PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS

OF

PROTESTING AND NON-PROTESTING STUDENTS

A Thesis

Submitted to

The Department of Psychology

University of Cape Town

In Fulfilment

of the requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

by

Elisha Davar

November, 1973

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following people for their assistance and support: Firstly my acknowledgements are due to Dr H.I.J. van der Spuy, my thesis supervisor, for his guidance and direction, Mark Schijf for his assistance with statistics, Zafra and Gael for their support and encouragement, and finally the students who made this study possible.

I would also like to acknowledge the financial assistance of the U.C.T. Postgraduate research scholarship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PART II: THE PRESENT STUDY

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF PROTESTING AND NON-PROTESTING STUDENTS

Elisha Davar

A sample of 68 protesting and 76 non-protesting students of the University of Cape Town were compared on the following scales; The 16 P.F., F scale, I-E scale, Keniston's Alienation scale and a questionnaire constructed by the investigator. It was hypothesised that protesting students were psychologically more adequate than non-protesting students and various questionnaires were used to validate the general hypothesis. Protesting students tended to be more psychologically adequate within a humanistic paradigm of mental health while non-protesting students were more adequate within a more conventional mental health paradigm. Reasons were put forward for considering the humanistic paradigm more appropriate and the findings of this study and implications within both paradigms were used towards generating a theory of protest.

Introduction

The rise of student activism in this decade has interested many social scientists and a variety of perspectives have been employed to examine this phenomenon. Within a sociological perspective Flacks (1967, 1969) and Lipset (1970) have tended to account for the rise of student activism in terms of this disjunction between past familial expectations and present social realities. Viewed within a psychological perspective student activism could be seen not only as an attempt to reconcile the discrepancies between egalitarian backgrounds and a more unjust impersonal social system, but as fostering identity formation by applying moral values taught in childhood to the broader social environment (Keniston, 1967).

Conversely Bettelheim (1969) viewed student activism as aberrant behaviour which did not promote identity formation but was rather a projection of unresolved aggressive urges and enormous inner doubts, loneliness and self hatred.

Thus two views regarding activism emerge. There were those theorists who regarded it as growth in the direction of sound psychological identity formation while other theorists regarded it as symptomatic of unresolved parental conflicts which were projected onto the society. An attempt was made to reconcile these divergent points of view bearing in mind that the findings would be very susceptible to the investigator's bias.

It was hypothesised that protesting students would be emotionally more adequate that non-protesting students. This would be demonstrable by their being more intelligent, sensitive, flexible, independent, expressive of their own urges, less rulebound, more anxious and more culturally alienated than non-protesting students.

Method

Subjects:

Initially a sample comprising 100 protesting and 100 non-protesting students was recruited for participation in the study. E went up to students in the students' union and outside the union during their lunchbreak and explained to them that he was doing a survey on the personality characteristics of protesting and non-protesting students and asked for participants. There were very few refusals. Nine protesting students and seven non-protesting students refused to participate in the study and all of these students said they could not afford the time as they had too much work to do. Those students who participated in

the study took the questionnaires home with them and were given approximately two weeks to complete them. E explained to Ss that they had to complete at least one questionnaire per session under conditions of minimal noise and strict privacy. By the end of the two weeks period 68 protesting Ss and 76 non-protesting Ss had completed their questionnaires and these formed the basis of the sample used to collate the findings.

The criterion employed for distinguishing between protesting and non-protesting students was the following:-

Protesting students were defined as those students who had taken part in protest on at least two occasions on which protest over an issue had taken place. However, first year students who did not have the opportunity to participate in protests prior to attending university were included in the sample if they had been involved in the protests that had recently taken place.

Non-protesting students were defined as those students who had never taken part in any form of public protest or demonstration.

Tests Administered:

16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (16 P.F.)

F scale

I-E scale

Keniston's Alienation Scale.

A questionnaire designed by E examining perceptions of the home environment, personal and social relationships, and attitudes towards society.

Results:

Protesting students were found to be significantly more assertive, expedient, experimenting, prone to undisciplined self conflict and independent on the 16 P.F. They were significantly less authoritarian on the F scale. No significant differences were found on the I-E scale. On Keniston's alienation scale protesting students were significantly more alienated on the item measuring cultural alienation. On the investigator's questionnaire protesring students reported significantly greater difficulty on items measuring adaptation to society and parental control.

Discussion

The results of this study are believed to support the general hypothesis that protesting students tend to be more emotionally adequate than non-protesting students. However, as the construction placed upon the results determines the perspective within which the results are viewed, it is important to use some external frame of reference within which to examine the results.

Within a humanistic model of mental health it is believed that protesting students are more adequate as they tend to approximate the major characteristics of the self-actualising person more closely than non-protesting students. Protesting students' greater assertiveness, independence, experimentation, expressiveness of their own urges, a lesser degree of being rulebound and authoritarian, were viewed as indicating a greater trend towards mastery, autonomy, openness, spontaneity and self actualisation coupled with a resistance to naive enculturation of the dominant social values.

However, within a more conventional paradigm of mental health, protesting students could be viewed as less adequate than non-protesting students, their protest being symptomatic of unresolved emotional crises. Their significantly greater impulsiveness and trend towards sensitivity could be due to pampering backgrounds fostering a large degree of emotional dependency and poor ego development. Furthermore their significantly greater degree of cultural alienation could be viewed as lack of adaptiveness to their social situation while their report of more discordant parental relationships could be a further indication of poor adjustment with a residue of parental conflicts which were manifested in protest.

The interpretation of the findings within a more conventional mental health paradigm was felt to be unsatisfactory as protesting students were significantly more independent and did not display significantly greater anxiety, thus making it dubious that their unresolved emotional crises were major determinants of their protesting behaviour. Furthermore, the more conventional mental health paradigm does not take sufficient cognizance of psycho-social factors as determinants of behaviour. For these reasons it was felt that the humanistic model was a more appropriate and valid index of mental health.

The possibility of interpreting these results within alternative mental health paradigms leading to totally contradictory conclusions, highlights certain theoretical problems which limit the scope of this study.

For instance, the emotional adequacy of protesting students could not be demonstrated per se as the findings were subject to interpretation within some sort of mental health model based upon certain

philosophical assumptions about the nature of the sane man. Nevertheless, given these limitations it is still possible to offer reasons as to why the findings and implications within one paradigm have greater validity and plausibility than those in another paradigm.

Then the looseness of terminology both within Cattell's multifactor trait theory and within the humanistic orientation makes it difficult to ascertain on theoretical grounds to what extent there is a correspondence of concepts within both systems, and what sorts of accretions or diminutions in meaning occur in translating findings based on one theory into the language system and ideas of another.

Despite these theoretical limitations and difficulties it was felt that there was sufficient justification to assert that protesting students were inclined to be more psychologically adequate than non-protesting students. These findings support the views adopted by Bay (1967), Block, Haan and Smith (1969), Flacks (1967), Lipset (1969), Trent and Craise (1967), and Whittaker and Watts (1971).

Finally, with regard to the rise of activism in South Africa and a general theory of activism this study suggests that the most crucial psychological variable which helped to determine activism was parental child rearing practices. Despite both protesting and non-protesting students being exposed to similar conformity-oriented political and social influences, protesting students' parents tended to be critical of conforming to authority and expressed this attitude through their child rearing practices. This involved being more tolerant of less rulebound and more independent and impulsive behaviour. This probably acted as counter conditioning to the broader cultural conditioning and was a very important determinant of activism.

Finally in trying to generate a theory of activism it was felt that both paradigms of mental health could be applied at different levels of analysis. For instance on the conscious level, protesting students were felt to be spontaneously expressing moral values in which they implicitly believed, while on a more unconscious level they may have been impulsively aggressing at symbols of authority and mechanisms of control and been unable to contain or limit their aggressive urges. Consequently it was felt that protesting students were developing their identity in opposition to accepted cultural values, which would lead to further self definition, while non-protesting students were more likely to develop their identity by sublimating their aggressive urges against mechanisms implementing social control and forming a collective identity aligned with the values and attitude of authority figures.

References:

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

Bettelheim, B. Obsolete Youth: Towards a Psychograph of Adolescent Rebellion. Encounter, September, 1969, 33, 29-42

Block, J.H., Haan, N. and Smith, M.B. Socialisation correlates of student activism. The Journal of Social Issues, 1969 25 (4), 143-177.

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

Flacks, R. Social and Cultural meanings of Student Revolt: Some informal comparative observations. Social Problems, 1969, 17, 340-357.

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

Lipset, S.M. American Student Activism in Comparative Perspective. American Psychologist, 1970, 25, 675-693.

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

Whittaker, D. and Watts, W.A. Personality Characteristics associated with Activism and Disaffiliation in today's college-age youth. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18 (3), 200-206.

PART I

GENERAL BACKGROUND TO THE PRESENT STUDY

A. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

A.1. Introduction

Social scientists have shown a great deal of interest in the current student protest movements. Psychologists have investigated the personality characteristics and backgrounds of both protesting and non-protesting students and have evaluated their results in terms of various concepts of mental health. This has led to opposing viewpoints concerning the emotional adequacy of protesting students; and in this study some sort of clarification of this contentious issue is attempted in the light of current conceptions of mental health.

Prior to assessing the emotional adequacy of protesting students, it is necessary to broadly define some of their characteristics. This entails specification of both the level of analysis (sociological, psychological) and the unit of analysis (group, individual), since differing levels and units of analysis yield information that may be interpreted differently depending on the context.

In this study, although the primary level of analysis is psychological, there is a broad overlap with a sociological level of analysis, so that the defining characteristics of protesting students will be viewed from both sociological and psychological perspectives.

A.2. Activism within a Sociological Perspective

Probably the most obvious manner of viewing student activism or student protesting activity is to regard it as falling within the category of social movements.

Turner and Killian (1957 p.308) define a social movement as a collectivity acting with some continuity to promote a change or resist a change.

As a collectivity it has the following properties. It is a group with indefinite and shifting membership with a leadership whose position is determined more by the informal response of the members than by formal procedures for legitimising authority.

In terms of continuity the movements objective must require sustained activity, a movement strategy, some continuity in division of function with some stability of leadership and other roles, and some sense of group identity so that even with rapid turnover of large portions of the membership the sense of group continuity prevails.

Hans Toch cited in Sampson (1967 p.29) suggests that the key elements which movements have are as follows:-

a) relatively long lasting groups

b) arise spontaneously

c) a clear programme of purpose

d) aimed at correcting, supplementing, overthrowing or in some manner influencing the social order

e) a collective effort that many people feel they have in common.

It is possible to use these two definitions of social movements as frames of reference within which to view student activism with qualification, because the extent to which student activist movements may be subsumed under social movements is debatable. Furthermore, the extent to which the activist movement is collective or continuous is also a matter of conjecture.

For instance Lipset (1969) mentions that the majority of students in all countries where opinion data are available claim to be politically inactive or moderate in their views. So students as a corporate group cannot be subsumed as a social movement or body desiring to promote change.

Furthermore, Lipset indicates that the activist group have a small membership. In America out of a total student population of seven million the American New Left Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) claims a total dues-paying membership of seven thousand with approximately twenty-five thousand participants in local activities. Thus these figures suggest that the student activist movement comprises less than 1% of the total American student population. However, as there are other student bodies involved in protest, the percentage poll is probably higher.

Beichman (1969) cites a survey which indicated that while the number of activist organisations had almost doubled in the last three years, the percentage of activists had remained approximately 2% of some seven million students. An additional 8-10% was described as strongly sympathetic to the movement for social change and capable of temporary activation depending on the issues.

This raises the issue of the extent to which student activism may be validly thought of as a social movement.

The investigator believes it may not be assumed to be a typical social movement since it hardly claims widespread allegiance, even among students, so that categorising it as a "social movement"is slightly inaccurate. Its dirth does not encompass a sufficient following to be thought of as a social movement.

Nevertheless Turner and Killian (1957, p.321) suggest that the only true basis of assessment of social movements is in terms of structure and function; and the student activist movement does embrace some sort of loose structure and can be viewed in terms of its stated function and the functions it serves in terms of some broader sociological theory, so that it does fulfil the most important criteria of being classified as a social movement.

For instance on the structural level Wight Bakke (1967, p.56) notes that all student activist movements are characterised by some sort of central organisation with followers and leaders; and all engage in some form of group activity. Thus the basic structure of student activism does involve a core organisational framework with initiating activists who act as leaders and some sort of diffuse and shifting following.

In terms of function, all student activists movements attempt some form of political change. Flacks (1967, p.59) mentions that student activist movements function to promote a change so that the disjunction between the values and role expectations created within the nucleus and family, and the values and expectations in the occupational sphere in the society, are lessened.

Thus to some extent student activist movements do meet the criteria of being characterised as a social movement since they do have some sort of loose organisational and social structure, and function in order to lessen the disjunction between perceived expectancies and real societal possibilities.

The extent to which the student activist movement may be termed continuous is also an issue of speculation. Sampson (1967) suggests

the movement, with its fairly variable membership and shift of leaders, seems to have the properties of collectivity but its continuity is debatable.

Although Flacks (1967) and Sampson suggest that the SDS is a continuous organisation on a national scale, Sampson indicates that there appear to be scattered groups which include the various civil rights groups, the peace groups, the SDS and others who occasionally manage to congregate their efforts for major protests, teach-ins or marches but afterwards seem to disintegrate, so that no enduring continuous organisational structure seems to be maintained. Sampson indicates that the continuity of the movement is based largely on the perception or belief shared among activist and alienated youth that a movement exists with a commonly shared set of values to which today's youth subscribe, rather than on any definable movement with a specific organisation and aim.

Thus the movement seems to lack continuity as it congregates in response to specific issues and then seems to diffuse; but in an informal sense, some sort of continuity prevails in terms of the perception of a movement with a common set of values.

Thus in summary, student activism was categorised under social movements in order to examine it. As a social movement it could be characterised more in terms of function than structure. It appeared to meet the formal criterion of collectivity but could not be characterised as continuous without some doubt. However, in an informal sense, the criterion of continuity seemed to be met, as activists perceived themselves to be part of a loose movement even if it is less obvious than other social movements in society.

The investigator believes that it is valuable to subsume student activism within the category of social movements since all the major criteria specified are met to some extent. Student activism may be seen as a movement with various goals. It does incorporate collective behaviour and in a loose way can be said to display continuity.

However, while it may loosely be categorised as a social movement, the student activist movement has certain unique features.

For instance, social movements are characterised by motives of self-interest, and usually members are frustrated and underprivileged in terms of the objectives to which they aspire. However, student activism seems unique in being a revolt of the advantages on behalf of the underprivileged. Flacks (1967) mentions that the student movement represents the disaffection, not of an underprivileged stratum of the student population, but of the most advantaged sector of the students.

Then Stewart (1968) suggests that the activist movement is markedly anti-authority. Authority may be identified as the contemporary power structure or "establishment" and may refer to political, parental, papal, academic, governmental, legal or police authority. Whereas most social movements will accept some forms of institutional control even if they react against the power structure, the student activist movement tends to be against nearly all forms of socially sanctioned control, so that the movement appears to have an anarchistic viewpoint to some extent.

A.3. Activism within a psychological perspective.

Within a psychological perspective activism may be viewed as part of a particular stage of the life cycle.

Erikson's (1964) theory of maturational development divides the life cycle of a human being into eight discrete stages within which the individual has to negotiate some sort of psychosocial crisis. Successful negotiation of each stage is partly dependent on successful negotiation of prior stages; and as each crisis is successfully negotiated and resolved, the individual's identity is strengthened and he acquires greater ego strength or virtue.

At the time of adolescence which extends from puberty onwards into early adulthood, the psychosocial crisis being negotiated is that of Identity vs Role Confusion; and the particular ego quality that emerges from adolescence is fidelity which Erikson defines as "the ability to sustain loyalties freely pledged in spite of inevitable contradictions of value systems (p.125)".

Student activism may be viewed as one of the possible ways of successfully negotiating the psychosocial crisis pertinent to adolescence, since the individual has to reconcile the values such as love, justice and truth which have been instilled in childhood with the fact that in society there is social injustice, poverty and oppression. One of the ways of reconciling the clash between the ideal and the real is by striving to change the social situation so that it becomes more ideal and congruous with values upon which past identity formation has taken place. Therefore student activism may be viewed as part of identity formation rather than identity diffusion, and will lead to greater "loyalty" and "virtue" as the contradictions between values which are held and practised are reconciled.

Keniston (1967) a prominent researcher on student activism, also tends to view activism as an attempt to live up to one's ideals and

incorporate them into one's life style where one's parents have failed to do so. He extrapolates Erikson's ideas by drawing a sharp contrast between activist students and their polar opposite - alienated students.

Keniston suggests that the most clearly defining characteristic of the new "activist" is his participation in student demonstrations or group activity generally concerned with some social, political and ethical issue. Thus the activist employs confrontation tactics to express disapproval and reconcile the discrepancy between past expectations and present realisations.

Conversely, alientated students use withdrawal into a private world of subjective experience as a mechanism of coping with their dissent from society, and lay stress on the immediacy of the moment rather than value frameworks as guides to life styles. Keniston regards these people as fairly psychologically disturbed; and within Eriksonian theory their employing withdrawal tactics as a way of dealing with their circumstances is likely to be seen as a failure to negotiate the psychosocial crisis pertinent to adolescence successfully, and is probably likely to lead to identity diffusion.

B. THE DETERMINANTS OF STUDENT ACTIVISM

The determinants of student activism may be broadly divided into the following categories -

a) Historical

b) Cultural

c) Institutional

d) Familial

e) Personal.

B.1. Historical Determinants

A variety of historical determinants contributed to the roots of student activism. In America where the thrust of the movement began, the parents of activists who grew up in the depression and post-depression years saw the New Deal as a means of eradicating inequality and injustice through the Federal government. Flacks (1969) mentions that the rise of labour as a political force, the passage of social legislation and subsidisation of reform by the government would create the conditions for a just and humane society. Furthermore, the expansion of the public sector would create vocational opportunities for educated people with humanitarian concerns in education, social service, public health, mental health, child care and public planning. Therefore the parents of activists were offered a solution towards eradicating social injustice as well as a means of expressing their values in vocational directions.

However, in the past twenty years, though the ranks of the educated middle class have expanded due to a considerable degree of government support for higher education as well as public sector types of occupation requiring advanced education, the social benefits expected from this development have not been realised.

The liberal politics has not succeeded in eradicating gross social inequality, nor has it improved the quality of public life. Finally, the American government has not lived up to the idea of being pacific. Thus educated middle class persons, who anticipated peace and prosperity for all, found themselves in a society that was increasingly deteriorating and wasteful of human resources as well as not being a liberalising international force.

Flacks (1969) and Lipset (1969) both suggest that activist parents became disillusioned in the American democracy at this point; and their children began to seek for an alternative, at first showing faith in the idea of a democratic process which to some extent worked during the Kennedy administration. Later the Vietnam war escalated, the draft was used to pursue the war, the war on poverty failed and greater police force was used to curb protest demonstrations. This resulted in the view that American society was reactionary, authoritarian and oppressive, and a counter culture arose the members of which actively took up cudgels against what they felt to be gross social injustice.

Furthermore, in this era owing to widened cultural contact and extended and improved communications Keniston (1967) mentions that an "internalisation of identity (p.130)" has evolved where men have become acutely aware of the disjunction between their different life styles and the poverty and misery suffered by oppressed individuals in developed countries, and those who suffer extreme privation in underdeveloped countries.

Thus historically student activism was partially determined by the failure of the American democratic process to deal with social

injustice. Furthermore, man's heightened awareness of the existence of affluence in the midst of poverty has also led to a quest for an alternative. All these historical factors, combined with cultural, institutional, familial and personal factors probably make the rise of student activism an overdetermined phenomenon.

B.2. Cultural Determinants

A variety of cultural determinants are associated with the rise of student activism.

Searle (1972, p.148) mentions that the present generation of white middle class students in Western society are the products of affluence unparallelled in the history of Western democracies. This affluence which becomes taken for granted affords these students the leisure to concern themselves with the rights of others. Furthermore, since their condition of affluence is granted, they are more free to be concerned with the expression of humanitarian values which, as Keniston (1967) mentions, their parents revered but could never implement.

Another cultural factor which may be associated with the rise of student activism is the overproduction of educated youth. Flacks (1969) mentions that jobs available for university graduates are not commensurate with the training they receive. He does however, state that this situation is not particularly pertinent to American students. It seems that careerism requiring ritual and routine which will be unsatisfying, is more relevant to those who are potentially activist in America. The possible careers at their disposal are seen as unsatisfying, the more so when affluence has liberated them from economic necessity and allowed them to seriously look towards other values and experience. This factor is likely to apply to many white South African students

who eventually protest. Thus the possibility of a lack of career or an uninteresting career is likely to increase the propensity for politicisation, radicalism and collective rebellion among youth.

Then the fact that activist students were born into a social stratum generally defined by occupations of a social nature emphasising collective welfare rather than private gain is probably a further cultural determinant associated with the rise of student activism. Flacks (1969) mentions that a large proportion of activist parents were located in occupations involving higher education - like the professions, education, social services, public service and the arts, while both businessmen and blue and white collar workers were under-represented among activist parents. Therefore the value of collective good rather than private gain was defined by the professions of the parents to whom activists were born and Flacks (1969 p.356) cites data gathered by Lubell which shows a general tendency for students involved in such professions to move left politically.

Thus culturally student activism seems partially determined by an era of affluence, the overproduction of education and in America, and probably South Africa, a series of career choices that are perceived as stultifying and the social stratem and parental professional milieu into which student activists are born.

B.3. Institutional Determinants

A variety of institutional factors contributes to the rise of student activism.

Searle (1972, p.152) points to the unresponsiveness and obsolescence of institutions within society as an important contributory factor to the rise of activism. He indicates that each new generation inherits

an institutional framework within which to operate which was created by earlier generations. Sometimes the institutional structure continues though the problems for which it was created have been solved or become irrelevant. Alternatively, the institutional structure is viewed as unable to solve problems that are important to the younger generation.

Two examples illustrating this point concern civil rights for Negroes and the Vietnam war. Lipset (1969) indicates that although Negroes had been granted equal civil rights by the ruling of the Supreme Court, in practice they have continued to remain poor, segregated and uneducated because the institutional framework was not adequate for implementing these changes.

The Vietnam war can be cited as another example of institutional obsolescence. Despite a majority of public opinion being against the war, it continued. Other examples can be cited e.g. marijuana laws, the seniority system of congress or the National Party convention. All these examples of institutional obsolescence or unresponsiveness have led students who were already prone to protest for other reasons, to question the quality of American democracy and seek a more viable alternative.

Then the university itself provides the opportunity for protest-prone persons to collectivise, work out their beliefs and devise a stratagem focussing on pertinent issues which will effect change. In fact both Keniston (1967) and Sampson (1967) regard the opportunity to meet and interact on campus as the primary role of the institution in promoting activism.

In order to see how the university acts as a politicising agent of protest-prone persons it is necessary to look at the concept and function of the university. Seabury (1967, p.254) and Sampson (1967) mention that the traditional university comprised a corporate body of scholars who shared a common pursuit of knowledge and truth. Today the traditional model is probably obsolete. The university also now acts as a training centre for large business corporations and the pursuit of "truth" is largely irrelevant within this context. Furthermore, the administrative structure of the university is more like that of a big business corporation than the traditional community of scholars seeking truth. So the traditional concept co-exists or has been replaced by the university of big business and this creates a conflict of interests among students since there are those students being trained for some specific occupation such as the various professional or business degrees as well as those students, more representative of activists, who generally take degrees involving critical thinking about politics, the role of institutions in society, their fecundity and possible alternatives.

These potential activist students find that when they attempt to bring about internal reform within the university they have to deal with the resistance of the university administration and the opposition of students in faculties whose primary aim is to give a basic training in order to later earn a living. Thus by attempting internal reform and meeting with opposition a polarisation takes place between activist students and the administration and students who are satisfied with the university. Once this polarisation begins to take place, potential activist students begin to congregate, interact and define their position with respect to the university and society in which they live. Thus the

university often has a very profound influence towards radicalising and politicising potential activist students.

Thus in summing up it appears that the constitutional framework of the American society has come to be seen as unable to solve major problems, and this has led to a movement for reform. Then the university gives potential activists the opportunity to congregate, define and implement their values with respect to the administration and students of differing beliefs, and this is also an important institutional determinant of activism.

B.4. Familial determinants

A number of familial factors help to determine student activism.

Searle (1972, p.147) mentions that the style of upbringing to which potential student activists are exposed helps to determine their activism. He mentions that the parents of activists had to struggle through the depression in tremendous poverty and this experience shaped their attitude to the future insofar as they struggled to become economically secure and were determined to see that their children should not suffer poverty as they did and would have a chance to lead more fulfilling lives. Furthermore, they reared their children on Spock and so their style of upbringing was liberal, warm, permissive and child centred. Naturally these rather secure democratic suburban households deviated considerably from the impersonality and injustice of the bureaucratic structure outside their homes; and at university Searle suggests these "spoiled idealists" (p.147) had their first encounter with the contrast between their liberal upbringing and the stringency, bureaucracy and impersonality of the system. The incongruity of their past and the present external reality led them to

revolt and try to bring about structural changes within the university and the society to conform to the pattern of the past.

More specifically, Flacks (1969) mentions some of the attitudes of activist parents which helped to implant the potential for activism within these children.

Firstly, as was previously mentioned, activist parents tended to be in those occupations requiring higher education. Many of these parents had advanced graduate and professional degrees and were inclined to professions that tended to stress collective welfare rather than private gain, so that in their definition of career choices parents of activists were laying down a model of their implicit values for their children to follow.

Then it seems that values were taken very seriously. While religion was sceptically treated, emphasis was placed on leading a principled, socially useful morally consistent life. Education was regarded as valuable for its own sake.

In the sphere of politics activist parents were politically aware to a high degree and encouraged their children to support fundamental humanitarian tenets like racial equality, civil liberties and other liberal political goals.

Activist parents also tended to be highly critical of conventional middle class morality. They were critical of sexual repressiveness, materialism, emphasis on status and strict methods of child rearing. Furthermore, they refused to impose conventional middle class male-female dichotomy stereotypes of conduct on their children. Many activist parents hoped that their children would be able to lead

self-fulfilling lives rather than participate in a "rat race" or commercial world. Flacks mentions that they consciously organised these attitudes through the family structure and pattern of child rearing to support anti-authoritarian and self-assertive impulses, and clearly instructed their children in an overall attitude favouring scepticism towards authority and a reverence for egalitarianism and personal autonomy. So perhaps these parents should not be seen as spoiling, overindulgent and overpermissive as Searle tends to view them. They had very explicit demands regarding intellect and leading a seriously considered principled life. It seems that what might be termed their spoiling could also be seen as affirming their egalitarian autonomous beliefs with respect to their children.

Thus activist parents had a profound influence upon their children as socialising agents transmitting various cultural values. Their attempt to rear their children within a liberal, participatory-oriented tradition was probably a major contributory factor to students within these families becoming "protest-prone personalities" (Keniston 1967, p.117).

B.5. Personal Determinants

Several personal factors seem to contribute to the rise of student activism. Trent and Craise (1967) undertook a study which demonstrates that the character structure of activists is likely to increase their susceptibility to revolt. They found activists to be very high in measured intellectual disposition, autonomy, flexibility, liberalism, individuality, social commitment and level of ability, and suggested that their findings imply that activists show a greater interest in intellectual inquiry, tolerance of ambiguity, objectivity

and independence of thought, a concern with aesthetic matters, religious liberalism and have higher anxiety levels. It is possible that personality factors like their intellectual disposition, individuality, autonomy, flexibility and social committedness partially determine their concern with social injustice and govern their choice of using protest rather than political parties to express their dissent.

Another determinant of student activism involves the identity strivings of youth. Several authors, namely Erikson (1970), Keniston (1967), Lipset (1969), Reich (1970, p.193-197), and Wight Bakke (1967, p.59) view student activism as part of the identity formation of youth movements. Lipset 1967 suggests that student activist movements "fulfil the function of socialisation into the new thought frameworks and offer status, security, suggesting avenues of collective penetration into the strange adult society they give students a sense of group identity which enables them to cope with the problem of differing with their elders. (p.681)"

Thus student activisim may partially be determined by the personality structure of activists as well as the universal search by adolescent youth for a self identity and social integration based upon specific ideals.

C. A CLOSER EXAMINATION OF A NUMBER OF STUDIES PERTINENT TO STUDENT ACTIVISM

Before giving a fairly detailed review and criticism of a number of studies on student activism, it is important to notice that these studies cannot be neatly systematised.

Earlier in this introduction mention was made of the diffuse quality of these studies. It is almost impossible to divide them into clear-cut categories such as personality, sociological and psychoanalytic type studies of activism as each study invariably involves several approaches and several levels of explanation.

Thus the categories which the investigator has utilized serve only as a very loose, flexible indication of the way in which these studies have been organised.

The method of categorisation is as follows :-

a) Studies stressing the role of personality factors.

b) Psychoanalytic types of studies.

c) Sociologically-oriented studies leading to a consideration of child rearing practices associated with activism.

C.1. Studies stressing the role of personality factors.

Studies of student activism began in the mid 60's. However, there is an earlier study investigating activism when it began to take its present form of passive resistance.

Fishman and Solomon (1963) report a study in which a group of black and white students formed a non-violent action group which aimed to abolish segregation by means of passive confrontation. For instance,

when asked to leave cafés which practiced segregation these students refused to leave and sat until they were served. Fishman and Solomon coined the term "prosocial acting out" (p.872)" to describe the behaviour of these students and suggested that the way in which these students overcame their problems was constructive, as these passive confrontations seemed to be therapeutic encounters where past circumstances and problems were constructively handled.

On the basis of this study Fishman and Solomon concluded that the identity strivings of activist students were similar to those of other adolescent groups. They also viewed the passive confrontation of these students in a healthy light and regarded them as constructive and therapeutic thus indicating a trend towards a healthy personality disposition.

An important criticism of this study is that no systematic attempt was made to compare activist students with a sample of non-activists. Studies that are reviewed further suggest that it is dubious whether the identity strivings of activists and non-activists are all that similar as they seem to hold radically different values.

Another study which seems to indicate that passive confrontation tactics has an association with a healthy personality disposition was undertaken by Gustav (1971). She compared two groups of students who differed in their degree of dissident behaviour and compared them for differences of any sort in family ritual.

The one group comprised 158 students many of whom had engaged in dissident behaviour that was disruptive and damaging. The other group consisted of 277 students (non-dissidents) who had participated in a student stike which was carried out peacefully and did not result in damage to persons or property.

Gustav found that the passively dissident group participated significantly more frequently in the following family rituals: meals eaten together, positive communication with parents, celebration of holidays and special events.

Conversely, the more actively dissident group scored significantly higher on the amount of time spent on television and negative communication with parents, which suggests there was little family ritual and cohesion within this group.

Interpretation of these findings is tentative for the following reasons. The samples were not pure and this may have contaminated the results. The subjects came from different universities so that demographic variables may also have influenced the results.

However, in the light of these results being tentative, Gustav suggested that passive resistance has an association with positive communication within the family, while more active resistance is associated with negative communication within the family. Keniston (1967) mentions that activists, whom he considers healthy, tend to share experiences and communicate positively with their parents, while alienated students who are often psychologically unstable reject their parents' values and do not have good relationships with them. Possibly Gustav's two samples fit Keniston's dimensions and indicate that activists who engage in passive confrontation tactics are healthy in their personality structure.

On the opposite extreme are a variety of authors like Rubenstein (1969) and Bettelheim (1969) who tend to view dissenting youth as emotionally disturbed.

Rubenstein (1969),a clinical psychologist, analysed the psychological motives of student protestors and concluded that protest activities were a therapeutic process in which emotional conflicts were being resolved. He concluded that students were deluding themselves, play acting and seeking for group experience.

Bettelheim (1969) believes that student activism which he coins "adolescent rebellion" arises from a prolongation of adolescence well beyond the normal time span as adolescence is a phase in which there is a great release of hostile and aggressive impulses aimed both towards society and oneself in the quest for identity formation. He also believes that youth to-day feel obsolete because technological innovation has rendered them superfluous. Bettelheim believes that a combination of their extended dependency on parents, usually due to affluence, adolescent identity strivings and a feeling of redundancy created by technology and institutions, all serve to make youth feel "they have become irrelevant and as persons insignificant (p.31)". Thus their protest is dominated by "hate not a desire for a better world (p.38)", and they use their revolt to escape their "devastating isolation or to prove themselves strong or both (p.37)", since their circumstances have rendered them feeling profoundly impotent and in protest they are able to aggress against the system, establish a short lived feeling of potency and usefulness, and obscure their inner isolation. Bettelheim suggests that most student extremists are imbued with self hatred, a measure of paranoia and desperate isolation. He ends by recommending a compulsory youth service programme for a few years duration in which young people could work on socially relevant projects while earning pay and obtaining higher professional training at the same time.

Thus Bettelheim views protesting students as suffering from inner emotional difficulties which are unrecognised and projected onto the university and society.

While there may be some measure of truth in these assertions, Rapoport (1970) mentions that the "moral and political issues youth raise cannot be explained away by references to their psychic disorders and our badly contrived institutions (p.185)."

Bettelheim does not appear to consider the view put forward by Lipset (1969) that "social unrest causes student unrest (p.677)," and neither Rubenstein nor Bettelheim take much cognizance of the bearing of non-psychological factors on activism. Furthermore, Bettelheim quotes that he has "worked professionally with some militant leaders for years (p.37)" and, although he does not explicitly state that his views are based upon those student activists who sought his professional assistance, this may well be the case. Thus his inferences are questionable, as the sample of activist students upon which he bases his views may have been representative of only those student activists who were unable to cope with their circumstances and personal difficulties.

In a later study which is more pertinent to the present study, Whittaker and Watts (1971) compared activist students, a random sample of students, and alienated non-students, who formed part of the subculture at Berkeley, along certain personality dimensions.

Heist (1965) had already obtained data using the Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI) on a sample of activist students arrested at the sit-in at Berkeley in 1964. He found Free Speech Movement (FSM) activists scored significantly higher than the random student sample

in thinking-introversion, theoretical orientation, aestheticism, complexity, autonomy, religious orientation - in this case religious liberalism, impulse expression and anxiety level.

They scored significantly lower on social extroversion and personal integration than the random sample.

Whittaker and Watts (1971) report that these profiles on the OPI suggest abstract intellectuality, broad creative potential, lack of authoritarian thinking, sensitivity and individual expressiveness.

In the Whittaker and Watts (1971) study the Gough and Heilbrun adjective check list and Srole's anomie scale were administered to a group of activist students, a group of alienated non-students and a random sample of students. Activist students were found to be more alienated than the random sample on Srole's Anomie scale. They scored higher than the random sample on the scales scoring need for Autonomy, Change, Exhibition and Aggression and lower on an order scale. Finally, activist students scored significantly higher on lability and lower on self control than the random student sample.

These findings largely confirm the findings of other investigators. Heist (1965) using the OPI had found FSM activist students to be significantly higher on their need for autonomy. This finding was duplicated in the study undertaken by Whittaker and Watts (1971). Watts and Whittaker (1966) found FSM activist students to be significantly higher on flexibility scores. This is similar to the low need for order reported in this study.

Both Heist and Whittaker and Watts' studies are a considerable improvement upon the studies of Fishman and Solomon, Rubinstein and

Bettelheim. These studies are more systematic because they counter-balance activist samples with random student samples and use questionnaires which act as specific yardsticks for measurement. Consequently their results are less likely to be speculative and more founded upon fact than opinion.

Even then it is difficult to draw conclusions about personality characteristics associated with activism. On the basis of these last two studies it seems that activist students tend to be more independent, complex, flexible persons than non-activists, but ultimately this is a matter of bias and interpretation. One could as easily conclude that activists are alienated, anxious, exhibitionistic and aggressive.

It seems evident to the investigator that the results of studies investigating personality characteristics of the protesting student are not nearly as important as the bias, values and convictions which the researchers reviewing these studies hold. It is ultimately the bias of the researcher which will determine the construction placed upon the results rather than the results themselves.

Thus the greatest possibilities for open-mindedness and impartiality lie in considering studies of activism undertaken from differing viewpoints.

C.2. Psychoanalytic types of studies

In 1969 a panel discussion on "Protest and Revolution" was held by the International Psychoanalytical Congress and many views were expressed concerning the origin and psychodynamics of protest.

While some members were prepared to accept psycho-social explanations of protesting activities, other members stressed that

protest has its roots in the pre-oedipal and oedipal situations though they have been displaced onto broader reality perspectives.

Alternatively, protests were viewed as counter identifications reflecting defence mechanisms, erected against unresolved dependency needs on parent figures or symbolic destruction of the father figure or identification with the aggressor.

The investigator feels that psychodynamic explanations do not make protesting behaviour more comprehensible. He feels that these explanations of behaviour tend to be highly unsatisfactory because they are very vague and broad and they are neither falsifiable nor verifiable. Furthermore, concepts like "identification with aggressor" may explain individual behaviour, but the investigator finds it dubious whether group behaviour could be explained in this way. Finally, in the interest of parsimony in theorising and because of scepticism concerning psychoanalytic explanations, the investigator feels that these explanations are probably often redundant and detract from the more obvious issues in which protest is so often rooted.

For instance, Nicholi (1970) believes that students' negative reactions to remote campus administrators may be explained in terms of transference phenomena. He suggests that their intense and inappropriate feelings immediately suggest transference to the clinician. These phenomena draw on latent unconscious primitive reactions to parents.

But, as Nicholi himself says, little is known about transference between masses and a leader. Indeed, it is uncertain whether such a relationship exists. It seems dubious whether transference takes place and on what basis it could be assumed to take place. Furthermore, this

explanation seems to suggest that feelings are intense and inappropriate without adequately accounting for these assertions.

The investigator feels that this sort of explanation is often unfounded or too vague and implies a series of value judgments concerning appropriate affect.

These implicit value judgments which are central to the foundations of psychoanalysis immediately make it a biased tool of investigation.

For instance, psychoanalysis is a consideration of abnormality rather than normality. It is built on the assumption of the sick individual and his inadequate adaptation to the society. It does not have a reversible conceptual schema which can investigate the same individual within the sick society. Thus the bias built into its conceptual schema can act as a shield which masks some very important considerations which cannot suitably be accommodated to psychoanalytic perspectives.

For all these numerous reasons the investigator tends to be wary of psychoanalytic types of explanations of student activism and feels they may be both limiting and misleading.

C.3. Sociologically oriented studies leading to a consideration of child rearing practices associated with Activism

Watts, Lynch and Whittaker (1969) compared socialisation patterns and current family relationships of activists, alienated non-students and random students by means of questionnaires.

Both activists and alienated non-students scored high on anomie scales; but activists had supportive family relationships including

a great deal of discussion of politics and intellectual ideas, while alienated non-students had poor family relationships. Activists were of higher socio-economic backgrounds and tended to profess no religious inclination, or be of the Jewish faith, or more liberal religious groups. Conversely, random students belonged to the more conservative religious groups; and non-students professed no faith or subscribed to various Eastern modes of religion. Similar findings were reported by Block, Haan and Smith (1969); Flacks (1967); Watts and Whittaker (1969); Westby and Braungart (1966).

This study seems to indicate that activist parents encourage their children's political interest and socialise their children so that they become politically aware and take an active part in politics. Flacks (1967) reports similar findings.

Flacks (1967) compared activists and non-activist students by means of extensive interviews with students and their parents. He also found activists tended to be Jewish and came from upper middle class socio-economic backgrounds. Furthermore, activist parents were more highly educated. They tended to be professionals and both parents and at least one grandparent usually had higher education. Politically activist parents tended to be liberal or even radical while non-activist students were more conservative.

Flacks isolated several value patterns from interview material and developed a system of coded categories on which he rated his subjects. These value patterns were Romanticism which involved aesthetic and emotional sensitivity, Intellectualism, Humanitarianism and Moralism which involved keeping control over one's emotions.

Activist students tended to score high on Romanticism, Intellectualism, Humanitarianism and low on Moralism which was equivalent to conventional morality. Conversely, non-activists' scores were lower on Romanticism, Intellectualism, Humanitarianism, and higher on Moralism.

Flacks therefore concluded that activists and their parents placed greater emphasis on involvement in intellectual, aesthetic and humanitarian concerns, opportunities for self expression, and tended to de-emphasise personal achievement, conventional morality and religious practices, while non-activists and their parents valued conventional orientations towards achievement, material success, sexual morality and religion.

Unfortunately no attempt was made to test whether the differences in value patterns between activists and non-activists were statistically significant. These findings are therefore still of a speculative nature. Nevertheless, the findings do imply that activists are more concerned with striving towards an idealistic world while non-activists are more oriented towards adapting to existing social conditions.

Block, Haan and Smith (1969) undertook a study on several groups of students, namely inactivists, conventionalists, constructivists, dissenters and activists. Each student group was given the Child Rearing Practices Report (CRPR) to complete and the results were factorially analysed.

It was found that inactivists and conventionalists stressed conventional values such as socially appropriate behaviour, independence, achievement and obedience, while activist parents, though also emphasising independence, responsibility and early maturity, de-

emphasised achievement and competition and were low on conformity demands. Dissenters' backgrounds tended to be an inconsistent mixture of both conventionalist and activist backgrounds.

One of the important differences that emerged from the comparison between the handling of activist, constructivist and dissenter children as opposed to the handling of inactives and conventionalists was in the manner in which discipline was meted out. In fact it was the only significant difference at the .01 level that was found between the groups for all four categories. The other findings which are quoted were significant but were not found in all four categories. Whereas the more lenient and permissive parents of constructivists, activists and dissenters used non-physical punishments coupled with a lack of psychological mechanisms such as intrusive control or anxiety induction, the more rigid and controlling parents of the conventionalists and inactives tended to rely on physical punishment for control of behaviour as well as psychological mechanisms like intrusive control and anxiety induction.

These results seem to suggest that certain child rearing disciplinary patterns help to lay the foundation for activism; and a few studies on the effects of differing disciplinary practices in child rearing are cited in order to view these sociologically-oriented studies within a developmental framework.

Bay (1967) reports an interesting study undertaken by Malewka. She found that children's notions of moral norms became more responsible (less formal and superficial) the less severely disciplinarian their parents were and the more urbanised their surroundings.

Hoffman and Salzstein (1960) found that boys who tended to have internalised standards reported that their mothers were less likely to use force, threat of force, deprivation or direct commands (power assertive techniques) in disciplining them. Instead they were more likely to stress how the child's misbehaviour hurt the parent. Similarly, internalisation in girls was related only to rational appeals by the father and to the absence of threats by the mother that the father would discipline them.

Both of these studies suggest that the development of an internalized moral code of behaviour towards others is facilitated by a lack of parental coercion. This seems to imply that children who were expected to behave appropriately towards others of their own accord learnt to do so. It also seems to imply that the use of punishment i.e. reliance on external discipline to enforce appropriate behaviour did not facilitate internalisation of moral judgments.

Thus, within a developmental context activists were more likely to come from backgrounds combining warmth and a lenient discipline. The findings of Becker cited in Hoffman and Hoffman (1965) lend support to these assertions.

Becker investigated the effects of disciplinary practices upon children and tabulated his findings as shown.

DISCIPLINE

QUALITY OF BACKGROUNDS	RESTRICTIVENESS	PERMISSIVENESS
WARMTH	1. Submissive, dependent, polite, neat, obedient. 2. Minimal aggression. 3. Maximum rule enforcement. 4. Dependent, not friendly, not creative. 5. Maximal compliance	1. Active, socially out-going, creative, successfully aggressive. 2. Minimal rule enforcement (boys) 3. Facilitates adult role taking. 4. Minimal self-aggression (boys) 5. Independent, friendly, creative, low projective hostility.
HOSTILITY	1. Neurotic problems (clinical studies) 2. More quarrelling and shyness with peers. 3. Socially withdrawn. 4. Low in adult role taking. 5. Maximum self aggression (boys)	1. Delinquency 2. Non-compliance 3. Maximal aggression.

Students who were inactive or of conventional orientation seem to have had backgrounds which combine warmth and restrictiveness and to some extent they fit the descriptions in the table above. For instance, they are conscientious about enforcement of and compliance with rules and tend to be dependent upon authority figures.

The combination of warmth and permissiveness seems to produce individuals with similar characteristics to those of activists. For instance, Heist (1965) indicated that activists score high on creativity

orientation, are independent and have minimal rule enforcement, while Whittaker and Watts (1969) indicated that they are also low on self-aggression or abasement.

Most of the findings reported by Whittaker and Watts (1971), Watts Lynch and Whittaker (1969), Flacks (1967), and Keniston (1967) tend to suggest that the backgrounds of activists are warm and permissive.

On the basis of the finding of Becker and his associates, Malweska, Hoffman and Saltzstein, Whittaker and Watts, Block, Haan and Smith, Flacks and Thomas (1971), it appears that inactives and conventionalists have stricter rule enforcement and are socialised in terms of conventional standards, while activists come from more permissive homes where there is minimal rule enforcement and are encouraged to be self assertive.

Mott and Goldie (1971) undertook a study but unlike all the other studies reviewed which are American, this study took place in Britain. These researchers attempted to investigate the social characteristics of militant and anti-militant students at a London Technical School by constructing a scale of militancy and basing their findings on 20% of the most militant students and 20% of the least militant students.

Surprisingly enough, militant students tended to describe themselves as working class or lower middle class as opposed to American activist students who were of upper middle class origin. Then within the militant group two clusters tended to emerge: namely the less militant group who tended to have better relationships with their parents and the more militant group whose parental relationships were poor or inconsistent.

Unfortunately, no definite conclusions can be drawn from this study as the researchers did not attempt to compare the quality of parental relationships and class differences between militant and anti-militant students by means of some sort of statistical method which would take chance factors into account. Thus the results are obviously tentative and speculative.

In summary, these studies indicate that student activists come from highly educated, high income upper middle class backgrounds. They are brought up in a warm, lenient manner which encourages individuation and social responsibility, and emphasis is placed on personal fulfilment rather than socially recognised achievements.

These types of studies are commendable as they draw from context-relevant variables which make student activist behaviour more comprehensible. For instance, these studies point to the types of parental socialization measures which are associated with activism.

Nevertheless, there are some weaknesses in these studies worth mentioning. No attempt has been made to take a sample of highly educated, high income, middle class parents who bring their children up in a permissive way to see how many of their children do become actively involved in politics.

These studies could be approached from a different angle - a parental sample, in order to investigate whether the same results can be upheld. The validity of these studies would be enhanced if the same findings were obtained.

In addition, insufficient cognizance is taken of the part played by patterns of child rearing in relation to activism by most researchers.

While all researchers are aware of the warm permissive style of upbringing associated with activism, it seems that only Keniston (1967), Flacks (1969) and Lipset (1969) are sufficiently aware of the profound influence exerted by patterns of parental socialisation, and more specifically the implicit values contained and expressed in these patterns of socialisation. For this reason, it would be valuable if greater emphasis were placed on the attitude being conveyed through lenient parental disciplinary practices within some sort of developmental context. This would help to broaden the understanding of some of the determinants of student activism.

C.4. Conclusions

In the last three sections, definitions, varying determinants and a variety of studies on student activism have been critically reviewed, and several conclusions can be drawn from the subject matter discussed in the previous sections.

The investigator believes student activism to be a complex social phenomenon which can be approached from several different angles so that no "objective" conclusions can emerge. Furthermore, the area is so fraught with ambiguity, bias and conjecture, that even so-called hard core empirical facts assume a different meaning within different contexts.

It seems that many studies reflect the researchers premises, beliefs and convictions about activism rather than a more objective analysis of activism.

Despite all these limitations some conclusions do emerge. There are a wide variety of personality and developmental factors associated

with activism. It may be concluded that given a warm, permissive, egalitarian background, stressing the rights of the individual and a broad social consciousness, the predisposition towards political activism will be enhanced to a larger extent than in backgrounds where these values are not of paramount importance.

Thus it may be postulated that certain backgrounds which stress certain values give rise to a predisposition to protest. But these predispositions could remain latent.

Specific environmental circumstances that act as catalysts and cause these predispositions to become realised in activity. These circumstances are as important as the predispositions and both complement each other.

When circumstances and events start to trigger these predispositions, obviously those who are most predisposed will respond first, but as the circumstances become more heavily loaded even those with lesser predispositions will respond to the circumstances. It is therefore suggested that the more heavily environmental circumstances are weighted, the more will personal and developmental predispositions become replaced by environmental factors and the lesser will be their importance as determinants of activism.

For this reason the particular context of South Africa as a political and social environment needs to be examined in order to ascertain what proportion of loading may be attributed to political frustrations and social malaise as determinants of activism rather than personal pathology indicating unadaptiveness to the present social situation.

Obviously, if student activism is viewed within the social and political structure of South Africa, it would be easier to ascertain whether it is inclined to be indicative of emotional pathology or tends to be a social response of distress to disequilibrium within the South African social structure.

D. ACTIVISM IN SOUTH AFRICA

D.1. General Political and Social Perspectives

In order to look at activism in South Africa, it is necessary to look at the political framework of South Africa and examine the premises upon which it is based.

The social structure of South Africa is based upon political domination. A group of approximately three and a half to four million white people control, manage and direct the affairs of the total population of approximately twenty million people which is largely comprised of Africans with far fewer numbers of Coloureds and Indians. The only people who have representation in parliament are the Whites, though some attempt has been made to establish Bantustans (homelands) where each ethnic group of the African population will have political representation in a separate homeland.

Furthermore, among the white population, there is a cleavage into English and Afrikaans speaking groups who have a largely separate and distinct cultural heritage.

The proportion of Afrikaans to English speaking people is approximately 60% to 40%. The present government, the nationalist government, is largely the mouthpiece of the Afrikaans majority. When it came into power in 1948 one of the main aims was to further establish and secure the identity of the Afrikaner nation and ensure its continued existence and growth. In pursuit of this aim numerous laws curtailing personal rights, which are accepted in other democratic countries, have been promulgated.

For instance, all people in South Africa are subject to certain limitations of their civil rights. They may be detained incommunicado

for an indefinite period without a trial if they are in any way politically suspect. Army recruits who are conscientious objectors are imprisoned. The right to protest may be removed on any occasion by decree. Films, books and magazines are severely censored and passports may be withheld from people whose political beliefs are suspect. Political opponents have been banned and put under house arrest which involves restrictions of their civil rights.

In addition to this, Africans are deprived of a large number of civil rights enjoyed by White South Africans. These include the right to elect representatives to the white parliament which is the dominant political body, the right to own property in urban areas, the right to live where they choose, the right to strike and to obtain jobs according to merit.

Thus the general atmosphere which prevails is one of suppression, intimidation, fear and conformity. Restriction of these civil rights reflects the methods employed by the ruling group in order to maintain a rigidly stratified society.

On what premises and beliefs do the ruling group base their legislation and consequent action?

Fick (1972, p.57) reports that the origin of the Afrikaner people is based upon a Christian-national philosophy of life and the world can be traced back to Calvinist teachings. This doctrine necessarily demands allegiance and an attempt to foster a national unity of purpose that encourages love of the nation and service to the nation.

Consequently, various measures have been undertaken to socialise people into the roles that fit this life style. Christian-National

Education (C.N.E.) is an attempt to educate people in accordance with Calvinist and Nationalist principles.

Ashley (1972, p.53) points out that although C.N.E. is not an official state educational policy, its aims are reflected in the 1967 National Education Act which speaks of white education having a broad Christian character and producing good and loyal citizens of the Republic.

There are other factors that also determine the values and beliefs that individuals exposed to the South African educational system imbibe.

For instance, Ashley points out that the spirit of criticism is missing in the classroom and demonstrates this point by indicating that great reliance is placed on prescribed text books which suggest answers and inculcate perspectives to which the conservative establishment subscribes.

Ashley also cites Webster who indicates that history is taught in text book fashion with examinations being predominant. This results in a minimal amount of time given to discussion so that text book authors' assumptions generally remain unchallenged.

Thus it seems that C.N.E. as well as the uncritical regimental mode of teaching help foster prescribed group thinking. This state of affairs is reinforced by the prevailing cultural ethic within the school system which places heavy reliance on tradition, conformity, discipline and order. It seems that the traditional conforming orientation of the British public school system, and the strict ritualistic emphasis derived from C.N.E., merge easily and create values favouring conformity, uniformity and uncritical acceptance.

This mode of teaching with its implicit values can be summed up by Marshal McLuhan's phrase 'the medium is the message' (1968), where the emphasis on uncritical belief in the values of authority figures is implicit in the method of teaching, and pupils model their thinking upon this basis.

In this manner the community of assumptions held by whites about their superior and dominant role in South African politics is furthered.

It is at this point that student activism and protest play a part.

Student protest in South Africa has often been aimed against racial discrimination and has been in favour of civil rights for all races. There have been a wave of protests condemning the policies of racial segregation based upon the inherent assumption of the superiority of whites who embody Western civilisation and its values. Thus student protests provide a critique of the society by defying beliefs and values inherent in C.N.E.

Thus student activism in South Africa may be seen as a reaction of protest which is directed at a total system which is well programmed to inculcate conformity and compliance in its members. Furthermore, it provides suggestions of alternatives to the prevailing political cultural and social order so that it provides both a critique of the society and suggestions for improvement.

The government has taken strong measures which they feel are in the interests of state security so that very little student political activity may take place.

When African or Coloured students have shown dissent, strong disciplinary action has been taken against them and they have sometimes

even been expelled. In reality only white students may indulge in protest without fear of expulsion from the university.

Even this is not a right - on occasions the police have broken up demonstrations and proclamations forbidding protest have been issued. Furthermore, police informers on campus have acted as dampers to freedom of dialogue among students.

Naturally student activism is affected by all these preventative measures. It becomes restricted and curtailed within the narrow confines of legality, and as the risks and penalties are heavy for transgressing the legal limits, the general effect of restrictive law is to blunt student activism.

Thus student activism in South Africa is probably much less intense in comparison with other countries. This is probably largely due to the potential consequences and penalties of activism.

It may also be due to a lesser degree of personal involvement and commitment on the part of South African students who do not suffer personally as a student group. In America protesting students had to face the probability of being drafted to Vietnam after they completed their studies, while French students suffered under the appalling conditions in which they had to study. Thus in all likelihood, since both American and French students were personally affected by their circumstances, the degree of commitment and virulence of their protest was far greater than activism experienced in South Africa.

However, the investigator believes that intensity of anger and frustration experienced by dissenting South African students is likely to be as great as those of overseas students, despite a lesser commit-

ment because fewer channels and possibilities for demonstration of dissent and change are tolerated.

Van der Merwe and Albertyn (1972, p.9) suggest that South African students differ from students in other countries in many respects, one of them being that South African students do not experience the same measure of anomie or identity crises as students in the United States of America or France.

It is a pity that van der Merwe and Albertyn do not attempt to define what they mean by anomie or identity crises. These terms are often used very broadly as blanket concepts covering a range of ideas and so the terms are mystifying without explication.

However, it seems reasonable to assume that they use these terms in a psychological and sociological context. Within this context, identity crises refer to being at odds with or variance from prevailing societal expectations, while anomie refers to the normlessness of restlessness that results from lack of identification with a reference group.

If these terms are viewed in this way, the investigator is led to believe that activist students as well as many other students of a liberal orientation in South Africa, suffer from identity crises that may be more acute than those of students in other countries.

The investigator feels that South African students may suffer from a greater measure of identity crises because the background and cultural context of South Africa is extremely conservative and authoritarian, so that when students attempt to break this pattern of values they have to surmount greater pressures towards conformity and suffer

more guilt and confusion than students coming from other less conservative countries where a break with established values is likely to be better tolerated.

Furthermore, even when South African students have broken a pattern of adherence to traditional values and seek to establish a new identity they are likely to suffer from an inability to act upon their new beliefs, especially in the context of desegregation and equal civil rights, which is likely to engender great frustration, a feeling of impotence of action and much doubt regarding the new identity and its efficacy.

The probability of dissenting students suffering from anomie or identity crises in response to their social circumstances raises a problem for this study, since it makes it impossible to assess the emotional adequacy of protesting students without paying regard to the influence of their social circumstances and the effects this may have upon their emotional adequacy. It is probable that the social and political circumstances to which protesting students are exposed will result in their suffering greater emotional disequilibrium than these students who accept the prevalent values fostered by the South African government.

However, their emotional disequilibrium is far more likely to reflect their difficulty in adapting themselves to social circumstances which do not accord with their value systems, i.e. social pathology, than be indicative of some deeply rooted emotional pathology. Since tests like the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire and F scale are meant to tap core personality constructs, the results of these tests should remain relatively unaffected by the social situation, while

the investigator's questionnaire and Keniston's alienation scale should, to some extent, be sensitive to social difficulties in adaptation. It is difficult to gauge where the I-E control scale would be placed in this respect as there is insufficient knowledge concerning it.

Within this section an attempt has been made to view activism within the political and social setting of South Africa. It has been indicated that student activism in South Africa is a reaction of dissent against lack of civil rights that are accepted in other countries as well as a response of criticism to the easy acceptance of certain assumptions and values that are being transmitted through the educational and social system.

The protests which form the background to this study took place within this tradition of criticism and disapproval against the social policies of the South African government.

D.2. Background to this study.

The student protests which took place recently have been among the most intense and virulent to occur in South Africa within the last decade.

The events which led to these protests are important not only as events in themselves, but as reactions to the undemocratic character of racial and educational policies of the South African Government. The roots of student dissent lie in the refusal to accept these policies without protest.

The issues which sparked off the nationwide student protests began when O.R. Tiro (1972) the SRC President of the University of the North (Turfloop), a Black University, made a speech at graduation.

In this speech he condemned Bantu education as part of a repressive social system. He suggested that each black graduate should work towards eradication of the present social system which breeds such evils as detention without trial, repugnant legislation and expulsion from schools. The rector of the university reacted strongly to this speech and Tiro was expelled.

This resulted in an organized sit-in protest by the students after which the rector cut off food, electricity and water supplies, called in the police and closed the university, sending all 1,145 students home.

The university of Fort Hare, another black university, went on strike for a week and there was a lecture boycott at Durban Westville, in sympathy with the students at Turfloop.

A "Free Education Week" was organized by students of the University of Cape Town which resulted in a protest on Thursday, 1st June, at which 52 students were arrested. The following day another protest was staged. When a student illegally addressed the crowd the police charged the students with batons and dispersed them.

On Monday a mass protest was arranged at St. George's Cathedral in reaction to the baton charge on Friday. A crowd of 10,000 people gathered and the protest was banned by official order before it could take place.

It is important to notice that at this point the focus of the protest swung from education to civil rights and basic liberties.

Students then decided to hold a mass public rally the following Saturday to which they would invite the Prime Minister and Minister

of Police and ask for an explanation of the baton charge. They wished also to interest the public in free education and to reaffirm the right to protest.

However, the following day, Tuesday, 6th June, a ban on open air political gatherings, protests and processions was placed in Cape Town, Johannesburg and Pretoria, and 15 other places, by the Minister of Justice.

The following day, Wednesday, 7th June, students held a gathering on Jameson Hall steps despite the ban on open air political gatherings, and when they refused either to go into Jameson Hall or disperse they were hit with batons or bodily removed by the police. Once again the issue at stake was civil liberties - the right to freedom of assembly by students wherever they choose.

At this stage students decided to conduct a publicity campaign and circulate petitions concerning civil rights.

All the subjects who took part in this study had been involved in these protests. This study was undertaken approximately six weeks after these protests

PART II

THE PRESENT STUDY

A. INTRODUCTION

This present study was undertaken with the broad aim of investigating some of the personality and background characteristics of a group of protesting students of the University of Cape Town in comparison with a random group of non-protesting students. It was also undertaken to investigate whether psychological findings of studies undertaken in other countries applied to student activism in South Africa and, if so, the extent to which they were applicable. Finally, it is also an attempt to add new knowledge to this interesting and ambiguous area of research which may help to reconcile divergent points of view regarding the psychological adequacy of protesting students.

In the introduction several studies which are among the most extensive, broad and interesting, were reviewed, and a number of ways in which student activism is viewed were cited. It was indicated that student activism is a complex social phenomenon and can be viewed in many different ways.

Some of the reviews have viewed student activism favourably as a constructive attempt to seek alternatives in Western society. Other reviews suggest that student protestors are emotionally unstable and view protest as a failure to bind their aggressive energies, play acting or paranoidal behaviour. Sometimes there is a suggestion that adults have failed in their roles as parents and that protest is in some fundamental sense aggression towards the father figure, which

can be remedied by older people spending more time assisting younger people to come to terms with the world in which they live.

The problem of attempting a genuine and fair assessment of student activism also arises for the investigator; in fact, this study was undertaken to try and ground some beliefs about student activism on the basis of more tangible evidence.

How then is student activism to be viewed? Is it the personal protest of a very diffuse group of malintegrated individuals who cannot find any meaningful and constructive roles in society, or is it a group of people whose intellectual incisiveness and broad perspective of society demands that they attempt to construct a new and more viable social system? Is it a disguised plea for help and notice of a group of students who are inadequate and immature and cannot face social responsibility, or is it testimony to the allegiance and commitment of people who are altruistic in orientation and will do whatever they can to ameliorate social evils?

The investigator believes that student activists need not be seen as emotionally unstable and rebellious, but can be seen as individuals who have transcended the conditioning towards conformity which is so prevalent in our society, and who display signs of a critical dissent by protesting in the face of great pressures towards compliance. Thus the investigator hypothesises the following broad hypothesis.

General Hypothesis

It is hypothesised that protesting students tend to be emotionally and psychologically more adequate than non-protesting students.

This should be demonstrable by their being more independent, intelligent, sensitive, flexible in their thinking and personality dispositions than non-protesting students. A combination of these factors is likely to produce people whose intelligence is sufficient to be critical of their society, whose sensitivity is likely to generate awareness of the malpractices they perceive within the society and a concern that these should be rectified, whose flexibility in thinking allows them to conceive of societal alternatives without tenaciously clinging to traditional beliefs and practices, and whose independence indicates sufficient emotional security to engage in dissent despite considerable social emphasis towards conformity.

The investigator also hypothesises that protesting students are likely to feel more anxious and alienated than non-protesting students because their values differ from the accepted societal values while their actions threaten the stability of the society. Their feelings of alienation and estrangement are likely to be the consequence of holding radically different viewpoints from the social norms permeating the culture. Furthermore, increased anxiety is likely to be generated by their dissenting activity which involves a risk of retaliation.

This rather broad main hypothesis can be divided into several neat unitary sub-hypotheses which are either explicitly stated or implied in the general hypothesis. This casts the general hypothesis into a more easily testable form.

Sub-hypotheses

(1) It is hypothesised that protesting students will be significantly more intelligent than non-protesting students. This is

expected as protesting backgrounds involved a higher degree of education and greater emphasis on ideas, and it is therefore probable that intelligence levels would develop maximally in such backgrounds (Flacks, 1967).

Furthermore, the work of both Kohlberg (1963) and Piaget (1932) on moral development indicates that higher levels of moral development are contingent upon higher levels of cognitive development, i.e. higher levels of intelligence. If protest is viewed as a moral act then most protestors can be expected to have reached a higher level of cognitive development than non-protestors.

(2) It is hypothesized that protesting students will be significantly more sensitive than non-protesting students. This is expected because their dissenting activity suggests a sensitivity towards the suffering of people who lack political rights or economic privileges.

Furthermore, Flacks (1967) suggests that their egalitarian backgrounds, which often involve a broad altruistic concern, are likely to foster sensitivity towards the needs of other people whether on a personal basis or a broader social basis.

(3) It is hypothesized that protesting students will be significantly more flexibile than non-protesting students. Their flexibility should be manifest in a significantly more experimental and imaginative nature, accompanied by a significantly lesser degree of authoritarian characteristics than would be expected of non-protesting students.

A greater degree of flexibility is expected to be associated with the personality profiles of protesting students as Flacks (1967) suggests that their parents were less conservative, more lenient, and probably served as more flexible models for internalization than the more conventional parents of non-protesting students.

(4) It is hypothesized that protesting students will be significantly more independent than non-protesting students. Their independence should involve a larger proportion of personality elements like self sufficiency, assertiveness, extraversion and inner directedness (internality) than would be expected of non-protesting students.

Several studies (Block, Haan and Smith, 1969; Flacks, 1967; Trent and Craise, 1967) have shown protesting students to be more independent than non-protesting students since their more lenient backgrounds, which did not stress conformity, are likely to encourage far greater independence and individuation.

(5) It is hypothesized that protesting students will be significantly more expressive of their own urges and less rule-bound than non-protesting students. They are expected to be more expressive of their own urges since their lenient backgrounds are likely to allow them more freedom for personal expression. Furthermore, they would probably be more impulsive and spontaneous because their backgrounds, which do not stress conventional moral norms, entail not being bound to prescribed social rules.

(6) It is hypothesized that protesting students will be significantly more anxious than non-protesting students. Their anxiety level

is expected to be higher than that of non-protesting students, as protesting students are likely to perceive their society to be in a greater state of disequilibrium. These perceptions of societal instability are likely to engender a level of increased anxiety, social unrest and dissatisfaction.

Furthermore, protesting students are expected to be more anxious because their values differ from conventional or prescribed social values and this is likely to engender some anxiety. Finally the act of protest which involves the possibility of retaliation is also likely to engender anxiety.

(7) It is hypothesised that protesting students will be significantly more alienated than non-protesting students. Their alienation is however, more likely to be concentrated in the cultural and social sphere than in personal relationships. This is likely to be the case as their values are largely at odds with those values which are both latent and manifest in the society. In their personal relationships they should not be alienated as Block, Haan and Smith (1969), Flacks (1967) and Keniston (1967) suggest that their backgrounds are probably conducive to secure personal relationships.

A.2. METHOD

Subjects

144 subjects consisting of 68 protesting students and 76 non-protesting students were sampled from the general student population for research purposes.

The criterion for deciding whether students were protestors or non-protestors was the following :-

Protesting students were defined as those students who publicly demonstrated or took part in picket protests at St. George's Cathedral during the current protest concerning educational and civil rights, or were involved in the baton charges on the Jameson Hall steps of the University of Cape Town.

If they were students above the first year level they were required to have taken part in at least one other protest besides the current one, whereas first year students were accepted for the sample on the basis of attendance at the current protest. An attempt was thus made to recruit students who were regular protestors. Obviously in the case of first year students this was not possible as most did not have the opportunity for protest prior to becoming members of the university.

Non-protesting students were defined as those students who had not taken part in any form of public protest or demonstration throughout their university careers.

Procedure

As permission to use the university register to obtain a strictly random sample was refused, the investigator approached students at

their central meeting place, the Jameson Hall steps or the student union during their lunch hour recess, and told them he was doing a psychological study on the personality characteristics of protesting and non-protesting students, and asked if students were willing to participate in the study.

Initially the investigator recruited a sample consisting of 100 protesting students and 100 non-protesting students and gave them the questionnaires to take home with them, and explained to them that they must complete their questionnaires under conditions of privacy and minimal noises. The investigator explained to them that they could take several sessions over which to complete the questionnaires, but that they must complete whichever questionnaire they were answering on a particular session. They were allowed two weeks to complete the questionnaires, and at the end of the two weeks 68 protesting and 76 non-protesting students had handed in their questionnaires, and they formed the basis of this study.

There were a number of students who were approached but refused to participate in the study. Nine students in the protesting student sample and seven students in the non-protesting student sample refused to participate in the study, and all of them stated they had too much work to do.

The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire

The most informative and broad ranging measurement scale employed in this study was the 16 P.F. Its advantages are numerous. It can be self-administered, applies to persons of 16 years onwards through all age ranges, and has norms based on over 10,000 representative cases.

Cattell (1965) indicates that test - retest reliabilities for the 16 factor scales average about .75 while internal construct validity is approximately .67. The corrected split half reliabilities for the 1956-57 edition of form A and B have a combined range from .93 to .71 and .87 to .54 for single forms. These values suggest that many single form scales' internal consistencies are thus only satisfactory for group prediction. The validities based upon factor loadings range from .73 to .96 with eleven coefficients exceeding .80 which indicates a fairly high overall validity.

The test consists of two forms A and B comprised of 187 items which include 10 to 13 items for each factor. The primary factors are oblique, i.e. they are correlated, while the second order factors are orthogonal. The majority of statements involve interests and references, while the remaining statements represent usual self reports of behaviour. The inventory yields 16 primary factors and four second order factors.

This test is a major development in the area of personality. It is based upon comprehensive factor analysis and the factorisation has been checked three times by independent experiment. As the items are scored on the basis of factorial composition, this means that the intercorrelations have determined the manner in which they are grouped, with the result that all items measuring a given factor measure the same thing. Wittenborn (1953) says that scores based upon this kind of behavioural homgeneity have certain advantages.

a) Scores of different magnitudes are likely to have the same kind of behavioural significance. (The distinction between individuals is likely to be on the basis of degree rather than kind).

b) The person interpreting the score has a better chance of knowing what the score means than the person who is forced to interpret scores representing heterogeneous and unspecified behaviours.

c) Owing to their behavioural homogeneity, it is possible that such scores may have an exceptional validity for homogeneous criteria of similar content, and reduced validity for criteria that are heterogeneous in content. This should mean that factor scores can be combined more economically in the multiple prediction of criteria than scores having no particular claim to behavioural homogeneity.

Nevertheless, there are several important limitations with regard to the factor analytic approach to personality and more specifically with regard to the 16 P.F. For instance, insofar as the pattern of correlations among items is determined by the habits which the sample of items may represent and by the habits present in the sample of subjects employed, factors do not have a significance transcending time, place and circumstance, so that it would be naive to just accept the label the factor analyst applies to the scores without scrutiny concerning the basis on which the factor analyst makes his inferences.

In fact, Argyle (1971) criticises Cattell's and Eysenck's multi-factor trait theories in this respect. He states that they assume a consistent position regarding the part played by personality factors in the determination of behaviour. Argyle suggests the following factors are not sufficiently taken into consideration:

a) The social situation.

b) The status of the person in that social situation.

c) Interaction with other persons and the environment.

Argyle feels that all these factors largely account for the behaviour of the person rather than personality disposition. This suggests that the behaviour differs very much in differing social contexts. An attempt was made to empirically validate these hypotheses.

Then with specific regard to the 16 P.F., Levonian (1961) studied intrafactor interitem phi correlations and reports that of 1,612 significant interitem correlations there were 183 intrafactor correlations. Furthermore, of the 183 intrafactor correlations ten were in the direction opposite to that intended by test designers, and 30% of items had no significant intrafactor correlations at all.

Such evidence of within factor heterogeneity requires a critical reappraisal of scale homogeneity. In fact, a reading of items making up a factor is quite diverse and supports Levonian's conclusions.

Becker's (1961) study raises doubts concerning the independence of the 16 factor scales. His factor analysis showed at best 8 distinguishable factors within the 16 P.F. This does not necessarily mean that there are not more than eight factors, but it does indicate that if they exist they do not emerge as independent sources of variance as revealed by the tests as presently scored.

Finally, Eysenck (1971), unlike Cattell (1972), regards the second order factors as more important than primary factors; and studies done by Levonian (1961) and Howarth and Browne (1971) have been collated by using different subjects, different countries, different items and methods of rotation to show that these primary factors cannot be found nor can factors similar to them be found. Thus these criticisms indicate that the second order factors are more reliable sources of information and do not show such considerable variability within differing countries.

Despite all these criticisms, the investigator feels it is appropriate to use the 16 PF for the following reasons. Pure factors like the second order factors are statistically independent, but traits in human beings are more likely to be correlated rather than independent, and it would therefore seem appropriate to make use of a questionnaire based on correlated factors rather than uncorrelated factors.

Then, although Cattell's multi-factor trait theory does not have universal validity or applicability, as it was originally standardised on an American university student population, it is likely to apply to the South African student population as many of the cultural values in Western society are commonly held. It therefore seems a fairly appropriate instrument to use in this study.

The F Scale

The F scale (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson and Sandford, 1945), a measure of authoritarianism, is based upon 9 theoretical constructs associated with conventionalism. These are as follows:-

1. Authoritarian submission
2. Authoritarian aggression
3. Anti-intraception
4. Superstition
5. Stereotypy
6. Power and Toughness
7. Destruction and Cynicism
8. Projectivity
9. Sex.

According to the authors of this scale the emergence of the "authoritarian personality" could be explained in terms of child rearing practices. Adorno et al argued that authoritarianism is derived from strict disciplinary treatment of the child in which stress is placed upon the correctness of parental rules and values reinforced by punishment. They also argued that these child rearing practices are often accompanied by a parental attitude, often unconscious, involving emotional rejection. Consequently children develop extremely submissive attitudes towards their parents and later all authority figures, accompanied by feelings of hostility towards parents or other authorities. These hostile feelings cannot be directly expressed and consequently they become repressed and displaced upon safer and weaker objects such as minority groups or groups of inferior status.

Although the F scale is a measurement of attitude rather than personality, the importance of personality factors in any explanation of prejudice has continuously been stressed (Srole, 1956; Kelman and Barclay, 1963).

It has been assumed that certain specific personality traits or needs are to some extent the basis of certain social attitudes, and the original theory and rationale of the F scale went further and suggested social attitudes such as prejudices were largely a function of personality needs.

The rationale underlying this assumption is that certain personality dispositions predispose one to prejudice because of a particular 'fit' between underlying needs and ideology.

Orpen (1970) says this general standpoint is based largely on the positive results which were obtained when the F scale measure of

authoritarianism at the personality level was correlated with measures of ideology and social attitude. Thus these results support the idea that the F scale is a measure of important personality differences.

So the F scale which can be viewed both as an index of attitude and personality is highly suitable for purposes of this study.

A great deal of research has been done on the construct validity of the F scale. Christie and Cook (1958) mention that the F scale has been found to be correlated meaningfully with a wide variety of important variables including non-pathological irrationality. Scores on the F scale have been correlated with the following measures :-

> conformity, intolerance and ambiguity, conventionality, prejudice, political views, anxiety, xenophobia, value orientation, social class, attitudes towards parents, behaviour in children, repression, projection, leadership patterns and aggression towards outsiders.

Thus the F scale has been related to a diversity of predicted behaviours in various areas which makes it a tool of great flexibility and potential for research purposes.

There are however, a number of criticisms of the F scale that must be borne in mind. Firstly, although it has been established that authoritarianism is a significant variable in social behaviour and can be measured fairly accurately (Lindgren, 1969), it is important to realise that the F scale does not seem to be measuring an undimensional attribute. For instance, even the original investigators, in their analysis of the inter-relationships between F scale items, obtained a mean correlation of + .13 with a range of - .05 to + .44,

thus indicating the possibility that the F scale is not measuring any single attribute.

Secondly, Rockeach (1956) puts forward the criticism that the F scale only measures dogmatism on the right and not the left.

However, despite these limitations, the F scale remains a tool of considerable potential and diversity if caution is used in interpretations.

The Internal - External Control Scale

Lefcourt (1966) in reviewing this scale notes that "as a general principle internal control refers to the perception of positive and/or negative events as being a consequence of one's own actions and thereby under personal control, external control refers to the perception of positive and negative events as being unrelated to one's own behaviours in certain situations and therefore beyond personal control (p.207)".

Thus the scale is concerned with measuring the extent to which individuals believe they have the ability to control their social environments.

The rationale underlying the creation of this scale is derived from Rotter's social learning theory. In this theory the potential for any behaviour to occur in a given situation is a function of the person's expectancy that his behaviour will secure the available reinforcement as well as the value placed on the available reinforcement for that person. In Rotter's theory the control construct is considered as a generalised expectancy which operates over a large range of situations and indicates the degree to which individuals believe they have or lack power over what happens to them. Thus if a person anticipates

no contingency between his behaviour in a situation and the end results this may be termed external control. If the person connects the end result of a situation with this behaviour this is termed internal control.

It is important to notice that in this theory the I-E control construct is viewed as an expectancy rather than motivational variable though it can be related to motivational constructs such as Adlerian concepts concerning strivings towards superiority quite easily.

Within recent years there has been extensive research on the I-E control scale and Lefcourt (1966) feels the following generalisations can be made :-

1. The test-retest reliability of the 29 item scale of the I-E is consistent and acceptable varying between .49 and .83 for varying samples and intervening periods.

2. Relationships to measures of intelligence have generally been nil though there is some evidence that internal scorers score higher on intelligence measures.

3. Finally and most important within the context of this study, it has been found that relationships to a measure of maladjustment (the Incomplete Sentences Blank), are perhaps curvilinear, non-existent, or quite complex.

With reference to activism Strickland (1965) compared a group of Negroes who were actively engaged in civil rights movements with a group of Negroes who were not active on the I-E control scale, and found those who were actively involved had significantly higher internal scores than those who were inactive.

This finding is most interesting, specially if it is interpreted with reference to Hersch and Scheibe's (1967) study.

Hersch and Scheibe (1967) undertook a study to test the relationship of the I-E control scale with measures of maladjustment. They found that the I-E control scale is consistently related to a variety of personality scales with internal scorers being less maladjusted and describing themselves as more active, striving, achieving, powerful, independent and effective, than external scorers. These results are consistent with other reviews (Lefcourt, 1966; Rotter, 1966); but in these reviews, as in other reviews, internal scorers are a more homogeneous group than external scorers. This finding suggests that although internal scorers describe themselves as active, striving and independent, external scorers are not necessarily passive, lacking in strivings and dependent, though there is more likelihood of their being so.

Another factor to be borne in mind with reference to the I-E construct is that external scorers may feel directed by benevolent external forces so that their feeling of lack of personal control may not affect their mental health.

Thus research indicates that while the I-E construct does have some relationship with mental health, interpretation of the E dimension is not easy because external scorers are not necessarily the opposite of internal scorers, and if externality is felt to be accompanied by benevolent control then lack of control may be immaterial as the reinforcement still occurs. For these reasons great caution needs to be exercised when interpreting the findings on this scale, particularly with reference to the E dimension.

Keniston's Alienation Scale

Keniston's (1968) alienation scale was adapted for this study. Alienation in the context of this scale means an explicit rejection of the dominant values of the surrounding society. From this definition Keniston and his colleagues developed a series of highly intercorrelated questionnaire scales enabling them to identity extremely alienated students. In the course of their study they were able to develop 13 related alienated outlooks. If a student held one of these outlooks he was likely to hold the rest; and if he disagreed with any one outlook he was likely to disagree with the rest as well. These attitudes therefore, constituted a kind of empirical cluster or alienation syndrome. The average scale-to-scale correlation is + .47 and the items comprising the scale are as follows :-

1. Distrust.

   Do you feel if you expect the worst in others you will avoid disappointment?

2. Pessimism.

   Do you feel there's little chance of ever finding real happiness?

3. Resentment.

   Do some people at times make you feel like killing them?

4. Egocentricity.

   Do you feel you'll certainly be left behind if you stop too often and too long to give a helping hand to other people?

5. Anxiety.

   Do you feel that whether he admits it or not every modern man is a helpless victim of one of the worst ailments of our time-neurotic society?

6. Interpersonal alienation.

Do you feel that emotional commitments to others are usually the prelude to disillusion and disappointment?

7. Social alienation.

Do you feel that trying to co-operate with other people brings mainly strained rivalry and inefficiency - consequently you prefer to work by yourself?

8. Cultural alienation.

Do you feel that trying to adjust to society as it is now constituted fills you with horror?

9. Self contempt.

Do you feel that any man who has really known himself has good cause to be horrified?

10. Vacillation.

Do you feel you make few commitments without some inner reservations about the wisdom of undertaking the responsibility or task?

11. Subspection.

Do you feel first impressions are not reliable: what lies beneath the surface is often utterly different?

12. Outsider.

Do you feel strongly how different you are from most people, even your own friends?

13. Unstructured universe.

Do you feel the idea that man and nature are governed by regular laws is an illusion based on our insatiable desire for certainty?

From each of these perspectives of alienation a related item was evolved to tap the particular form of alienation being measured.

The investigator felt this scale was highly suitable because of its sophistication and complexity. The concept of alienation as used in this scale suggests that individuals who respond to this scale have sufficient intellectual capacity for dissent from the general tenets of the society so that this scale is geared towards people who have a relatively advanced intellectual comprehension and can articulate and crystallise their feelings of alienation. Students tend to be the academic elite of a society so the scale is suitable because of its intellectual sophistication. Furthermore, empirical validation of this scale was attempted using students. Finally, it covers a broad spectrum of different types of alienation, thus combining sophistication with breadth.

The Investigator's Questionnaire

A questionnaire constructed by the investigator was used in the study. This questionnaire was divided into several categories within which the investigator hoped to detect if there were differences between the perceptions of protesting and non-protesting students. As it is a self constructed questionnaire no claims may be made for the validity or reliability of the questionnaire. The following categories were used in this questionnaire:

a) Background factors. This category involved information about social class differences, the perception of parents' marriage and parental discipline of subjects.

b) Items measuring the perception of parental dominance vs submissiveness. In this category the investigator attempted to

gauge the degree of autonomy that subjects perceived their parents to have allowed them.

c) Items measuring perceived parental acceptance or non-acceptance of subjects. In this category an attempt was made to gauge the extent to which subjects felt their parents were sensitive and responsive to their needs by means of a variety of questions that all, to some extent, measured the degree of acceptance or rejection.

d) Items measuring subjects' feelings of acceptance of their parents. This category attempted to measure the extent to which subjects reported that they were accepting of their parents.

e) Items measuring perception of quality of relationships with parents. In this category items were geared towards measuring the degree of trust, honesty and discussion of problems with parents.

f) Items measuring the perception of the quality of familial relationships. These items attempted to gauge the subjects' perceptions of family cohesion, unity and strife.

g) Items measuring perception of social-self image. These items attempted to measure the degree to which subjects felt uncomfortable, isolated or unreal with others.

h) Items measuring "dropping out" of university and society. In this category an attempt was made to gauge the extent to which subjects felt they would like to "drop out" because of personal doubts, the irrelevance of university education, incogruity of university and life style, social remoteness and politics.

i) Items measuring subjects' perception of social roles. In this category an attempt was made to gauge the extent to which subjects found prescribed roles adequate or inadequate.

j) Items measuring subjects' perceptions of personal feelings and interpersonal relationships. In these items a few questions were put to subjects concerning feelings of endurance, adequacy, loneliness, self-knowledge, as well as feelings concerning same and opposite sexed relationships, questions about faith and love and the genuiness of emotion.

k) Items measuring subjects' release mechanisms. Within this category an attempt was made to gauge the extent to which subjects drank, took drugs, and indulged in fantasy rather than reality fulfilment.

The investigator's questionnaire was constructed in the following manner. The investigator outlined several categories that he felt would be important as a brief index of background, parental, social and communal relationships. Four other psychologists, who were consulted, also suggested further categories, and the investigator and these other psychologists devised questions that they thought were important within each category. In this manner the investigator collated a variety of questions within each category, and finally selected those questions which he felt were most appropriate with the aid of a clinical psychologist.

A.2. RESULTS

The statistical data tabulated in this section was computed on a Hewlett Packard 9100 Desk Computor.

TABLE I

16 P.F. COMPARISONS BETWEEN PROTESTORS AND NON-PROTESTORS

Variable		Protestors (N=68) Mean	S.D.	Non-Protestors (N=76) Mean	S.D.	t
Primary Factors						
Factor A	Reserved vs Outgoing	9.29	3.53	9.70	3.74	.66
Factor B	Less Intelligent vs More Intelligent	9.75	1.79	9.28	1.76	1.60
Factor C	Affected by Feelings vs Emotionally Stable	13.18	4.08	13.38	4.36	.28
Factor E	Humble vs Assertive	15.84	3.74	12.07	4.06	5.78**
Factor F	Sober vs Happy-go-Lucky	14.99	4.35	14.40	4.99	.75
Factor G	Expedient vs Conscientious	7.43	4.06	10.50	3.92	4.62**
Factor H	Shy vs Venturesome	11.77	5.66	11.55	6.12	.22
Factor I	Tough-Minded vs Tenderminded	13.13	3.62	11.97	3.90	1.84
Factor L	Trusting vs Suspicious	9.79	3.51	9.25	3.61	.91
Factor M	Practical vs Imaginative	15.47	3.45	14.21	3.61	2.14*
Factor N	Forthright vs Shrewd	8.68	2.62	9.39	2.93	1.54
Factor O	Placid vs Apprehensive	11.87	3.62	12.05	4.19	.28
Factor Q1	Conservative vs Experimenting	12.25	2.48	10.81	3.07	3.09**
Factor Q2	Group Dependent vs Self Sufficient	11.77	2.98	11.63	3.23	.26
Factor Q3	Undisciplined Self Conflict vs Controlled	8.07	2.90	10.59	3.10	5.02**
Factor Q4	Relaxed vs Tense	14.81	4.61	14.21	5.26	.72
Secondary Factors						
Factor I	Low Anxiety vs High Anxiety	6.79	1.70	6.44	2.19	1.08
Factor II	Introversion vs Extraversion	5.05	2.04	4.36	2.36	1.79
Factor III	Tenderminded Emotionally vs Alert Poise	4.89	1.51	5.09	1.87	.70
Factor IV	Subduedness vs Independence	8.35	1.69	6.75	2.32	4.66**