

The "Hang-Loose" Ethic and the Spirit of Drug Use

EDWARD A. SUCHMAN

University of Pittsburgh

A cross-sectional, sampling survey of drug use on a college campus reveals the close association between the use of drugs (overwhelmingly marijuana) and adherence to what might be characterized as a "hang-loose" ethic. Use of drugs was more likely to occur among those students whose behavior, attitudes or values, and self-image were indicative of opposition to the traditional, established order. Such differences occurred regardless of those demographic characteristics of the students also related to drug use, such as sex, socio-economic status, and religion. For these students, marijuana was the recreational drug of choice and its use became a central core of their sub-culture.

STUDIES of college students made about 15 years ago found that generation of youth to be "politically disinterested, apathetic, and conservative." (Goldsen, et al., 1960:199; Jacob, 1957) To an increasing degree, the college student of the current generation is striving to overcome this image of passive conformity and conservatism in order to evolve a new and more meaningful role for himself, both on campus and in the larger community. Reflecting the many social, political, and economic forces that have widened the generational gap between young people and those "over 30," this youth movement is seeking to develop new values and behavior patterns, often in defiance and opposition to those of the established order.

Central to this new world of youth is a whole new range of recreational and psychedelic drugs. Studies of college students in the last generation found alcohol to be the major campus "vice" and alarming reports were published about the "drinking problem of college students." (Straus and Bacon, 1953) No mention was made of other drugs. In this respect, the students displayed one more sign of their conformity—drinking was also the favorite social pastime, and problem, of their parents. Almost as if rejection of the establishment also demanded the development of a different form of "high," the new generation of college students is increasingly turning to other drugs for the relaxation and "kicks" their parents found in alcohol. As described by

Simmons and Winograd (1966:86), "The drug scene is the central plaza of happening America . . . it is here, in the drug scene that generational change in America most vividly thrusts itself forward. . . ." And perhaps forgetting their own bouts with the law in the days of prohibition and repressing the serious threat of alcoholism as a major health problem today (Suchman, 1963; Plaut, 1967), adults have been almost unanimous in their condemnation of this new and strange intoxicant. As one "over 30" judge recently opined, alcohol is the socially approved drug of choice for the well-adjusted, responsible, hard-working member of society seeking sociability and pleasant relaxation, while the use of marijuana represents the neurotic and anti-social behavior of the juvenile delinquent.

Unfortunately, there is little empirical data about what is taking place in the colleges today. The present study represents an initial attempt to ascertain basic facts about the use of drugs by one college population and to examine those factors, both causes and consequences, associated with the use of drugs. The major assumption is that drug use on the campuses today is largely limited to the occasional smoking of marijuana cigarettes and represents a social form of recreation far removed in nature from the traditional problem of narcotics addiction and, for that matter, alcoholism. (McGlothlin, 1967) Furthermore, the set of hypotheses to be tested is that the use of marijuana will be highly

associated with other expressions of a new breed of youth characterized by a "hang-loose" ethic. As described by Simmons and Winograd (1966:12), "One of the fundamental characteristics of the hang-loose ethic is that it is irreverent. It repudiates, or at least questions, such cornerstones of conventional society as Christianity, 'my country right or wrong,' the sanctity of marriage and premarital chastity, civil disobedience, the accumulation of wealth, the right and even competence of parents, the schools, and the government to head and make decisions for everyone—in sum, the Establishment."

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

This study was conducted in November, 1967, at a West Coast university. A representative sample of 600 students out of a student body of 12,200 was selected at random from the registration lists of undergraduate and graduate students. A questionnaire dealing with drug use and various aspects of college life, educational and political values, and current social issues was prepared on the basis of detailed interviews of students, especially so-called "hippies," and observation of student activities, especially so-called "happenings." Interviews and observation were carried out by 125 students enrolled in a course on social research methods.

The questionnaire was administered in two parts of almost equal length. The first part was a personal interview, while the second, which sought information on more sensitive topics, such as sex, drug use and the draft, was filled out by the respondent and placed with the first part in a sealed envelope without identification. The questionnaires were thus kept anonymous to increase the probability of truthful answers. The completion rate of interviews was 81 per cent. The remaining 19 per cent were not interviewed largely because the assigned respondent could not be reached during the week allotted to field work, rather than the refusal to be interviewed (less than 5 percent). A comparison of the sample obtained with available demographic characteristics for the entire population shows no characteristic with a difference beyond what might be expected by chance.

Conceptual and Operational Model. Our dependent variable is frequency of drug use as reported by the respondent. Our major independent variable is degree of adherence to the "hang-loose" ethic as determined by a series of questions designed to tap (1) behavioral patterns, (2) attitudes and values, and (3) self-image and personality. The behavioral patterns refer to such acts as taking part in "happenings" and mass protests, and reading underground newspapers. We view such behaviors as indicative of a rejection of traditional society on the part of the student and subject to disapproval by the representatives of that society. The attitudes and values studied are drawn from the educational area (i.e., worthwhileness of college education, student power), the political area (i.e., Vietnam war, the draft), and the social area (i.e., "hippies," the law, sex and life goals). Finally, we study the student's self-image in such respects as conformity, cynicism, anti-establishment and rebellion in an effort to index his own portrait of himself vis-à-vis the established order.

In all three aspects of behavior, attitudes, and self-image, our major hypothesis is that the more the student embraces the "hang-loose" ethic (as opposed to the so-called "Protestant ethic") the more frequently will he make use of drugs.

FINDINGS

Prevalence of Drug Use. The following proportions of students reported taking some drug (Question: "How frequently do you take drugs (marijuana, LSD, etc.)?"):

About every day	2.0
Once or twice a week	6.6
Once or twice a month	6.6
Less than once a month	6.0
Do not use drugs	78.8
Total	100.0% (N=497)

Of the drugs used, marijuana was listed by *all* students taking drugs, with occasional use of LSD mentioned by 18 per cent of those taking drugs (2.2% of the entire population). A wide variety of other drugs (i.e. "speed," Methadrine, peyote) also was listed, none by more than 10 per cent. There can be little question concerning marijuana's being the recreational drug of

choice among this college population, one of five admitting its use, despite its illegality. The word "drugs" as used in this report may therefore be equated largely with marijuana.

This figure of 21.1 per cent use is quite similar to the results of surveys at UCLA (33%) (Santa Barbara News-Press, 1967), Harvard (25%), Yale (20%), and Princeton (15%) (Time, 1967), although a Gallup Poll of 426 college campuses reports only about 6 per cent as having smoked marijuana (Reader's Digest, 1967). While this "numbers game" is largely unproductive in the absence of any reliable and valid data, it does seem apparent that marijuana use on the campus is high enough to warrant serious attention.

Most of the students using drugs began in college, 40 per cent in their freshman year, although 22 per cent had smoked marijuana before coming to college. Almost all began to use drugs through the personal influence of a friend who was already smoking marijuana (Becker, 1953). Drug use usually took place at night as a social activity with other people in the student's or a friend's room.

Overwhelmingly, the reaction of the students smoking marijuana is positive. Four out of five report that they have never gotten sick, although one out of four does mention having experienced a bad "trip." Less than 10 per cent want to stop or have ever tried to stop, although 20 per cent report being "somewhat" worried.

There is no evidence in these findings to support the claims that smoking marijuana is a predecessor to the use of other, more than dangerous drugs. Marijuana users may occasionally "cross over" to try other drugs, but this is more of a search for new experiences than "progressive degeneration."

Alcohol and Marijuana. In addition to the question about their own use of drugs, the students were asked, "How frequently do most of the students you know do the following: smoke marijuana, take LSD, drink alcoholic beverages?" They were also asked in relation to these three recreational drugs, "How strongly do you approve or disapprove doing each of the following?" and "How much pressure do you feel to

engage in any of the following?" A comparison of their responses to these three aspects of use, attitude, and pressure for marijuana, LSD, and alcohol is given in Table 1.

First, we note the higher perception of marijuana use as compared to actual use. While 4 out of 5 students (78.8%) report that they do not use marijuana themselves, only 1 out of 3 (30.7%) estimates that most of the students they know do not smoke marijuana. Almost 2 out of 5 (38.6%) report that most of the students they know smoke marijuana frequently or occasionally.

Second, we see that alcohol continues by far to be most frequently used, with an overwhelming majority of students (84.1%) reporting that most of the students they know drink alcohol frequently or occasionally, as compared to 38.9 per cent for marijuana and 10.0 per cent for LSD.

TABLE 1. COMPARISON OF DRUGS ACCORDING TO USE, ATTITUDES, AND PRESSURES

Questions	Type-Drug		
	Alcoholic Beverages	Marijuana	LSD
Use ^a			
Frequently	47.2	14.1	1.2
Occasionally	36.9	24.5	8.8
Seldom	10.0	18.9	16.9
Never	2.4	30.7	53.8
Don't know	3.5	11.8	19.3
Attitude ^b			
Strongly approve	11.4	5.6	1.2
Approve	59.2	29.5	3.6
Undecided	22.2	31.5	20.9
Disapprove	5.2	20.1	25.7
Strongly disapprove	2.0	13.3	48.6
Pressure ^c			
A great deal	12.9	3.0	2.8
Some, but not much	38.2	16.5	2.0
Very little	47.0	78.1	92.6
No answer	1.9	2.4	2.6
Total per cent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total cases	497	497	497

^a Question: "How frequently do most of the students you know do the following?"

^b Question: "How strongly do you approve or disapprove of students doing each of the following?"

^c Question: "How much pressure do you feel to engage in any of the following?"

Third, we note that approval parallels use, with most of the students (70.6%) approving alcohol, some approving marijuana (35.4%), and few approving LSD (4.8%). The ratio of approval to disapproval is 10:1 in favor for alcohol, 1:1 for marijuana and 1:20 against LSD. It would appear that the campus is split on the use of marijuana, but overwhelmingly in favor of alcohol and against LSD.

Fourth, the pressure to use each of these drugs also parallels attitudes and practices. Most students report pressure to drink alcoholic beverages (51.1%), but only 19.5 per cent report feeling any pressure to smoke marijuana, with 4.9 per cent feeling some pressure to use LSD. These findings underscore the highly personal and voluntary nature of marijuana or LSD use. If anything, students are being more highly pressured toward possible alcoholism than drug addiction. The major recreational drug on the college campuses is still alcohol.

The relationship between pressure toward use of drugs and the actual frequency of use is quite high. An individual who reports feeling pressure to smoke marijuana is twice as likely to be a frequent user of marijuana (at least once a week) than one who reports little or no pressure (15.7% vs. 7.2%). A similar relationship exists between pressure to use LSD and actual use (16.6% vs. 8.5%). This finding is supported by the much more frequent use of marijuana among those students who report that most of the students they know also smoke marijuana. As many as 68.6 per cent of those students who report that most of the students they know smoke marijuana frequently do so themselves, as compared to only 0.7 per cent among those whose friends do not smoke marijuana.

A significant reversal between alcohol and drug use occurs in these data. The more the individual knows other students who drink alcohol, and the more pressure he feels to drink himself, the *less* likely is he to use marijuana. This finding would indicate that marijuana is more of a substitute for alcohol than a supplement. For many students it would appear that the use of marijuana represents a preference over alcohol as a source of "high."

The relationship of attitudes toward use

and actual use is, not unexpectedly, extremely high. Approval is much more likely to mean use (45.7%), with only a small minority (0.6%) disapproving of smoking marijuana at the same time that they do it. This finding once again attests to the voluntary nature of this act. It is also interesting to note that half of the students who approve of smoking marijuana still do not do so themselves. Most of the students (66.6%) do not feel that "anyone smoking marijuana is foolish" although only a minority agree that "the use of psychedelic drugs should be a matter of conscience and not legal restriction" (34.7%) and that "the university should not cooperate with legal authorities in the enforcement of drug use laws" (23.2%). In all cases, those students having positive attitudes towards marijuana, either in the wisdom of its use or in its freedom from legal restrictions, are much more likely to be users of marijuana.

Demographic Comparisons. The use of drugs varies significantly by sex, social class, marital status, and religion. No differences were found by age, year in college, birthplace or current marital status of parents. Males are almost three times as likely as females to be using drugs (e.g., smoking marijuana) at least once a week (13.9% vs. 4.6%), upper income groups twice as likely as lower income groups (14.1% vs. 7.3%), single students four times as likely as married students (8.9% vs. 2.1%) (but engaged students show greatest use—10.7%), and Atheists and "other religious affiliations reporting much more use (25.0%) than Protestants (4.9%), Catholics (4.8%), and Jews (4.0%). Similar differences occur in the category "less than once a week."

Social class differences are much more pronounced among the females than male students. Among coeds, the proportion smoking marijuana at least once a week rises rapidly from 1.5 per cent among those who come from families with annual incomes under \$12,000 to 13.1 per cent from families with incomes of \$20,000 or more. No statistically significant social class differences are found among the male students. In general, our analysis by demographic characteristics would support the

findings of others that marijuana smoking is not, like the use of narcotics, linked to a lower income sub-culture.

The "Hang-Loose" Ethic: Behavioral Correlates. Our primary hypothesis has been that drug use is only one aspect of the more general "happening" scene and reflects a broad range of other "anti-establishment" behaviors. Support for this hypothesis comes from our finding that drug use varies considerably according to such activities as participating in "happenings" (34.3% drug users among those who participate frequently vs. 17.0% among those who do so rarely), reading "underground" newspapers (42.0% users among frequent readers vs. 3.7% among non-readers), and participating in mass protests (45.9% among those who have done so more than twice vs. 15.2% for non-participants). It appears from these results that drug use in the form of smoking marijuana is highly associated with "non-conformist" behavior.

If we look at the student's cumulative grade as an index of his academic behavior, we see that drug use is more likely to occur among the poorer than the better students. Among those with an average grade of 3.0 or higher, only 15.3 per cent report the use of drugs as compared to 31.0 per cent among those with an average of 2.5 or less. This difference in grade probably represents one more manifestation of the rejection of the "hard work-success" ethic of conventional society.

The "Hang-Loose" Ethic: Attitudinal Correlates. Similar differences in frequency of drug use are found in relation to a wide range of educational, political, and social attitudes and values indicative of a rejection of the established order. Drug use is more likely to be reported by those students who are relatively antagonistic to the educational system and who are dissatisfied with the education they are receiving. For example, among those students who disagree with the statement, "American colleges today should place more emphasis on teaching American ideals and values," more than seven times as many are frequent smokers of marijuana than among those who agree (13.8% vs. 1.8%). Similarly, whereas 30.2 per cent of those students who "often" feel that what they are learning is a waste

of time smoke marijuana, only 12.9 per cent of those who don't feel this way do so. However drug use does not mean "apathy" toward academic life—more smokers of marijuana are to be found among those students who believe that students should have a more active role in making decisions about student life than among those who do not (28.4% vs. 11.1%).

On the political scene, drug use is much more likely to occur if the student is opposed to the Vietnam war (37.5% among those favoring immediate military withdrawal vs. 3.0% among those supporting President Johnson's policy). Drug users are also more frequent among those who believe that "human lives are too important to be sacrificed for any form of government" (32.0% vs. 12.6%). Opposition to the draft is another political view associated with drug use. Among those who are opposed to military service, 35.2 per cent use drugs as compared to 15.0 per cent among those who are not opposed, and, in fact, for those male students whose decision to attend college was affected by the possibility of being drafted, 41.7 per cent are drug users as compared to 25.2 per cent among those for whom this was not a consideration.

Social attitudes also reflect this "hang-loose" ethic on the part of drug users. Drug users are more likely to be found among those who feel it is all right to get around the law if you don't actually break it (34.6% vs. 13.8%) and who feel that the "hippie" way of life represents a desire for serious change as opposed to an unproductive expression of non-conformism (26.6% vs. 10.5%). The student who reports that he expects to get the most satisfaction out of life by means of his leisure time recreational activities is a much more frequent user of marijuana than the student who values participation in civic affairs or family relations (45.2% vs. 12.5% and 17.0%). An indication of possible family conflict among drug users is given by the higher proportion of drug users among those students who feel that their parents don't respect their opinions (29.2% vs. 15.3%).

One finding in regard to social attitudes appears contrary to many claims made

about drug use. A series of four questions designed to index "alienation" (i.e., "These days a person does not really know whom he can count on"; "If you don't watch yourself, people will take advantage of you.") showed no statistically significant relationships to smoking marijuana, despite the claim of Halleck (Time, 1967) that "Smoking marijuana has become almost an emblem of alienation." Given the large number of significant differences found, this lack of any association between drug use and alienation is impressive. The "hang-loose" ethic, while it may represent antagonism to the conventional world, does not appear to create apathy and withdrawal. Subscribers to this ethic are not so much "anomic" in regard to society in general as critical of the existing "Establishment" in specific.

The "Hang-Loose" Ethic: Personality Correlates. The more the student's self-image tends to be rebellious, cynical, anti-establishment, "hippie," and apathetic, the more likely is he to smoke marijuana. Conversely, the more his self-image tends to be conformist, well-behaved, moral, and "square," the less likely is he to make use of marijuana. The greatest differences are to be found between those students who regard themselves as "hippies" (39% difference in favor of use) or well-behaved (37% difference against use). The smallest differences occur in relation to apathy (8% difference in favor of use) and cynicism (10% difference in favor of use).

These contrasts in self-image between users and non-users are congruent with the previous findings in relation to behavioral and attitudinal correlates. Such attitudes as disrespect for the law and skepticism about the worthwhileness of college, coupled with such behaviors as participating in mass protests and "happenings," match the self-portrait of the marijuana smoker as anti-establishment, cynical, and rebellious. If we view these traits as indicative of an underlying value system, we can quite readily see the contrast in "Protestant" vs. "hang-loose" ethic between marijuana smokers and non-smokers. These self-characterizations do lend face validity to the general public stereotyping of the mari-

juana smoker as "deviant" and the marijuana's own stereotyping of those who do not use marijuana as "square."

Demographic Controls. Each of the major differences in behavior, attitudes, and personality between users and non-users of marijuana was examined separately by sex, income, and religious group. Since, for example, males are more likely than females to smoke marijuana and also to subscribe to the "hang-loose" ethic, the possibility exists that both ethic and drug use are reflections of sex and are not really associated in and of themselves.

Analysis of the demographic control tables shows that this, by and large, is not the case. In almost every instance, the differences in marijuana use occur independently for both the demographic control and the behavioral, attitudinal, and personality correlates of the "hang-loose" ethic. In other words, the "hang-loose" ethic continues to be related to marijuana smoking regardless of the sub-group of the student population being studied.

This is illustrated in Table 2, which presents the relationship between several different indices of the "hang-loose" ethic and marijuana use separately for males and females. First, we note that males are more likely than females both to subscribe to the "hang-loose" ethic and to smoke marijuana. Second, we see that for males and females separately, the more the student adheres to the "hang-loose" ethic, either in his or her behavior, attitudes, or personality, the more likely he or she is to smoke marijuana. Thus, we conclude that both sex and ethic contribute independently to marijuana use. This same conclusion appears in general for other demographic variables and for other indices of the "hang-loose" ethic.

We can also see from Table 2, in general, that the relationship between the "hang-loose" ethic and marijuana use is somewhat higher among the males. Also, the differences due to sex are much smaller than those due to variations in behavior, attitudes, or personality. It would thus appear that one's ethic is a more important determinant of marijuana use than one's sex. For example, in all cases, those females

TABLE 2. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN "HANG-LOOSE" ETHIC AND MARIJUANA USE, ACCORDING TO SEX

"Hang-loose" Ethic	(Per Cent Smoking Marijuana)	
	Male	Female
Behavioral		
Participate in mass protests		
No	9.9(141)	3.8(212)
Once or twice	12.5 (48)	5.9 (51)
More than twice	40.0 (25)	16.7 (12)
Attend a "Happening"		
Rarely	8.6(116)	2.4(168)
Occasionally	15.5 (58)	3.7 (82)
Frequently	33.3 (33)	20.8 (24)
Attitudinal		
"It is all right to get around the law, if you don't actually break it."		
Disagree	18.2 (99)	11.3(168)
Undecided	34.0 (47)	19.0 (63)
Agree	40.3 (62)	26.7 (45)
"How strongly do you approve or disapprove of students having premarital sexual intercourse?"		
Disapprove	0.0 (18)	1.2 (81)
Undecided	26.8 (56)	11.1 (90)
Approve	33.8(136)	33.3(102)
Personality		
"Anti-establishment"		
Not at all well	18.0(111)	12.1(182)
A little	32.4 (34)	13.2 (38)
Undecided and well	46.9 (64)	32.7 (55)
"Well-behaved"		
Very well	15.6 (32)	4.6 (65)
Fairly well	21.4(131)	17.8(185)
Undecided and not well	56.2 (48)	27.6 (29)

who subscribe to the "hang-loose" ethic are much more likely to use marijuana than those males who do not.

Attitude Toward Use and Frequency of Use by Other Students. In the same way that we have analyzed the student's use of marijuana according to various correlates of the "hang-loose" ethic, we can also examine his attitudes toward such use and his reports about how many of the students he knows also smoke marijuana. (Since so few students report feeling any pressure to

smoke marijuana, this aspect is omitted from the following analysis.) We present the results of this analysis in a summary fashion in Table 3. With only one exception—the relationship of family income to attitudes to marijuana use—all of the variables listed are significantly related (chi square $p < .05$) to attitudes to use and frequency of use by other students in the same direction as the student's own use of marijuana. That is, the behavioral, attitudinal, and personality correlates of the "hang-loose" ethic also relate to one's attitude toward smoking marijuana and the frequency of marijuana use among the students one knows. These three aspects of attitudes toward use, use by one's friends, and use by oneself, then, all become part of the general picture of marijuana use as such use reflects adherence to the "hang-loose" ethic.

The relative size of the associations (keeping in mind the variations from question to question of the number of answer categories) can be determined in an approximate way from the size of Cramer's V , a coefficient of association (Blalock, 230). Self-image tends to be more highly related than either attitudes or behavior. Sex attitudes are, in general, more highly related than either political or educational values. Very high associations are to be found among attitudes and behaviors in regard to smoking marijuana, taking LSD, having sexual intercourse, and drinking alcoholic beverages, in about that order.

In summary, this table of associations underscores the interrelationships between attitudes and use, and between the various correlates of the "hang-loose" ethic and such attitudes and use. It is quite clear that the more one's behaviors, attitudes, and personality conform to the "hang-loose" ethic, the more likely one will be to approve of smoking marijuana and the more likely it is that one will associate with other students who smoke marijuana.

Finally, in Table 4, we show the mutual effects of attitude toward smoking marijuana and several aspects of the "hang-loose" ethic upon the use of marijuana. By and large, similar differences are found for all other aspects of the "hang-loose" ethic. As hypothesized, these two variables

TABLE 3. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDE TO USE OF MARIJUANA, FREQUENCY OF USE BY OTHER STUDENTS AND SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Student Characteristics ^a	Attitude to Use of Marijuana ^b	Frequency of Use by Other Students ^c
Demographic		
Sex	.14 ^d	.19
Income	n.s.	.14
Behavior patterns		
Attend "happening"	.17	.30
Read "underground" newspaper	.30	.26
Participate in mass protest	.16	.20
Self-image		
"Hippie"	.28	.30
Anti-establishment	.23	.19
Well-behaved	.23	.22
Educational values		
College a waste of time	.16	.16
Students active in student affairs	.14	.13
Political values		
Vietnam a mistake	.19	.20
Human lives not to be sacrificed in war	.12	.12
Conscientious objection a loophole	.19	.17
Social values		
Approval of pre-marital sex, if consent	.32	.28
Approval of abortion	.22	.20
Approval of birth control	.22	.17
Approval of law-breaking	.15	.14
Frequency of other student behaviors		
Drink alcoholic beverages	.15	.19
Smoke marijuana	.42	...
Take LSD	.29	.41
Have sexual intercourse	.30	.37
Attitude to student behaviors		
Drink alcoholic beverages	.25	.14
Smoke marijuana	...	.42
Takes LSD	.33	.30
Have sexual intercourse	.42	.31

^a See previous text for question wording used to determine student characteristics.

^b Question: "How strongly do you approve or disapprove of students smoking marijuana?" (Strongly Approve, Approve, Undecided, Disapprove, Strongly Disapprove).

^c Question: "How frequently do most of the students you know smoke marijuana?" (Frequently, Occasionally, Seldom, Never, Don't Know).

^d Coefficients of association as determined by Cramer's V.

are independently related to drug use with the most frequent use occurring among those students who have both a favorable attitude toward the use of marijuana and an adherence to the "hang-loose" ethic. In general, an unfavorable attitude toward the use of marijuana will be equated with the absence of marijuana smoking. However, even among those with an unfavorable attitude, use will be higher with adherence to the "hang-loose" ethic. Similarly, given a favorable attitude toward use of marijuana, actual use is much more likely to take place among those students displaying "hang-loose" attitudes, behavior, and personality.

On the basis of these interrelationships of demographic characteristics, attitudes, behavior, and personality to drug use, the following sequence or chain of events appears quite probable (although it would require a prospective study to test it); adherence to the "hang-loose" ethic is more likely to occur among certain predisposed personality types (i.e. rebellious, cynical) and in certain social sub-groups (i.e. males, non-religious); such adherence is likely to lead to a favorable attitude toward smoking marijuana both for its "high" effects and its symbolism of rebellion against author-

TABLE 4. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN "HANG-LOOSE" ETHIC, ATTITUDE TOWARD MARIJUANA USE AND USE OF MARIJUANA

	(Per Cent Smoking Marijuana)	
	Attitude to Use of Marijuana	
	Favorable	Unfavorable
"Hang-loose" Ethic		
Attend a "Happening"		
Rarely	31.3 (83)	4.5 (201)
Occasionally	51.9 (54)	11.8 (84)
Frequently	73.5 (34)	25.6 (19)
"It's all right to get around the law, if you don't actually break it"		
Disagree	37.3 (75)	4.7 (191)
Undecided	42.2 (45)	14.3 (61)
Agree	60.4 (48)	14.6 (55)
"Anti-establishment"		
No	39.8 (103)	6.6 (260)
Yes	54.9 (71)	19.3 (47)

ity; this favorable attitude will be supported by other students who also embrace the "hang-loose" ethic and engage in similar overt and covert expressions of rejection of the established order. Finally, given this climate of opinion and behavior, the smoking of marijuana becomes almost a "natural" act for many students far removed from the public's current efforts to define it either as a legal or a health problem.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The data presented in this report strongly support the major hypothesis that the more the student embraces the "hang-loose" ethic, the more frequently will he make use of marijuana. Also supported is the further hypothesis that certain social sub-groups such as males will more frequently both smoke marijuana and adhere to the "hang-loose" ethic, but that regardless of group membership, the "hang-loose" ethic will be related to marijuana use. In regard to attitudes toward use, we find, as hypothesized, that the more the student subscribes to the "hang-loose" ethic, the more favorable will he be toward marijuana use; and the more favorable he is, the more will he actually use marijuana. These attitudes toward use and the "hang-loose" ethic become independent factors in marijuana smoking, reinforcing each other with the greatest use occurring among those students with a favorable attitude who also believe in the "hang-loose" ethic. Finally, the student's use of marijuana is strongly supported when his friends also smoke marijuana.

These findings have significance for both sociological theory and social action. From a theoretical point of view, they support the interpretation of drug use as part of a sub-cultural group way of life. Among students, this sub-culture is strongly characterized by a "hang-loose" ethic which attempts to cut itself loose from the traditional "establishment" and to develop freedom from conformity and the search for new experiences. This culture becomes expressed in such behaviors as attending "happenings," reading underground newspapers, participating in mass protests, avoiding the draft, engaging in sexual in-

tercourse and, very much to the point of this report, smoking marijuana. Such use of marijuana constitutes an important means both of attaining "freedom" from the pressures of society and of expressing antagonism toward the "unfair" laws and restrictions of that society. For such students, marijuana serves much the same function as "social drinking" does for their parents, and their "law breaking" has the same social sanctions as drinking did during Prohibition. And just as "social drinking" is a far cry from "alcoholism," so is smoking marijuana far removed from "narcotics addiction."

The relationship of both social drinking to alcoholism and smoking marijuana to narcotics addiction illustrates a significant interaction between social problems, health problems, and legal problems (Suchman, 1963:58-64). A social act (e.g. one carried out by members of a group as part of the sub-cultural norm of that group) will be labelled a social problem when it conflicts with the accepted norms of the larger society. In this sense, marijuana smoking among students has become a social problem, whereas drinking alcohol has not. The type of corrective action "legitimized" by the larger society to meet this problem will then determine whether it is viewed as a health or a legal problem. The more the social problem threatens the "value system" of the society, the more likely is it to be labelled a legal as opposed to a health problem and to be assigned to the police rather than the doctor. Restriction and punishment become the means for handling the problem rather than understanding and treatment.

In the absence of any clear-cut evidence that (1) marijuana smoking is physiologically addictive or has serious health effects, and (2) use of marijuana leads to crime and delinquency or use of other drugs, it seems premature to view it as either a health or a legal problem. (Mayor's Committee on Marijuana, 1944) Our data would strongly suggest that use of marijuana is predominantly a social act favored by a sub-group in our society which happens to be disenchanted with the established order and for whom such use has become simply a normal preference for their

own particular recreational drug. (Simmons, 1967) To crack down on these youth with all of the powerful forces of law and order and to justify such a restriction of freedom in the name of preventing crime or disease seems more an uncontrolled expression of adult moral indignation and righteousness than of human concern or social justice—and, sadly, an ineffective and destructive expression at that. (Lindesmith, 1965) While there can be little question that the “hang-loose” ethic is contrary to the Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism, and may be socially disapproved for that and other reasons, the issue, it seems to us, should be openly faced and debated as one of conflicting social values and not of crime or health. As formulated by Simmons (1967:11), “It [the marijuana issue] seems to be the pivot around which far deeper conflicts and confrontations are raging—oldsters versus youngsters, hippies versus straight society, administered morality versus personal freedom.”

Surely, it should be possible to express one's disapproval of marijuana and to seek its control without making its use a crime against society.

REFERENCES

- Becker, H. S.
1953 “Becoming a marijuana user.” *American Journal of Sociology* 59 (November): 235–242.
- Blalock, Hubert M.
1960 *Social Statistics*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Goldsen, Rose K., et al.
1960 *What College Students Think*. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand.
- Jacob, Phillip E.
1957 *Changing Values in College*. New York: Harper and Bros.
- Lindesmith, Alfred R.
1965 *The Addict and the Law*, Bloomington: The Indiana University Press.
- Mayor's Committee on Marijuana.
1944 “The marijuana problem in the City of New York,” pp. 233–360 in David Solomon (ed.), *The Marijuana Papers*. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1966. For an excellent analysis of this report see David Arnold, “The meaning of the La Guardia report,” pp. 111–135 in Jerry Simmons (ed.), *Marijuana: Myths and Realities*, North Hollywood, Calif.: Brandon House, 1967.
- McGlothlin, W. H.
1967 “Toward a rational view of marijuana,” pp. 163–214 in Jerry Simmons (ed.), *Marijuana: Myths and Realities*. North Hollywood, Calif.: Brandon House.
- Plaut, Thomas F.
1967 *Alcohol Problems: A Report of the Nation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reader's Digest.
1967 November, 1967.
- Simmons, Jerry L. (ed.).
1967 *Marijuana: Myths and Realities*. North Hollywood, Calif.: Brandon House.
- Simmons, Jerry L., and Barry Winograd.
1966 *It's Happening: A Portrait of the Youth Scene Today*. Santa Barbara, Calif.: Marc-Laird Publications.
- Straus, Robert and Selden D. Bacon.
1953 *Drinking in College*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Suchman, Edward A.
1963 *Sociology and the Field of Public Health*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Suchman, E.
1963 “The addictive diseases as socio-environmental health problems,” pp. 123–143 in H. Freeman, et al. (eds.), *Handbook of Medical Sociology*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Time.
1967 May 19, 1967.