS

Likert Items - Definitely yes to definitely no

1. Are the Clinic's services helpful?
2. Would you refer someone who needs help to the Clinic?
3. Do you think the Clinic does a good job?
4. Do you have a good opinion of the Clinic?
APPENDIX FOUR

72 ITEM DRUG ATTITUDE SCALE
72 ITEM DRUG ATTITUDE SCALE

Likert Items - Strongly agree to strongly disagree

1. To relieve tension is a good reason for using marijuana.
2. People who use soft drugs tend to be well-adjusted.
3. People who use prescription drugs enjoy life.
4. Hard drugs are a waste of money.
5. People who use alcohol tend to be well-adjusted.
6. People who use hard drugs are tolerant of others.
7. Glue and stuff is terrible.
8. People who use soft drugs are good citizens.
9. People who use marijuana are really stupid.
10. Feeling lonely is a good reason for using alcohol.
11. People who use marijuana are tolerant of others.
12. People who sniff glue and stuff are good citizens.
13. Prescription drugs are a waste of money.
14. Soft drugs expand the mind.
15. Marijuana is a drag.
16. Feeling hopeless is a good reason for using hard drugs.
17. Alcohol is terrible.
18. People who use hard drugs enjoy life.
19. People who use prescription drugs are tolerant of others.
20. Hard drugs can help a person understand things better.
21. Soft drugs are good.
22. To feel wanted is a good reason for using prescription drugs.
23. People who use hard drugs are reckless.
24. **Marijuana** is wonderful.
25. Glue and stuff expand the mind.
26. To feel better is a good reason for using **hard drugs**.
27. Feeling overwhelmed is a good reason for sniffing **glue and stuff**.
28. Coming from a broken home is a good reason for using **alcohol**.
29. Feeling hopeless is a good reason for using **marijuana**.
30. **Prescription drugs** can help a person understand things better.
31. People who use **alcohol** are losers.
32. Feeling inadequate is a good reason for sniffing **glue and stuff**.
33. **Marijuana** is a waste of money.
34. People who use **prescription drugs** are reckless.
35. **Alcohol** is good.
36. People who use **marijuana** enjoy life.
37. People who use **alcohol** are good citizens.
38. People who sniff **glue and stuff** are inadequate.
39. Feeling lonely is a good reason for using **soft drugs**.
40. **Alcohol** expands the mind.
41. Feeling overwhelmed is a good reason for using **soft drugs**.
42. To feel wanted is a good reason for using **hard drugs**.
43. People who sniff **glue and stuff** tend to be well-adjusted.
44. Some **prescription drugs** are wonderful.
45. **Hard drugs** are a drag.
46. To feel better is a good reason for using **marijuana**.
47. **Alcohol** is bad.
48. People who use **hard drugs** are really stupid.
49. To feel wanted is a good reason for using **marijuana**.
50. To relieve tension is a good reason for using hard drugs.
51. People who use alcohol are inadequate.
52. People who sniff glue and stuff are losers.
53. Feeling inadequate is a good reason for using alcohol.
54. Soft drugs are bad.
55. Feeling hopeless is a good reason for using prescription drugs.
56. Feeling inadequate is a good reason for using soft drugs.
57. Marijuana can help a person understand things better.
58. Prescription drugs are a drag.
59. Coming from a broken home is a good reason for using soft drugs.
60. Glue and stuff is bad.
61. People who use soft drugs are losers.
62. To relieve tension is a good reason for using prescription drugs.
63. Soft drugs are terrible.
64. Feeling overwhelmed is a good reason for using alcohol.
65. Feeling lonely is a good reason for sniffing glue and stuff.
66. People who use soft drugs are inadequate.
67. Glue and stuff are good.
68. Some hard drugs are wonderful.
69. People who use prescription drugs are really stupid.
70. Coming from a broken home is a good reason for sniffing glue and stuff.
71. To feel better is a good reason for using prescription drugs.
72. People who use marijuana are reckless.
APPENDIX FIVE

IN RETROSPECT
In General

I suppose every researcher has a real feeling of satisfaction when his project is finished and the final report is ready for the typist. At the same time, there is always that uneasy feeling resulting from knowing all too well that the research has real limitations and weaknesses. The study is quite good; but ... And it is that "but" which prompts me to offend these retrospective observations. I have opted to be my first critic. As such, and not without recognized bias, let me characterize my critique as focusing on the strengths and limitations of the study.

The Drug Problem

In Chapter One, the Drug Problem is defined as international in scope and is posited as involving—in a substantial way—nearly all teenagers in all areas of the United States. This research does not, support that definition of the problem's scope. In the rural Ohio school district studied, drug use was quite low during the thirty days prior to data collection. Figure Four shows the percent of users—use rate—for each type of drug as well as the mean extent of use completed, for each use type, on a scale from 0—no use— to 6—using 51 or more times. As is clear from that figure, both the use rates and the extent of use are quite low. From these findings, it is seen that at
least one school system has a rather minimal drug problem. Two points follow: first, any school planning to expend significant resources on their drug problem should take care to be sure that they have a significant problem. The school studied does not; and second, the low use rate within the sample meant that there was very little variance in the dependent variable—use. The effect is, of course, that minor fluctuations in the independent variables as well as some multilinearity in those variables could adversely affect the correlation analyses. The point is that the major hypotheses should be reconsidered using a population with substantially more variance in use.

FIGURE THREE

THIRTY DAY EXTENT AND RATE OF USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Drug</th>
<th>Extent of Use</th>
<th>Use Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popping Pills</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarettes</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed or Heroin</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer or Wine</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glue, etc.</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Liquor</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acid, LSD, etc.</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Theory of Use

Let me emphasize the fact that the theory of use in Chapter Two resulted from reviewing the drug literature, extracting those factors related to use, and organizing those factors into a coherent theory. That theory, then, represents the present state of knowledge in reference to use. As presented, the theory is basically strong, but reflects some tendency to "force" categories and thus to oversimplify some areas such as social influences and community factors. Similarly, the theoretical movement from the macro to the micro is a little jerky. This leads to dropping some important factors while losing some of the richness in others. This should be given special attention when developing further hypotheses in future research.

As I reconsider the theory, and keep in mind that 80% of the variance in use is left unexplained by this research, two possible causal areas catch my attention. First, is the idea of "waves" of drug abuse. This would involve consideration of epidemiology and diffusion. Second, I would attend closely to differential patterns of teenagers handling and responding to peer pressure.

Instruments

The instruments used are quite good; and the "conversion process" represents a useful innovation. The "rapport" scale incorporates significant multilinearity, however. In this respect, they need much attention and refinement before using them further. The use index needs further work especially in terms of the horizontal axis. Also
Coffee should be dropped; and the clustering seen in Figure Four should be used as a conceptual clue for further work on the index.

**FIGURE FOUR**

**CLUSTERING PATTERN OF USE TYPES:** LINES CONNECT USE TYPES RELATED AT $r = .50$ OR GREATER

---

As Figure Four shows; cigarettes, beer or wine, hard liquor, and marijuana are linked. Marijuana is also linked separately to pills, and to acid which are not linked to each other. Glue, etc. and speed and heroin are only linked to each other; and coffee is clearly separate.
A Final Note

The study is basically strong; and the limitations above serve more to focus and define its contribution than anything else. As a final comment, the single most important and useful result of the research is that many significant relationships were found, but that they were quite weak. This brings under suspicion all "drug knowledge" which posits significant relationship without careful review of the strength of those relationships. It is clear that present theory does not help much when trying to understand the rather slight drug problem in the school system studied.
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