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CHAPTER ONE

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Since the mid-1960's the number of black students attending predominately white institutions of higher education has increased tremendously (Powell, 1970). Although this increase in black students on college and university campuses has encouraged several investigations (Edwards, 1971; Harper, 1971 and Joseph, 1968), most of these have been descriptive or philosophical in nature. One of the most serious impediments to developing a clear understanding of black students as functioning individuals and how they perceive the world has been the dearth of empirical data on these students.

The data, to date, can usually be categorized as two types; that based on the observations and interactions of black faculty and staff and that based on the experiences of former black students.

Staff members such as Gibbs (1973) have summarized the problems of black students as a difference in expectations from that of white administrators and staff,
with the white staff and administrators pushing for acculturation and the black students expecting the university to be flexible and sensitive to their needs by offering a diversity of activities and lifestyles. Erwin (1976) and Pruitt (1970) also agree that there is a push for acculturation which is contrary to the expectations of black students. Gibbs (1973) found the black students she counseled suffering from personal identity crises and as a result separating from white students in search of their own ethnic heritage and a place within the university. Erwin (1976) asserts that blacks want an expressive education which enhances their own personal pride as members of the black race, but feels this is neglected by white institutions of higher learning thus alienating the black student.

Harper (1971) sees the problem as a lack of preparation on the part of the white institutions for black students and the exploitation of the black community in research by these institutions, which is in direct contrast to the expectations of black students that their education would enhance the local black community (Gibbs, 1973). This could further lead to the alienation of black students.

Former black students express similar opinions.
Dillingham (1976) believes black students draw together in search of psychological security. Miller (1969) feels the problems blacks encounter on campus force them to feel alienated and Harper (1969) sums up his feelings about being black on a predominantly white campus as being "hyper-alienated."

Even the small amount of empirical data examining black-white perceptions of the university climate have concluded that black and white students have different perceptions and experiences of the same campus (Centra, 1970). Hedegard and Brown (1969) found the differences to stem from the fact that black students find much of the university atmosphere tailored with someone else in mind.

Alienation from the predominantly white university or college seems to be a theme running through the literature on black students. Alienation is a multidimensional concept consisting of components such as powerlessness, meaningfulness, normlessness, and social isolation. Dean (1961) operationalizes the concept of alienation to consist of powerlessness which refers to a person's felt inability to influence important aspects of their lives; normlessness which refers to the absence of values that might give purpose to life or the experience of conflicting codes of behavior; and social isolation which pertains
to a feeling of separation from the group or its standards.

This concept is also a dominant theme in the life of today's college students. Herron (1974) attributes much of the alienation of college students to the structural changes within the systems of higher learning which have been transformed into large-scale bureaucratic organizations. The minimizing of the student's role in higher education has led to frustrations among students about their purpose. Herron (1974) feels this leads to alienation.

This explanation of college student alienation is crucial to the black student who lacks the experience or expertise to handle the complexities of the university system (Haettenschwiller, 1971). Experiencing the bureaucracy may frustrate the white student, but could very well overwhelm the first generation black collegian.

Black writers also propose an interesting interpretation about the alienation of the black student. Harper (1971) and Erwin (1976) feel the university serves a predominantly white society and perpetuates the values and traditions of that society of which it is a microcosm. Burbach and Thompson (1971) also agree with this interpretation, but take it further by concluding that the university espouses hope and opportunity while in reality
the minority student confronts the same type of problems there, as in the greater society. They believe it is the hope and purported opportunity which frustrates the minority students to separation and alienation.

The area of comparing alienation among black and white students is also lacking in empirical data. Burbach and Thompson (1971) used the Dean Alienation scale (Dean, 1961) while comparing alienation among black, Puerto Rican, and White college students. They found the blacks to be the most alienated.

Babbit, Burbach and Thompson (1975) investigated the alienation felt by black students in three educational settings: a large urban university, a medium-sized urban college and a small urban center. They found the black students attending the small urban center to be less alienated than those attending the other two institutions. The results were attributed to the size and complexity of the college and university and the nearness and close contact the small urban center had with the surrounding black community. This lack of empirical research addresses the need for further investigation of the alienation of black students.

Clark (1959) attests to how closely the concept of alienation is related to Rotter's (1966) concept of Internal-External Locus of Control. He feels no matter
what definition is given to the concept of alienation one's feelings of lack of power to eliminate the gap between what one feels one should be and what one is seems to be encompassed. The internal-external locus of control scale was introduced as a way to measure individual differences in beliefs of control over one's own destiny. Rotter (1966) presents a belief in external control as a belief in chance, luck, or powerful others factors as a source of control over one's behaviors or experiences and a belief in internal control as a belief in one's own ability to control one's own life.

Since its inception, locus of control has been the focus of a vast amount of research. Two very comprehensive reviews of the literature on internal-external locus of control (Lefourt, 1966; Rotter, 1966) have found that internals rather than externals would be more likely to make greater attempts at mastering the environment; to be more resistant to influence attempts from others; yet more effective in attempts to influence others; to prefer high probability choices in risk taking behavior; to be higher in achievement orientation and lower in anxiety; to act more responsively to probability changes in a situation; to place higher value on skill determined rewards, and to be more involved in social action.
From this brief review it is obvious that beliefs in internal control are more positively valued than beliefs in external control. Blacks have been found to be more external than whites in various studies (Lefcourt, 1966; Lefcourt and Ladwig, 1965). Battle and Rotter (1963) found an interaction between race and social class with lower class blacks being significantly more external than lower class whites or middle class whites or middle class blacks.

Recent research has suggested that there are additional factors within the Rotter I-E scale which could diffuse the understanding of the construct which it is supposed to measure. Most of the research, to date, has proceeded under the assumption that internal-external locus of control is a unidimensional construct. There is research now which suggests otherwise.

Mirels (1970) has identified two distinct factors within the Rotter scale. One factor is concerned with the belief in one's mastery over one's own life and the other is concerned with the degree to which the individual citizen is deemed capable of exerting an impact on political systems. Mirels explains that the wording of the items makes these two factors different because of their reference to the individual (self) or others. Reid
and Ware (1973) make a similar distinction calling these two factors "fatalism" and "social system control." In contrast to Mirels (1970), Reid and Ware (1973) feel the individual is perceived target in both situations, but that the source of control is the primary difference between the two dimensions (chance, luck and fortune versus social forces and institutions).

Gurin, Gurin, Lao, and Beattie (1969) have also investigated the multidimensionality of the I-E construct and they agree with Mirels (1970) that the I-E construct has not distinguished between the amount of control that people feel over their lives, which they call personal control versus the amount of control that people feel people in general have, which they call control ideology. Gurin et al. (1969) feel that it is assumed in the literature that internal scores are a reflection of the control the individual perceives having, yet they found the questions on the Rotter I-E scale to include items which refer to personal control and others which refer to the control others have.

Along the external dimension, Levenson (1973); 1974 formulated an I-E scale using a Likert-format which differentiated among three different sources of control: self (I), powerful others (P), and chance (C). She used
self as the target of control consistently across all three dimensions. She constructed the new scales to separate the belief in chance or fate from a belief in powerful others because she expected externally oriented people to act differently depending on whether they expect to be controlled by chance or powerful others. This distinction was found to be valid for a sample of psychiatric patients, a sample of college students, a sample of 96 adults and a study comparing black and white student's beliefs in locus of control (Levenson, 1973; 1974, and Garcia and Levenson, 1975). In the latter study blacks were found to hold stronger beliefs in chance and powerful other when socio-economic level was controlled.

Gurin et al. (1969) also make this type of distinction along the external dimension. They point out that a belief in external control may be very realistic for low income or minority group members who experience external obstacles that have little to do with chance. These obstacles are usually in the form of powerful others or social systems. In addition black individuals face the external forces of discrimination which operates over and above class restraints. Discrimination and racism operate quite differently from chance in that they are systematic, predictable and reliable which would tend
to make the belief in powerful others stronger.

These findings seem to suggest that predictions involving the I-E scale might do well to consider the source and target of control described by these items. This would seem to have implications for blacks who have consistently been shown to be more external than whites. Based on this discussion of the multidimensionality of the I-E construct it is evident that there is still confusion over the factors which make up this construct. This confusion would cloud the relationship between locus of control and alienation.

The general purpose of this study was to exploit the perceptions of locus of control and alienation for black and white male and female college students. Stated more specifically, this investigation has the following major purposes:

1. To identify the differences between black and white students in their responses to a Multidimensional I-E scale, the University Alienation Scale (USA), the Rotter I-E scale, and three demographic variables (number of brothers, number of sisters and sibling rank).

2. To identify the differences between males and females in their responses to a Multidimensional I-E scale, the University Alienation Scale, the Rotter I-E scale and three demographic variables (number of brothers, number of sisters and sibling rank).

3. To identify the interaction between race and sex in the subject's responses to a Multidimensional I-E scale, the University Alienation Scale, the Rotter I-E scale, and three demographic
variables (number of brothers, number of sisters and sibling rank).
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As previously noted, alienation is a prominent theme in the literature on black students in predominantly white universities and colleges. Clark (1959) has suggested that there is a connection between Internal-External control and alienation, but a definitive understanding is confused by the evidence that I-E is a multidimensional construct instead of the unidimensional construct it was thought to be. With these points in mind, a review of the relevant theories and research is in order.

BLACK STUDENTS IN THE LITERATURE

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is considered the turning point in increasing the number of black students on today's college campuses. Title VI of this act "barred discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal assistance against any person because of his race, color or national origin" (Pierce, Phillips and Velsey, 1965). So to be in accordance with the law and continue receiving federal funds, predominantly white institutions were forced to recruit students to effect a
change in the numbers of minority group students enrolled on their campuses.

The existing information on the black student experience is based either on the observations of black staff and administrators or the experiences recalled by former black students. These evaluations of the lives of black students on predominantly white campuses have been descriptive and philosophical. The literature is quite informative, but there is a lack of empirical data in this area.

Gibbs (1973), while working at the University of Santa Clara, concludes that a problem arises because black students and white administrators and staff come to the college situation with very different expectations. She feels that since these groups have had very little previous interaction, they operate under expectations which are based on the status of the other group instead of actual knowledge (Cohen, 1969).

Gibbs' (1973) assessment of the white staff's assumptions of black students includes the assumption that the black student will be so grateful for having been given a chance to gain quality integrated education that they will blend into the socio-cultural life of the campus and assimilate into the university community without the need for any substantial alteration of academic structure
or programs.

In contrast, Gibbs (1973) found black students expecting the university to be flexible and sensitive to their needs, to offer a greater diversity of activities and lifestyles, to have a greater contact with the black community surrounding the campus and that they would contribute as much to the university as it contributed to them, and this would benefit the institution.

Johnson (1975) feels there is little concern about how black students fare in learning to cope in a predominantly white environment. He is concerned about the high attrition rate among black students in white colleges. Johnson (1975) has found that some black students leave because they don't have the skills needed to compete academically, whereas others, in good academic standing, drop out because they are uncertain about the relevance of their courses to their careers or they drop out from a feeling of social alienation from their teachers or the university.

Johnson (1975) discusses cooperation, withdrawal from conflict or aggressive behavior as the three basic coping mechanisms available to black students. The cooperative approach encourages interaction with white students to dispel myths and promote mutual education among groups. Some of the behaviors displayed in withdrawal
from the conflict are separation from the source of the conflict (white students and administrators) and isolation. Acting out aggressively may take the constructive form of discussions or debates with students and administrators or the destructive form of lashing out at persons or property.

Erwin (1976) feels that black students do have very different college experiences and expectations. He asserts that these students share with their white counterparts the desire to gain knowledge which will be economically useful after graduation, but he also finds that black students want an expressive education which will strengthen their sense of personal identity as members of the Black race. The author's assessment of the attitudes of black students reveals that these students have the desire to attend college, but feel alienated from the colleges they attend.

Erwin (1976), like Gibbs (1973), suggests that white administrators hold beliefs which are based on the acculturation-oriented attitude that black students should behave and act just like white students. This attitude is contrary to the expectations of black students since it was stated earlier that these students want an education that would strengthen their own ethnic heritage (Erwin, 1976).
As a result of this contradiction, the black students began to demand the elimination of racism, recruitment of black faculty and students, curriculum reform and psychological (group) togetherness and Erwin (1976) feels the demand for togetherness is another indication of the degree to which black students do not identify with or feel a part of the total university setting.

Pruitt (1970) feels one of the severest upheavals facing black students can result from the process of acculturation, defined as the learning of a majority culture by an ethnic group and the learning of middle-class culture by lower class individuals.

Harper (1971) views the problems of black students in terms of the lack of preparation on the part of the colleges for these students. He contends the institutions have admitted black students without changes to the curriculum, attitudes or social environment to meet the needs of these students. Harper (1971) also points out that the university is usually isolated from the local community and has not only failed to serve and enhance the black community, but has exploited the community through their research. One of Gibbs' (1973) black students' expectations was a greater contact with the black community surrounding the campus. This would make it very difficult to feel a part of a university which exploits
the community or a community similar to the one in which you were raised or hope to serve in the future.

Harper (1971) has decided that because of the small numbers of blacks on college campuses, the need for love and belongingness propels the black student to identify with other blacks. This could be a reaction to the fear of rejection or the knowledge that social activities on campus were not designed with blacks in mind (Gibbs, 1973). Harper (1971) has found blacks on large campuses to identify more with the Black race than their universities.

The sentiments are similar in the articles written by former black students on their college experiences. Dillingham (1976) advocates that black students draw together in search of psychological security. He felt the attitudes expressed toward him as a black student were that blacks are underprivileged, behind, in need of help and not as good as the white students.

Miller (1969) has some pretty bitter recollections of his experiences on a white campus. He feels that blacks, as a minority on campus, are condemned to encounter problems not encountered by their white counterparts and this results in feelings of alienation.

The small amount of empirical research examining
black-white differences in perceptions of the university climate suggest that people in different groups at the same university may function under different conditions and perceive the university differently. Hedegard and Brown (1969) found, after studying the perceptions of a large group of black and white freshman at a large university, that there were black-white differences in experiences, levels of skill and abilities, modes of expression and communication and ways of viewing the world.

Willie and Levy (1972), in their investigation of black-white differences in social life, have noted that the separation between blacks and whites on integrated campuses could lead to different university-related experiences.

Pfiefer and Schneider (1974) devised a questionnaire to measure the university climate to which 138 black and 550 white students responded. One of the main differences in the climate factors between the black and the white samples was the emergence of two racism factors for the black sample. Racism for the black sample was divided by what happens to blacks on a person-to-person level (personal racism) and what the institution does to blacks as a class of people (institutional racism). They found that black students were paying closer attention to cues of racism, which were relevant to their lives, than white students.
This evidence is by no means presented as the feelings of all black students since these students compose a very heterogeneous group which crosses all socio-economic levels and lifestyles. This very broad and extensive review of literature on the experiences of black students was included because of the lack of empirical studies in this area. Each piece of literature encompasses the theme of alienation. Despite the different reasons given by the authors for the black students' alienation they all seem to point to the fact that the institutions are not meeting special needs of black students and as a result these students are alienated.

RACE AND ALIENATION

An examination of the literature on race and alienation indicates that blacks are among the most highly alienated members of this society (Burbach and Thompson, 1971). The writing of James Baldwin can better illustrate this phenomenon. Baldwin (L962) senses the cultural estrangement to be so extreme among blacks in American that he feels there are wars that American Blacks would not support. His feelings are that blacks won't fight for a country that has not yet given them their freedom. Carmichael and Hamilton (1967) and Malcolm X (1964) also provide first hand accounts of the alienated condition
of the black man in society,

In an empirical study measuring alienation and race, Middleton (1963) found, in a small Southern town, the percentage of blacks who felt alienated on measures of powerlessness, meaninglessness, social estrangement and estrangement from work to be higher than the percentage of whites. Middleton (1963) had felt that each of these different types of alienation was highly correlated with one another and hypothesized that each type of alienation would be directly related to a disabling social condition, either subordinate racial status or low educational attainment, that would limit or block attainment of culturally valued objects. Middleton (1963) found marked number of blacks perceived a conflict between success goals and ethical means. The author felt this was partly due to the blacks' recognition that discrimination leaves open to them few legitimate avenues to success and also blacks may take a more cynical perspective on society after observing the discrepancy between the whites professed ideals and their actual behavior, especially where blacks are concerned.

Middleton (1963) found the percentage differences between high and low educational groups among whites to be more than twice that for blacks on the meaninglessness scale. The findings suggest that education is not a
significant factor in relieving blacks of their sense of not really understanding what is going on. Middleton (1963) speculates that the blacks' sense of powerlessness is responsible. His feeling is that even educated blacks would feel little interest in attempting to understand things they believe are beyond their control.

ALIENATION AND COLLEGE STUDENTS

Alienation from the university is not a phenomenon unique to black students. College and university students have been increasingly categorized as alienated since the early 1960's. Herron (1974) has investigated this area and found that while much of the literature has perceived alienation as a dysfunction of the individual, there is a growing awareness that the root cause of this alienation may be the structural changes within higher education. Herron (1974) states that "the immense growth and rapid development of most universitites and colleges has transformed once intimate and close-knit structures into large bureaucratic organizations" (p. 107). This development, which is hastened by demands upon the university by its non-student constituency, leads to a minimization of the student's role in the system of higher education. Herron's (1974) feelings are that, where the students were once the
center of the educational system, they are now finding it hard to integrate the experiences of which they now have become a part. Alienation occurs when attempts at integration fail leading to frustration of a reasonable expectation.

This interpretation may be doubly important in the case of black students. Many black students attending predominantly white institutions do not come from families with a history of college attendance. They may be first generation collegians (Gibbs, 1973) who have not undergone the anticipatory socialization to prepare them for the complexities of college life. Haettenschwiller (1971) also points out that compared to white students, who have had years to learn and be exposed to the intricacies of the academic institution, blacks lack the experience with the bureaucracy. The complexity of the university may frustrate the white student, but come end up overwhelming the black student.

Black writers have presented another explanation for the increased feelings of alienation among black students. Both Harper (1971) and Erwin (1976) point to the fact that white institutions are an integral part of society, which is racist, and that these institutions are set up to serve a primarily white society. Burbach and Thompson (1971)
see the issue as "many problems arise from the fact that minority students encounter within the microcosm of the university the same problems they confront in the larger society. But when this reality is experienced against a backdrop of hope and anticipated promise through higher education, it serves to exacerbate the differences of minorities within a society and a university which largely exhibits white traditions and values" (p. 248).

Burbach and Thompson (1971) point to an interesting phenomenon which is alluded to in the research mentioned earlier which is that black students come to college with high expectations that the education they will receive will fulfill their vocational, economic, social, and cultural needs, but find instead of encouragement, that life within the institution is just like that outside and the paths are similarly blocked by racism and discrimination.

Burbach and Thompson (1971) conducted an investigation comparing the alienation of black, Puerto Rican and white college students. Using the Dean Alienation Scale (Dean, 1961) to measure powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation the authors sampled 145 black, 525 white, and 55 Puerto Rican freshman. They found the black group to attain the highest mean score on each of the three scales, while the Puerto Rican group, except for a slightly higher mean score on powerlessness than the white group, obtained
the lowest mean score on each scale. An explanation offered by Burbach and Thompson (1971) for the low score on the alienation subscales by the Puerto Rican group were that these subjects were from a community surrounding the campus and thus experienced stable family and community lives.

In interpreting the comparisons between the black and white groups, in which blacks were found to be more alienated than whites on the powerlessness and normlessness scales, Burbach and Thompson (1971) suggested that the differences on normlessness showed that blacks experienced a greater sense of purposelessness (the loss of socialized values and the absence of values that might give purpose to life) and more of a feeling of being confronted with contradictory normative patterns than their white counterparts. The authors attributed the differences on the powerlessness subscale to feelings among blacks that they have little control over their every day lives and that they are being manipulated for purposes other than their own.

Babbit, Burbach, and Thompson (1975) compared levels of organizational alienation among black students in three educational settings using the University Alienation Scale (USA) which measures the powerlessness, meaningfulness and social estrangement components of alienation
within the university context. The three educational settings were a large urban university, a medium sized urban college and a small urban center.

Babbit et al. (1975) found the black students attending the small urban center to be substantially less alienated than the students at the two other settings. Explanations offered by the authors for these results were that the larger and more complex institutions were more alienating. This is in agreement with Herron's (1974) interpretation of student alienation. Babbit et al. (1975) also felt that because the small urban center was in the black community, unlike the other two settings, and the composition of the student body was predominantly black, the students were less alienated. The students at the urban center felt a common bond between themselves and the black community. It is evident by this scant amount of data that there is a need to examine fully the concept of alienation among black college students and how it operates in their daily lives.

TOWARD A DEFINITION OF ALIENATION

Alienation and locus of control are similar concepts, but out of different orientations, which measure similar things. Seeman's (1959) definitions of the five components
of alienation will give a better understanding of this complex and multidimensional concept. Seeman (1959) has endeavored to measure five major meanings of alienation. These are powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation and self-estrangement.

This idea of powerlessness is the most popular and frequent usage of alienation in current literature. Seeman (1959) conceives of powerlessness as being the expectancy or probability held by an individual that his or her own behavior can not determine the occurrence of the outcomes sought. The use of powerlessness as an expectancy makes this version of alienation very closely related to the concept of internal-external locus of control (Rotter, 1966). Rotter (1966) describes a belief in internal control as one's perceiving that reinforcement is contingent upon one's own behaviors or abilities whereas one who believes in the external control would perceive reinforcement as being under the control of external factors such as luck, chance or powerful others. A belief in external control implies a lack of personal control or power.

Seeman (1959) sees these two formulations as very congruent and feels that further research can open the way for the development of a closer bond between two languages of
analysis—-that of psychology and sociology.

Seeman (1959) feels meaninglessness refers to the individual's sense of understanding of the events in which he or she is engaged. The individual experiencing meaninglessness can bring about feelings of purposelessness in which a person may feel that what they are doing has no purpose and that they themselves may have no purpose.

The component of normlessness is derived from Durkheim's description of "anomie" (Seeman, 1959). Anomie denotes a situation in which the social norms regulating individual conduct have broken down or are no longer effective as rules of behavior. Seeman (1959) notes that the anomie behavior leads to low predictability in behavior and may lead to beliefs in luck which would fit along the lines of Rotter's (1966) external dimension.

The fourth type of alienation is isolation. A common usage of isolation refers to the intellectual role where the individual is detached from the popular cultural standards. Nettler (1957) concludes that this individual is estranged from the society and the culture it carries. Seeman (1959) defines the isolated to be an individual who assigns low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the greater society. Isolation may be the result of feelings of
powerlessness to effect any change over the course of events of one's life.

The final variant of alienation discussed by Seeman (1959) is self-estrangement. He interprets self-estrangement to mean being something less than one might ideally be if the circumstances in society were different. Self-estrangement includes conforming or pleasing others to gain rewards with little concern for self wants. Self-estrangement would seem to be closely related to powerlessness which has been shown to relate to locus of control.

Clark (1959) pulls together an important interpretation for understanding this multidimensional concept of alienation. He states that, "the numerous definitions given to alienation . . . , an insoluble feature in all of them is man's feeling of lack of means (power) to eliminate the discrepancy between his definition of the role he is playing and one he feels he should be playing in a situation. Alienation is the degree to which man feels powerless to achieve the role he has determined to be rightfully his in a specific situation" (p. 849). This focus on powerlessness as the main component of alienation is closely related to the concepts used in the internal-external locus of control concept (Rotter, 1966).
INTERNAL-EXTERNAL LOCUS OF CONTROL

Since its inception locus of control has been the subject of over 150 research projects (Throop and MacDonald, 1971). Two very comprehensive reviews of the literature (Lefcourt, 1966 and Rotter, 1966) have found internals, who perceive reinforcements to be contingent upon their own abilities and behaviors, rather than externals, who perceive the source of control over their lives luck, chance or powerful others, to make greater attempts at mastering their environment; to be more resistant to influence by others, yet more effective in attempts to influence others; to prefer high probability choices in risk taking behavior; to be lower in anxiety and higher in achievement orientation; to act more responsive to changes in the situation; to place higher value on skill determined rewards; and to be more involved in social action.

This brief review of the literature on locus of control indicates that a belief in internal control is more positively valued than a belief in external control. Blacks have been found to hold greater beliefs in external control (Lefcourt, 1966; Lefcourt and Ladwig, 1965). Lefcourt and Ladwig (1965) administered the Rotter I-E scale (1966) and the powerlessness and normlessness subscales
of the Dean Alienation Scale (Dean, 1961) to 60 black and 60 white inmates. They found the blacks to have low expectancies for internal control of reinforcements. The largest gap between blacks and whites was found on the normlessness scale which suggests blacks are even more doubtful about the avenues open to them than they are about their own ability.

Lefcourt and Ladwig (1965) suggest that segregation and discrimination facilitate the growth of the external orientation. These two factors would deny positive reinforcements to blacks despite their individual achievement, and therefore provide the kind of experience necessary for the development and maintenance of expectations along the external dimension.

Battle and Rotter (1963) have found an interaction between race and social class with lower class blacks being significantly more external than lower-class whites or middle-class whites or middle-class blacks. Gurin, Gurin, Lao and Beattie (1969) have looked at a number of studies addressing the motivation and performance of the black student populations. The studies seem to indicate that blacks, in comparison to whites, are less likely to hold strong beliefs in internal control. Gurin et al. (1969) point out that race and socioeconomic status
probably interact in the case of lower class blacks who come off particularly external.

MULTIDIMENSIONALITY OF I-E

Recently researchers have found additional factors within the Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale. These additional factors may confuse the issue since the research indicates that the I-E construct may not be as simple as once was thought. Most of the research on locus of control has been done under the assumption that I-E is unidimensional. Recent research points to the contrary.

Mirels (1970) uncovered two distinct factors after administering the Rotter I-E scale to 157 female and 159 male undergraduates. The first distinct factor concerns the mastery one feels over one's own life and the second involves beliefs about the amount of influence the individual citizen can exert over political institutions.

Reid and Ware (1973) have replicated these results naming Mirel's (1970) personal factor "fatalism" and the general factor "social system control."

Mirels (1970) distinguishes from the wording of the items comprising the factors, a difference in the target of control (social systems versus the individual)
and in their reference to self or other. Mirels (1970) points out that the items loading on the personal factor focus on the individual as the target of control whereas the items loading on the general factor focus on social systems as the target of control. He also points out that the items on the personal factor are worded in the first person which implies that the item is concerned with one's own belief in one's own personal control, while the items on the general factor are worded in the third person thus tapping into the control of social systems over people in general.

In contrast to the interpretation of Mirels (1970), Reid and Ware (1974) view the primary difference between the two factors as the source of control. They believe the individual is the target of control in both factors. They view the social systems dimension as being controlled by the government, social institutions and social forces and they view the fatalism dimension as being controlled by luck, chance or fortune.

Reid and Ware (1974) attempted to clarify this confusion empirically by administering a force-choice I-E questionnaire to 134 undergraduates. The scale were constructed so there were ten items concerned with each of the following: (a) chance determinant of self;
(b) chance determinant of other people; (c) social systems control of self; and (d) social systems control of other people. The factor analysis found both the social system control and the fatalism factors and found self and others used interchangably between the two factors. These results supported Reid and Ware's claim of two primary sources of control with the target being the individual on both dimensions.

Gurin et al. (1969) became interested in the concept of locus of control and how it related to the literature on low-income and minority groups. A dominant theme in the literature on poverty is the concept of powerlessness.

Like the researchers mentioned earlier, Gurin et al. (1969) do not view internal-external locus of control as a simple matter. They have found that, even though the literature assumes that a belief in internal control represents one's belief in one's own influence over one's own life, the items on the Rotter I-E scale are comprised of two types that have not been distinguished--those items which refer to the individual's own life situations and those items which refer to beliefs about what causes success or failure for people in general. They call the former beliefs "personal control" and the latter "control ideology." These distinctions are similar to those made by Mirels (1970).
Gurin et al. (1969) have tested this distinction between personal control and control ideology using the following samples: (a) students attending predominantly black colleges in the deep South; (b) black high school drop-outs attending a job training program in a large northern city; and (c) a national study of both black and white adults taking part in retraining programs all over the country.

Gurin et al. (1969) labeled the distinction in personal control and control ideology as the self-other distinction. They tested the meaningfulness of this self-other distinction in a factor analysis of a pool of items bearing on internal control which were administered in the study of the college students. The factor analysis included 23 items from the Rotter I-E scale, 4 items from a Personal Efficacy scale, and a set of questions written in the same forced-choice format, as the Rotter I-E, which tapped the individual's beliefs about the operation of personal and external forces in the race situation in the U.S.

The results of the factor analysis indicated that the black college students did make a distinction in terms of whose failure or success was referred to in the question. The five items found with the highest loadings on factor
were all phrased in the first person. This factor, personal control, measured the beliefs that one can control one's own life if the internal alternative is chosen. Factor I individual beliefs in control ideology, which Gurin et al. (1969) explains as "referring instead to people generally, these items seem to measure the respondent's ideology or general beliefs about the role of internal and external forces in determining success or failure in the culture at large. Endorsing the internal alternative on these items means rejecting the notion that success follows from luck, the right breaks or knowing the right people, and accepting a traditional Protestant ethic explanation" (p. 35). Such a person would believe that hard work, effort, skill and ability are the most important determinants of success in life. This explanation is in line with the findings of Waters, Batlis and Waters (1975) that the Protestant Ethic scales are negatively related to the external orientation on the I-E scale.

Gurin et al. (1969) realized that the separation of self from other is not typical of the factor analytic result of the studies on white populations. Most of the studies report finding one general factor which includes both types of questions. Gurin et al (1969) believe that the self-other distinction is a valid difference between
black and white populations and do not feel that the inclusion of items from the Personal Efficacy scale, which provided more items in personal terms, brought about artificial differences among blacks and whites.

Gurin's et al. (1969) rationale for expecting the distinction of self from other for the black sample, but not for the white sample, lies in the fact that blacks may very well adopt the general cultural beliefs about internal control but may find that these beliefs cannot always be applied in their own life's situations. Without the same experience of racial prejudice and discrimination, whites are less likely to perceive an inconsistency between cultural beliefs and what works for them. This inconsistency in personal control and control ideology beliefs could lead to a sense of powerlessness in these black individuals since they know and believe in what is needed generally to be successful, but they can't operationalize this in their lives because of external forces over which they have no control. The strong beliefs in control ideology but lesser beliefs in personal control were uncovered also in the black high school sample and in the sample of black and white adults in job retraining programs (Gurin et al., 1969). To date this study investigating the distinction in internal
control among blacks and whites has not been replicated using black and white college students from a predominantly white institution.

Along the external end of the I-E construct, Levenson (1973; 1974) has developed an I-E scale which differs from the Rotter scale in four ways: (a) a six point Likert scale was used instead of the forced-choice format of the Rotter scale; (b) all items were phrased in first person terminology so as to pertain to the subjects belief about self; (c) the individual was the target of control in all the items; and (d) three different sources of control were differentiated among the I-E subscales (self, powerful others and chance). This scale was administered to 329 male undergraduates and a factor analysis confirmed the existence of all three factors with virtually no overlap of items comprising the three dimensions. Levenson's (1974) rationale for splitting up the external dimension into beliefs of control by chance and beliefs of control by powerful others is her feeling that people who believe the world is unordered (chance) would behave and think differently from people who believe the world is ordered, but that powerful others are in control.

Gurin, Gurin, Lao and Beattie (1969) also feel that the distinction between control by chance and control by powerful others is a valid one. They feel this is very
important to the research on minority groups. Previous research examining internal-external locus of control has viewed the construct to measure skill versus chance. This is done even though the external dimension includes chance luck and powerful others factors (Rotter, 1969).

Gurin et al. (1969) point to the fact that low income group members may experience external obstacles which have nothing to do with chance. They feel class-tied obstacles relating to the labor market, such as poor transportation systems, lay offs and class bound attitudes in hiring practices reduce the chances for opportunities and resources for these individuals, but are in no way related to chance or luck. For blacks there are the additional obstacles of racism and discrimination, which operate above and beyond class constraints, and which are systematic, predictable and reliable.

Gurin et al. (1969) feel that although the literature indicates that people who believe in external control are less motivated, these same effects may not be valid for low income persons, especially blacks, who through personal experiences, may believe that economic and discriminatory factors are more important than individual skill and personal qualities in explaining why they succeed or fail.
Levenson (1973) also validated her I-E scale by administering the scale to 165 consecutive admissions to a state mental hospital. A factor analysis of the results also verified the existence of the internal, chance and powerful others subscales.

In a recent study, Garcia and Levenson (1975) looked at differences in black and white expectations of control by chance and powerful others. They used the same scale Levenson (1973; 1974) used in her earlier studies. This study was designed to examine the relationship between the multidimensional measures of locus of control and two demographic variables--ethnicity and socioeconomic status. They hypothesized that blacks would score higher than whites on the Powerful Others scale and that students from low income families would score higher on the chance scale than subjects from middle-income families.

Garcia and Levenson (1975) had 84 white subjects which were attending predominantly white colleges and 110 blacks who were from predominantly black institutions. Socioeconomic status was categorized by the Hollingshead Occupational status scale (Bonjean, Hill and MacDonald, 1967).

Garcia and Levenson (1975) found that students from low income families had stronger perceptions of control by
chances than the wealthier students. There were no significant differences between the two groups on the Internal or Powerful Others scales. The hypothesis that blacks would hold higher expectations of control by Powerful Others was confirmed when socioeconomic status was controlled. Controlling for SES, blacks were shown to hold significantly higher expectations for chance control than whites, but there were no significant differences on the Internal scale between blacks and whites.

Reasons suggested by Garcia and Levenson (1975) for the strong beliefs in chance by low income individuals were that people who live on the poverty incomes are affected by circumstances which are usually interpreted as being beyond anyone's direct control such as illness, weather or joblessness. Garcia and Levenson's (1975) expectation that the black sample would identify external control primarily with control by powerful others and, therefore, score higher than whites only on the Powerful Others scale was not borne out. Blacks scored higher than whites on the chance scale.

There could be many reasons for Garcia and Levenson's (1975) results. Since most of the black subjects were attending a predominantly black college, the perceptions of control by powerful others may not have been encouraged
in that uniracial atmosphere. Since these students shared similar circumstances with those around them the saliency of powerful others may not have been an issue for them. It may be that the lack of significant differences in Garcia and Levenson's (1975) study between blacks and whites on the Internal scale are due to the fact that their black sample came from a predominantly black school. Harris and Phelan (1973) have found that blacks in a segregated environment to be more internal than blacks in an integrated environment.

The present study was an attempt to further investigate the multidimensionality of the internal-external locus of control construct. Taking the incentive of Gurin et al. (1969), the internal dimension will be divided into control one perceives one has over one's own life (personal control) and the control one perceives people in general have over their own lives (control ideology) and using the work of Levenson (1973; 1974) and Garcia and Levenson (1975) to divide the external dimension into the source of control as chance or powerful others. These divisions in the factors of I-E will further help clarify this construct. These divisions would be especially useful in the research using the I-E construct with minority group members.

The concept of alienation, which Clark (1959) views as the degree to which one feels powerless to achieve
the role one has determined to be rightfully one's own in a specific situation, is closely related to this topic. This definition could also be stretched to include the feeling of powerlessness to achieve a role deemed socially acceptable by society because of external forces. In the sense alienation could easily be measured by the discrepancy between the power one perceives one has (personal control) and the power one believes one should have (control ideology). This way this relationship between locus of control and alienation may further illuminate the situation black students experience on predominantly white campuses and also the situation experienced by black Americans in this society. This study will look at black-white differences in perceptions of locus of control and feelings of alienation.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The primary purpose of this study was to identify the differences in the perceptions of locus of control and feelings of alienation between black and white male and female college freshmen.

Subjects

The subjects were 160 students who were at least second quarter freshmen. One hundred and ten white subjects, 60 females and 50 males, and 13 black subjects, 7 females and 6 males, were recruited from introductory psychology classes during Winter quarter, 1978. These students were participating in this study in partial fulfillment of the research requirements for the course. Due to lack of black students in these classes, the remaining 37 students, 18 females and 19 males, were recruited from the residence halls. The mean ages for white females, white males, black females, and black males were 18.3, 18.98, 19.56 and 18.8, respectively.

Instruments

All students responded to the Biographical data
sheet, the Multidimensional I-E scale, the University Alienation Scale and the Rotter I-E scale.

A more comprehensive Multidimensional Internal-External Locus of Control scale was constructed in accordance with the suggestion of various theorists and their research discussed earlier. The following scales were used:

PC (#1)--personal control, self as the source of control
CI (#2)--control ideology, belief in the amount of control people have in general
P (33)--powerful others as the source of control
C (#4)--chance as the source of control

Items on these PC, CI, P and C scales were taken directly, or with slight changes, from already existing I-E scales. Levenson's (1973; 1974) scale was used in its entirety. The Kuder-Richardson reliabilities for this scale yielded $r = .64$, .77 and .78 for the Internal, Powerful Others and Chance scales respectively. Split-half reliabilities were $r = .62$ (I scale), .66 (P scale) and .64 (C scale). Several items were taken from the Rotter (1966) scale. The internal consistency for this scale ranges from .65 to .79 and the test-retest reliability ranges from .55 to .83. Many of the items used from
the former two scales also appear on the Gurin, Curin, Lao and Beattie (1969) scale. No reliability or validity information is available on this scale. All items were adapted to a six-point Likert format with the following intervals: strongly disagree (6), moderately disagree (5), slightly disagree (4), slightly agree (3), moderately agree (2) and strongly agree (1). Since a six-point Likert format was used the four scales should be statistically independent of one another (Levenson, 1974).

All items, except those pertaining to the Control Ideology scale, were worded in first person terminology focusing on self as the target of control. Each scale consisted of eight items, except the Control Ideology scale which consisted of 14 items. More Control Ideology items were utilized to combat a pattern of answering all items in terms of self since all the other items were worded in first person terminology. The items of the various scales were randomly distributed throughout the questionnaire for a total of 38 items. The scales were altered to make them more meaningful and the consequent effect on reliability and validity is not known. For a complete listing of all items utilized (broken down by scale), see Appendix A.
The University Alienation Scale (Burbach, 1972) was used to assess the variable of alienation. This scale consists of 24 items and has three major components: the Meaninglessness, the Powerlessness and the Social Estrangement subscales. Seeman's (1959) definitions provide the conceptual basis for the formulation of the Meaninglessness and Powerlessness items. Individuals experiencing meaninglessness would have difficulty understanding the purpose of events in which they are engaged and persons expecting that their own behavior cannot determine the outcomes they seek would be experiencing powerlessness (Seeman, 1959). Social Estrangement pertains to a separation from the group and its standards (Dean, 1961). Nine Powerlessness, eight Meaninglessness and seven Social Estrangement items are randomly distributed on the scale, a five choice agree-disagree Likert-type continuum, on which subjects are asked to indicate the degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement. The range of the scale total is 24 to 120. The range of reliability coefficients for the subscales is .72 to .89. The University Alienation Scale correlates with the subscales of the Dean (1961) Alienation scale in a range of .47 to .58. For a listing of all items, see the Appendix B.

Rotter I-E scale (Rotter, 1966) was also used to
assess Internal-External Locus of Control. This scale consists of 29 pairs of forced choice items which each item consists of an internal response (belief that events are contingent on one's own self) and an external response (belief that events are contingent on things beyond one's own control). Twenty-three of the items are scored and the remaining six items are fillers. The Rotter (1966) I-E scale has an internal consistency reliability of .65 to .79 and a test-retest reliability of .55 to .83. For a listing of all items, see Appendix C.

A biographical data face sheet requesting the following information: race, sex, age, class rank, major, number of quarters attended O.S.U., father's occupation, mother's occupation, number of brothers, number of sisters, and sibling rank. Data were recorded on the last three demographic variables (number of brothers, number of sisters and sibling rank).

Procedure

Each testing session began with instructions for taking the inventories. The 160 subjects were given test packets containing a Biographical Data Sheet, the Multi-dimensional I-E scale, the University Alienation scale (USA), and the Rotter I-E scale, in that order. The packets were completed anonymously in group settings lasting
approximately 45 minutes. Residence hall students were contacted by phone by the author or in person by their residence hall advisors about participating in the study. The packets were then mailed or personally handed to those students who indicated they would participate.

Hypotheses and Statistical Tests

The following hypotheses were tested:

1) There are no significant differences between the mean scores for the black and white subjects on the Multidimensional I-E scale, the University Alienation Scale, the Rotter I-E scale and three demographic variables (number of brothers, number of sisters and sibling rank).

2) There are no significant differences between the mean scores for males and females on the Multidimensional I-E scale, the University Alienation Scale, the Rotter I-E scale and three demographic variables.

3) There are no significant differences between the mean scores for the black and white male and female groups.

All hypotheses were tested by means of a 2x2 multivariate analysis of variance for the Multidimensional I-E scale, the University Alienation Scale, the Rotter I-E scale, and three demographic variables. This procedure includes a univariate analysis of each scale.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

All hypotheses were tested using a multivariate analysis of variance. This procedure includes a follow-up univariate analysis.

Results

The means and standard deviations for the four variables on the Multidimensional I-E scale, the four variables on the University Alienation Scale, and the two variables on the Rotter I-E scale by sex for the black and white groups are shown on Table 1. Univariate tests of significance on these scales for each of the three hypotheses are shown on Table 2.

In the first hypothesis the multivariate test for the main effect of race across the ten variables was found to be significant ($F = 2.027, \ p < .05$). In the univariate analysis (see Table 2) the Control Ideology subscale ($p < .05$) on the Multidimensional I-E scale was found to be significant. On the University Alienation Scale the Meaninglessness subscale ($p < .05$), the Powerlessness subscale ($p < .001$) and the Total ($p < .005$) were
found to be significant. The External subscale (p < .01) and the Internal subscale (p < .01) on the Rotter I-E scale were found to be significant.

For the second hypothesis the multivariate test for the main effect of sex was not found to be significant (F = 1.093, p < .372). In the univariate analysis two scales were found to be significant. The Rotter I-E scale obtained significance on the External (p < .05) subscale and the Internal (p < .05) subscale (Table 2).

In exploring the interaction effect (Hypothesis 3) for all scales, the multivariate test was not found to be significant (F = 0.313, p < 0.977). The univariate analysis (Table 2) produced no significant (p < .05) findings.

In order to take a closer look at the above significant results the Tukey b test (Winer, 1971) was used in a follow-up analysis. All combinations of groups were analyzed for each significant scale in order to identify specific group differences.

There were no significant differences (p < .05) found on the Control Ideology subscale on the Multidimensional I-E scale. Black males had the highest mean score and white males had the lowest mean score.

In the secondary analysis of the University Alienation Scale no significant group differences were found (p < .05)
or the Meaninglessness subscale. The black female group had the highest mean score and the white female group had the lowest mean score. On the Powerlessness subscale the black females were found to be significantly different (p < .05) from white females and white males. Black males were found to be significantly different (p < .05) from white females. The black females had the highest mean score and the white females had the lowest score. On the Total subscale of the University Alienation Scale the black females were found to be significantly different (p < .05) from the white females and the black females had the highest mean score and the white females had the lowest mean score.

The External subscale of the Rotter I-E scale yielded significant differences (p < .05) between black females and white males. Also at the p < .01 level significant differences were found between black females and white males. Black females had the highest mean score and white males had the lowest mean score. On the Internal subscale of the Rotter I-E scale significant differences (p < .05) were found between white males and black females. White males had the highest mean score and black females had the lowest mean score.

The means and standard deviations for the three demographic
variables (number of brothers, number of sisters and sibling rank) by sex for black and white groups are shown on Table 3. Univariate tests of significance on these variables for each of the hypothesis are shown on Table 4.

In the first hypothesis the multivariate test for the main effect of race across the three variables was found to be significant ($F = 0.652, p < .05$). In the univariate analysis (Table 4) the number of sisters variable ($p < .015$) and the Sibling Rank variable ($p < .02$) were found to be significant.

In the multivariate test for the main effect of sex (Hypothesis 2) was not found to be significant ($F = 0.652, p < .583$).

In exploring the interaction effect (Hypothesis 3) for all three variables, the multivariate test was not found to be significant ($F = 1.576, p < .198$). The univariate analysis (Table 4) bore out one significant difference. The number of brothers variable ($p < .03$) was found to be significant.

The Tukey b test (Winer, 1971) was used in a follow-up analysis to take a closer look at the significant variables. However, no significant group differences were found. Black males had the highest mean score and white males had the lowest mean score on the number of brothers
variable. Black males had the highest mean score and white females had the lowest mean score on the number of sisters variable. Black males had the highest mean score and white females had the lowest mean score on the Sibling Rank variable.

Discussion

The findings show that race (black and white) tends to be associated with the variables of internal-external locus of control, alienation and demographics. In general, there was a significant difference between the way black and white students responded to the inventories. Black students scored significantly higher than white students on all variables except the Chance and the Internal variables. These findings suggest that black students tend to perceive themselves as less internally controlled and more alienated than white students.

More specifically the findings suggest that black students believe less in the control people have over their lives, tend to be less clear about why they are at the university, feel more of a sense of purposelessness, believe more that their own behavior cannot determine the outcome they seek, feel more alienated from the university and believe more in external control of their
lives. On all scales, except the Internal Control scale, black students had the highest mean scores and white students had the lowest mean scores. The significant differences between black and white students in perception of locus of control and alienation in the university community may indicate that black students come to college with feelings that may prohibit or limit their freedom and growth in the university.

On the demographic variables there were significant differences along the race dimension. The univariate analysis suggested that blacks tend to be different from whites on the number of sisters and the sibling rank variables. However, the follow-up analysis found no specific group differences.

The univariate analysis for the main effect of sex found that males differed from females on the Internal and External variables. Looking the follow-up analysis the black females scored higher than white males on the External scale. High scorers on the Rotter I-E scale tend to report that events in their lives are not contingent on their own behavior. A belief in External control would indicate a belief in control by powerful others, chance or luck. Inversely white males scored higher on Internal control than black females. A high
score on Internal control indicates a belief in one's own personal control over one's life. These findings are in accordance with the findings of Lefcourt (1966) and Lefcourt and Ladwig (1965) who found blacks to be more external than whites.

There were no significant sex differences on the three demographic variables.

In summary, this study indicates that there are differences between black and white students in their perceptions of locus of control and their feelings of alienation. The evidence in this study suggests that there are significant differences between males and females on beliefs in Internal-External control.
Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations for the Multidimensional I-E Scale, the University Alienation Scale and the Rotter I-E Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidimensional I-E Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Control</td>
<td>21.920</td>
<td>20.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.780</td>
<td>5.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Ideology</td>
<td>44.400</td>
<td>44.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.332</td>
<td>7.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful Others</td>
<td>31.960</td>
<td>32.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.730</td>
<td>7.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>30.800</td>
<td>31.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.900</td>
<td>5.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Alienation Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.538</td>
<td>5.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
<td>28.920</td>
<td>27.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.726</td>
<td>6.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.545</td>
<td>4.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.680</td>
<td>70.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>15.124</td>
<td>14.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotter I-E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>13.920</td>
<td>12.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.222</td>
<td>5.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>9.080</td>
<td>10.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.222</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multidimensional I-E Scale</td>
<td>University Alienation Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race (A)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Control</td>
<td>1.131 0.289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Ideology</td>
<td>4.416 0.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful Others</td>
<td>0.647 0.423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>0.718 0.398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex (B)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Control</td>
<td>0.464 0.497 1.036 0.310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Ideology</td>
<td>0.202 0.887 0.051 0.822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful Others</td>
<td>0.021 0.884 0.174 0.677</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>0.005 0.945 0.178 0.674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R x S (AB)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Control</td>
<td>4.526 0.035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Ideology</td>
<td>12.962 0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful Others</td>
<td>2.315 0.130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>8.673 0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>6.540 0.011</td>
<td>4.617 0.033 0.006 0.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>6.540 0.011</td>
<td>4.617 0.033 0.006 0.936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Values are F statistics with associated p-values.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of brothers</td>
<td>1.560</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>1.300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.227</td>
<td>2.160</td>
<td>1.239</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sisters</td>
<td>1.560</td>
<td>1.720</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>1.240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>1.429</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Rank</td>
<td>2.720</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>2.317</td>
<td>2.440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.429</td>
<td>2.582</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4
Univariate Tests of Significance for the Three Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Race (A) p less than</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sex (B) p less than</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>RxS (AB) p less than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of brothers</td>
<td>2.172</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>4.474</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sisters</td>
<td>5.992</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Rank</td>
<td>4.837</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Summary of the Tukey b Analysis
for the Multidimensional I-E Scale, the
University Alienation Scale and the Rotter I-E Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>p .05</th>
<th>p .01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
<td>Black females-White males</td>
<td>Black females-White males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black females-White females</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Males-White females</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Black females-White females</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>Black females-White males</td>
<td>Black females-White males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>White males-Black females</td>
<td>White males-Black females</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to identify differences between black and white male and female students on locus of control, alienation and demographic variables. The sample consisted of 160 male and female introductory psychology and residence hall volunteers who were at least second quarter first year students. There were a total of four groups: black females (25), black males (25), white females (60) and white males (50).

Three inventories were employed in this study: 1) Multidimensional Internal-External Locus of Control Scale. The items for this scale were taken from already existing I-E scales such as Rotter (1966), Gurin, Gurin, Lao and Beattie (1969) and Levenson (1973; 1974). This inventory was used to determine distinctions in the beliefs in the internal and external dimension; 2) University Alienation Scale (USA) (Burbach, 1972) was used to assess alienation in the university community and 3) Rotter (1966) Internal-External Locus of Control scale was also used to assess locus of control. Also three
demographic variables (number of brothers, number of sisters and sibling rank) were looked at.

Three hypotheses were explored using a 2x2 multivariate analysis of variance, a univariate analysis of variance and the Tukey b test.

Conclusions

Given the outcome of this study, some conclusions may be drawn. Significant differences were found between the black and white students on Control Ideology of the Multidimensional I-E scale, Meaninglessness, Powerlessness and Total alienation on the University Alienation Scale and Internal and External on the Rotter I-E scale.

Differences due to subjects' sex were found only on the Internal and External variables. No significant differences were found on the three demographic variables for race or sex.

In summary the findings suggest an association between (1) race and locus of control, (2) race and alienation and (3) sex and locus of control. This association seems to be the strongest in black females.

Limitations

In this research, the Multidimensional I-E scale was constructed using items from the Levenson (1973; 1974),
Rotter (1966) and Gruin, Gurin, Loa and Beattie (1969) I-E scales. The items were altered to make the scale more meaningful to this research and as a result there is no information on the reliability or validity of the scale.

There was a smaller sample of black students used due to the lack of blacks in the introductory psychology classes. All the white students responded to the inventories during Winter, 1978. A majority of the black students (37) responded to the questionnaire during Spring, 1978. The difference in the weather during these two quarters may have affected the student's perception of locus of control or feelings of alienation. Also a majority of the black students (37) did not respond to the inventories in the presence of the author, whereas all of the white sample did.

The University Alienation Scale (Burbach, 1972) is a relatively new scale and has been used only in a few studies. There is also a limited amount of data on reliability and validity factors. Although the Rotter (1966) I-E scale has shown to be a sufficiently valid and reliable research tool, it is not without its limitations. The controversy over whether the Rotter I-E is a unidimensional scale or a multidimensional scale was discussed
earlier. Several authors (Mirels, 1970; Reid and Ware, 1973; 1974; and Gurin, Gurin, Lao and Beattie, 1969) have found evidence which suggests the Rotter I-E measures more than strictly a belief in Internal and External Control. As long as this contradictory evidence is available the validity of the Rotter I-E is in question.

In summary, the limitations of this study which have been discussed are: 1) lack of reliability and validity information on the Multidimensional I-E scale, 2) small sample of blacks and different response quarters, 3) limited replication data on reliability and validity of the USA, and 4) controversy over the validity of the Rotter I-E scale.

Implications

The results of this study suggest that there is a significant relationship between race and locus of control and alienation as perceived by first year university students. In addition, significant relationships were found between sex and locus of control. The scale scores indicate that black students, especially black females, perceive themselves as believing events in their lives are contingent on external control and experience powerlessness, meaninglessness and total alienation from the university community. Black females followed by black
males had the highest mean scores on most of these scales. These findings are in accordance with the literature reviewed earlier which indicated that black students have stronger beliefs in external control (Lefcourt, 1966; Lefcourt and Ladwig, 1965) and perceive themselves to be more alienated from the university community (Burbach and Thompson, 1971). There was a significant difference between black and white students on Control Ideology, where white females had the lowest mean scores and black males had the highest mean scores. These findings indicate that white females had stronger belief in the power people have over their lives. These results were not in accordance with those of Gurin, Gurin, Loa and Beattie (1969) who found blacks believing more strongly than whites in the power people in general possess. Also the results of this study find blacks and whites believing equally in Personal Control which is different from the findings of Gurin et al. (1969) who found whites believing more strongly in Personal Control than blacks. Reasons for these findings may be the differences in the samples. Gurin et al. (1969) used students attending predominantly black colleges in the South, black high school drop-outs and black and white adults, in a retraining program, from all over the country. This study used a black and white
sample experiencing the same university environment. Although black students indicated a belief in Personal Control as strongly as white students, black students responded more externally to the Rotter I-E scale. There were no significant differences between blacks and whites on the External dimension (Powerful Others and Chance) on the Multidimensional I-E scale. These findings could be attributed to the lack of reliability and validity information on the Multidimensional I-E scale. The significant findings on the Rotter I-E for sex differences were in line with other findings, that females are more external than males. There were no significant differences in alienation between males and females.

In summary, the results of this study suggests that a significant relationship exists between race and locus of control and alienation. Black students had especially high mean score on the Powerlessness subscale which may indicate that these students experience a discrepancy between what their situation is presently and how they want it to be. The significant differences between black and white students in perception of locus of control and alienation in the university community indicate that black students come to the university experiencing feelings that might inhibit and limit their freedom and growth at the
university. This added to being a minority in a large university may make these students feel alone and powerless to change their situation.
Appendix A
Multidimensional I-E Scale

Item #

**Scale #1**: Personal Control, self as source of control

1. Whether or not I get to be a leader depends mostly on my own ability.

5. When I make plans, I'm almost certain to make them work.

8. Whether or not I get into a car accident depends mostly on how good driver I am.

13. How many friends I have depends on how nice a person I am.

27. I can pretty much determine what will happen in my life.

29. I am usually able to protect my personal interests.

33. My life is determined by my own actions.

38. My life is determined by my own actions.

**Scale #2**: Control Ideology, control people in general have

2. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

6. People are lonely because they don't try to make friends.

9. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.

12. The average citizen can have influence in government decisions.

14. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

15. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

18. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work.

21. With hard work the average citizen can make their plans work.
24. People must rely on their own ability to get others to do the right thing.

28. How many friends a person has depends on how nice that person is.

31. Most misfortunes are the result of ability, ignorance, laziness or all three.

32. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.

35. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.

37. People have the power to influence what happens to them.

Scale #3: Powerful Others as the source of control

4. I feel like what happens in my life is mostly determined by powerful people.

11. Although I might have good ability, I will not be given leadership responsibility without appealing to those in positions of power.

17. My life is chiefly controlled by powerful others.

20. People like myself have little chance of protecting our personal interests when they conflict with those of strong pressure groups.

23. Getting what I want requires pleasing the people above me.

26. If important were to decide they don't like me, I probably won't make many friends.

30. Whether or not I get into a car accident depends mostly on the other driver.

36. In order to have my plans work, I make sure they fit in with the desires of people who have power over me.
**Scale #4**

3. To a great extent my life is controlled by accidental happenings.

7. Often there is no chance of protecting my personal interests from bad luck happenings.

10. When I get what I want it is usually because I'm lucky.

16. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.

19. Whether or not I get into a car accident is mostly a matter of luck.

22. It's not always wise for me to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune.

25. Whether or not I get to be a leader depends on whether I'm lucky enough to be in the right place at the right time.

34. It's chiefly a matter of fate whether or not I have a few friends or many.
Appendix B
University Alienation Scale

1. The size and complexity of this university makes it very difficult for a student to know where to turn.

2. It is only wishful thinking to believe that one can really influence what happens at this university.

3. Classes at this university are so regimented that there is little room for the personal needs and interest of the student.

4. The faculty has too much control over the lives of students at this university.

5. The bureaucracy of this university has me confused and bewildered.

6. I feel that I am an integral part of the university community.

7. Things have become so complicated at this university that I don't really understand just what is going on.

8. I seldom feel "lost" or "alone" at this university.

9. Students are just so many cogs in the machinery at this university.

10. I don't have as many friends as I would like at this university.

11. Most of the time I feel I have an effective voice in the decisions regarding my destiny at this university.

12. Life within the social systems of this university is so chaotic that the student really doesn't know where to turn.

13. Many students at this university are lonely and unrelated to their fellow human beings.

14. More and more, I feel helpless in the face of what is happening at this university today.

15. There are forces affecting me at this university that are so complex and confusing that I find it difficult to
effectively make decisions.

16. I can't seem to make sense out of my university experience.

17. My experience at this university has been devoid of any meaningful relationships.

18. The administration has too much control over my life at this university.

19. This university is run by a few people in power and there is not much the student can do about it.

20. The student has little chance of protecting his personal interests when they conflict with those of this university.

21. In spite of the fast pace of this university, it is easy to make many close friends that you can really count on.

22. My life is so confusing at this university that I hardly know what to expect from day to day.

23. In this fast-changing university, with so much conflicting information available, it is difficult to think clearly about many issues.

24. This university is just too big and impersonal to provide for the individual student.
Appendix C
Rotter I-E Scale

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
   
b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
   
b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
   
b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
   
b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
   
b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

6. a. Without the right break one cannot be an effective leader.
   
b. Capable people who fail to be leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

7. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
   
b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

8. a. Heredity plays the determining role in determining one's personality.
b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.

9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.

b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

10. a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.

b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

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

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

13. a. When I make plans, I am almost sure I can make them work.

b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.

b. There is some good in everybody.

15. a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.

b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

16. a. Who gets to be boss often depends on who is lucky enough to be in the right place first.

b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
   b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.

18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
   b. There is really no such thing as "luck".

19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
   b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
   b. How many friends you have depends on how nice a person you are.

21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good things.
   b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
   b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
   b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
   b. A good leader makes clear to everyone what their jobs are.

25. a. Many times I feel I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
   
   b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
   
   b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
   
   b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

29. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
   
   b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.
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